

# Use of assistive technology to assess distal motor function in subjects with neuromuscular disease

Dominique Vincent-Genod<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Sylvain Roche<sup>3,4</sup>, Aurélie Barrière<sup>5</sup>, Capucine de Latre<sup>5#a</sup>, Marie Tinat<sup>1</sup>, Eelke Venema<sup>6</sup>, Emmeline Lagrange<sup>6</sup>, Adriana Gomes Lisboa de Souza<sup>7</sup>, Guillaume Thomann<sup>7</sup>, Justine Coton<sup>7</sup>, Vincent Gautheron<sup>2,8</sup>, Léonard Féasson<sup>2,9</sup>, Pascal Rippert<sup>10</sup>, Carole Vuillerot<sup>1,11</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Centre Référent Maladies Rares Neuromusculaires, Service de Médecine Physique et de Réadaptation Pédiatrique des Hospices Civils de Lyon - Hôpital Femme Mère Enfant, Bron, France

<sup>2</sup> Université Jean Monnet Saint-Etienne, Lyon 1, Université Savoie Mont-Blanc, Laboratoire Interuniversitaire de Biologie de la Motricité, Saint-Étienne, France

<sup>3</sup> Service de Biostatistique-Bioinformatique, Pôle Santé Publique des Hospices Civils de Lyon, Lyon, France

<sup>4</sup> Laboratoire de Biométrie et Biologie Évolutive, Équipe Biostatistique-Santé, Villeurbanne, France – Université de Lyon, Lyon, France

<sup>5</sup> Centre Référent Maladies Rares Neuromusculaires des Hospices Civils de Lyon, Hôpital de la Croix Rousse, Lyon, France

<sup>6</sup> Consultations Maladies Rares Neuromusculaires du CHU Michallon, Grenoble, France

<sup>7</sup> Université. Grenoble Alpes, CNRS, Grenoble INP, Institute of Engineering Univ. Grenoble Alpes, G-SCOP, Grenoble, France

<sup>8</sup> Service de Médecine Physique et de Réadaptation Pédiatrique, Centre Référent Maladies Rares Neuromusculaires – Euro-NmD, CHU de Saint-Etienne, Saint Etienne, France

<sup>9</sup> Unité de Myologie, IRMIS, Centre Référent Maladies Rares Neuromusculaires – Euro-NmD, CHU de Saint-Etienne, Saint-Étienne, France

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

36

37 <sup>10</sup> Pôle Santé Publique, Service de Recherche et épidémiologie cliniques, Hospices Civils de Lyon,  
38 Lyon, France

39

40 <sup>11</sup> Pathophysiology and Genetics of Neuron and Muscle, CNRS UMR 5261, INSERM U1315,  
41 Université Lyon1, Faculté de Médecine Lyon Est, Lyon, France

42

43 <sup>#a</sup> Current address: SMR pédiatrique ESEAN APF France handicap, Nantes, France

44

45 \*Corresponding author

46 E-mail: [dominique.vincent-genod@chu-lyon.fr](mailto:dominique.vincent-genod@chu-lyon.fr)

47

48

49

50

## 51 **Abstract**

52 Purpose: Among the 32 items of the Motor Function Measure scale, 3 concern the assessment of hand  
53 function on a paper-based support. Their characteristics make it possible to envisage the use of a tablet  
54 instead of the original paper-based support for their completion. This would then make it possible to  
55 automate the score to reduce intra- and inter-individual variability.

56 The main objective of the present study was to validate the digital completion of items 18, 19, and 22  
57 by measuring the agreement of the scores obtained using a digital tablet with those obtained using the  
58 original paper-based support in children and adults with various neuromuscular diseases (NMD). The  
59 secondary objective is to calibrate an algorithm for the automatic items scoring.

60 Design: Prospective, multicentre, non-interventional study.

61 Methods: Ninety-eight subjects aged 5 to 60 years with a confirmed NMD completed MFM items 18,  
62 19, and 22 both on a paper support and a digital tablet.

63 Results: The median age of included subjects was 16.2 years. Agreement between scores as assessed  
64 using the weighted Kappa coefficient was almost perfect for the scores of items 18 and 22 ( $K=0.93$ , and  
65  $0.95$ , respectively) and substantial for item 19 ( $K=0.70$ ). In all cases of disagreement, the difference was  
66 of 1 point. The most frequent disagreement concerned item 19; mainly in the direction of a scoring of 1  
67 point less on the tablet. An automatic analysis algorithm was tested on 82 recordings to suggest  
68 improvements.

69 Conclusion: The switch from original paper-based support to the tablet results in minimal and  
70 acceptable differences, and maintains a valid and reproducible measure of the 3 items. The developed  
71 algorithm for automatic scoring appears feasible with the perspective to include them in a digital  
72 application that will make it easier to monitor patients.

73

74

## 75 **Introduction**

76 In subjects affected by a neuromuscular disease (NMD), muscle damages progressively affect motor  
77 function leading to limitations in the activities of daily living. The assessment of motor function is  
78 crucial to measure the impact of the disease on functional limitations and participation restrictions in  
79 order to propose adequate management of people living with a NMD [1–3]. In subjects with the most  
80 severe phenotypes, assessment is focused on upper limb distal motor function as the distal muscles  
81 groups of the upper extremities are those best preserved for the longest. Studies have found that adult  
82 subjects with Duchenne muscular dystrophy are still able to perform important functional activities  
83 despite having limited distal motor function. Over time, they tend to lose their functional abilities,  
84 although their muscle strength decreases only slightly [4,5]. Upper limb function measurement is also  
85 of value for certain NMD where upper limb distal motor function is primarily impaired, such as the  
86 distal myopathies and peripheral neuropathies, for routine monitoring of such patients but also clinical  
87 trials [6]. In addition, upper extremity function is determined not only by weakness, but also by  
88 prominent and progressive joint contractures or sometimes prominent distal laxity underscoring the  
89 need for valid hand motor assessments applicable in various NMD [7]. The Motor Function Measure  
90 (MFM) is a 32-items scale for assessing motor function of subjects with a NMD that is frequently used  
91 in clinical trials and clinical follow-up. Validation studies have confirmed its value, its ease of use,  
92 validity, reproducibility, and responsiveness [8,10]. Despite the many advantages and increasing use of  
93 functional assessment scale, there is still a variation in ratings between examiners and by the same  
94 examiner, linked to the subjectivity and intrinsic qualities of the assessor, a limitation found in all hetero  
95 functional assessments.

96 The characteristics of 3 items focused on upper limb distal motor function make it possible to envisage  
97 using a digital tablet instead of the original paper support to administer them. Digitising the 3 items  
98 paved the way to the automatization of the item scoring, diminishing the therapist's influence on item  
99 rating levels.

100 In the present study we present a validation study of the digital completion of items 18, 19, and 22 by  
101 measuring the agreement of the scores obtained using a digital tablet (T-score) with those obtained using  
102 the original paper-based support (P-score) in children and adults with various NMD, as well as assessing  
103 performances of automatic items scoring algorithms.

104

## 105 **Methods**

### 106 **Study design and ethic**

107 This prospective, multicentre, non-interventional study conducted in 5 neuromuscular disease reference  
108 centres located in 3 university hospitals; 2 paediatric and 3 adult centres. Patients aged 5 to 60 years  
109 with a confirmed NMD and scheduled to be evaluated using the MFM were invited to participate during  
110 a clinical follow-up visit. They were provided with written information describing the study and,  
111 according to legislation in place at the time of the study, patients (or parents/legal guardian) who gave  
112 oral consent to participate were included between January to December 2018. Ethics approval was  
113 obtained from the regional review board (*Comité éthique de Protection des Personnes du Sud-Ouest et*  
114 *Outre-Mer de France*), the study was registered on ClinicalTrials.gov (ID: NCT03465358).

### 115 **The MFM scale**

116 The MFM is a functional rating scale available in 2 versions; one composed of 32 items dedicated to  
117 subjects with a NMD aged 6 to 60 years (MFM-32)[8,10], the other composed of 20 items of the MFM-  
118 32 validated for children aged from 2 to 7 years of age (MFM-20)[11]. In both versions, items are  
119 grouped into 3 domains: D1, standing and transfers; D2, axial and proximal motor function; and D3,  
120 distal motor function. The scoring of items uses a 4-point Likert scale based on the individual's maximal  
121 abilities. The generic scoring is 0= cannot initiate the exercise or maintain the starting position; 1=  
122 performs the task partially; 2= performs the movement incompletely, or completely but imperfectly  
123 (compensatory movements, slowness ...); and 3= performs the task fully and 'normally' (the detailed

124 rating procedure, is described in the MFM user's manual available from <http://www.mfm-nmd.org>). The  
125 total score, as well as the D1, D2, and D3 sub-scores, are expressed as a proportion (%) of the maximum  
126 possible score; the lower the score, the more severe the impairment.

127 MFM items 18, 19, and 22 are items performed originally on a paper-based support, with the subject  
128 sitting on a chair or in a wheelchair in front of a table.

129 The task to be perform for item 18 is to go round the edge of a CD, with one finger placed in the centre  
130 of the CD at the beginning of the item. The CD is glued to a piece of cardboard (Fig 1A). The scores  
131 are as follows : 0, the subject cannot go round the small circle of the CD (diameter 3.5 cm) with a  
132 finger ; score 1, he goes round the small circle of the CD with a finger ; score 2, he goes round the edge  
133 of the CD with compensatory movements or difficulty, he may stop one or more times and/or may  
134 change finger during the task, and compensatory pf the trunk are allowed ; score 3, he goes round the  
135 edge of the CD with the same finger without hand support on the table and without compensatory  
136 movements.

137

138

139 **Fig 1. Original paper-based support for item 18 (A), 19 (B) and 22 (C) and screenshots of the**  
140 **digital interfaces of the item 18 (D), 19 (E) and 22 (F)**

141

142

143 The task to perform for item 19 is to pick up a pencil and draw loops inside a frame (Fig 1B). The frame  
144 is a rectangle measuring 1 cm high and 4 cm long, with a line width of 0.1 cm. The scores are as follows:  
145 0, the subject cannot pick up the pencil or cannot make a written mark; score 1, he cannot draw one  
146 loop inside the frame touching the top and bottom of the frame; score 2, he draws at least one loop  
147 inside the frame, but cannot draw a continuous series of loops in the frame touching the top and the

148 bottom lines of the frame; score 3, he draws a continuous series of loops over the full length of the frame  
149 without stopping.

150 The task to perform for item 22 is to place a finger on drawings in a diagram from an initial touch on  
151 the centre of the diagram (Fig 1C). The scores are as follows: 0, the subject cannot raise the finger, nor  
152 slide it onto a drawing; score 1, he cannot raise the finger to place it on a drawing, but can slide it on at  
153 least one drawing; score 2, he raises the finger and places it imprecisely on 1 to 8 drawings on the  
154 diagram; score 3, he raises the finger and places it successively on the 8 drawings of the diagram without  
155 touching the lines. For all scoring levels, the hand and/or the other fingers may give support.

156 Items 18 and 22 are in both the MFM-32 and MFM-20; item 19 is only in MFM-32.

## 157 **Choice of the tablet**

158 The ZenPad 3S 10 Android tablet associated with the Z Stylus (Asus, New Taipei, Taiwan) was used  
159 in the present study. The tablet has a 9.7-inch screen (sufficient to contain the dimensions of a CD), it  
160 is 5.8mm thick, has a resolution of 1536 X 2048 pixels, and a multi-touch capacity allowing the tracing  
161 of 5 fingers simultaneously; the Z Stylus has a peak of 1.2 mm, and weighs 11.58 g.

## 162 **TabMe2 software**

163 In order to record the subject's traces left on the ZenPad tablet, a software (TabMe2) was developed by  
164 the G-SCOP laboratory (Grenoble, France). It allows recording the X and Y coordinates over time of  
165 fingers or stylus on a tablet and includes a module to display the recorded tracks retrospectively. The  
166 digital interfaces have been developed respecting the size and symbols of the “materiel” usually used in  
167 the MFM (Fig 1). The figures representing the CD, the rectangle and the diagram can be moved and  
168 positioned manually on the screen according to the subject's preferred choice. The 'EFFACER' button  
169 can be used to reset the plot and perform the evaluation any number of times.

170 Mathematical models and decision-making algorithms were applied on the recorded traces (see S1 File.)  
171 to give automatic scorings. The automatic scoring procedures were developed during the course of the  
172 study and could only be applied to the last patients included.

## 173 **Study procedure**

174 Subjects aged 6 years or more completed the MFM-32 in the usual way, and items 18, 19 and 22 were  
175 completed once more using the tablet. Subjects under the age of 6 years completed the MFM-20 in the  
176 usual way and items 18 and 22 once more using the tablet. The order (paper or tablet first) was  
177 determined using a computer-generated list of random numbers. Completions with the paper-based  
178 system and the tablet were performed with the same therapist. Scores of items 18, 19, and 22 obtained  
179 with the paper-based system were expressed as P-score, those obtained with the tablet T-score. An  
180 automatic scoring, expressed as A-score, was retrieved later on from the TabMe2 software.

181 An investigator meeting was organised before the start of the inclusions to ensure the correct completion  
182 and scoring of the MFM, as well as to provide training in the use of the TabMe2 software on the tablet.  
183 All the material was provided by the sponsor to each of the 5 study centres.

184 The day of MFM completion, demographic characteristics, diagnosis, as well as the score for each of  
185 the MFM items were collected. Therapists and subjects were also questioned about the relative of  
186 difficulty (easier, the same, or more difficult) of the item's completion using the paper-based system  
187 and tablet.

## 188 **Statistical analysis**

189 Quantitative variables were described by the number of subjects, the number of missing values, the  
190 median and the interquartile range [IQR]. Categorical variables were summarized by the number of  
191 each category and the number of missing values (missing values were not included in the denominator  
192 used for frequency computation).

193 With respect to the design of the study, as scores of items are ordinal [12], the assessment of agreement  
194 between the P-score and the T-score was evaluated using the weighted Cohen's Kappa coefficient  
195 (quadratic weighting, so-called Fleiss-Cohen [13]) with its 95% confidence interval for each item. This  
196 coefficient express agreement as a number between 0 and 1 (0: no agreement; 1: perfect agreement).



197 The results were interpreted as suggested by Landis and Koch [14]: 0-0.20: slight, 0.21-0.40: fair, 0.41-  
198 0.60: moderate, 0.61-0.80: substantial, 0.81-1.00: almost perfect.

199 Exact and partial agreements for each item were displayed on a Bangdiwala chart [15]. This chart is a  
200 representation that displays agreement in paired categorical data where areas of various colour densities  
201 represent exact and partial agreements (respectively darker and lighter colours). The Bangdiwala chart  
202 reflects also a joint distribution of the scores, which gives a visual idea about the relative distributions  
203 of the scores of the two supports. The bias between these two supports is shown by the deviation of the  
204 rectangles from the 45° diagonal line within the larger square.

205 Analyses were conducted using SAS software version 9.3 for Windows (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC,  
206 USA).

207

## 208 **Results**

### 209 **Characteristics of the population**

210 Ninety-eight subjects (54 males and 44 females, aged between 5.0 and 60.0 years) were included in the  
211 study. The median age of the subjects was 16.2 years, and 55.1% were aged under 18 years of age. The  
212 2 youngest subjects were less than 6 years old and completed an MFM-20; other subjects an MFM-32.  
213 Duchenne or Becker muscular dystrophy were the most frequent (25.5% of subjects), followed by spinal  
214 muscular atrophy (16.3%) and myotonic dystrophy (15.3%). The median [IQR] total MFM score was  
215 77.1% [53.1-85.4]; there were 32.7% of non-ambulant subjects and the median [IQR] MFM D1 score  
216 (standing and transfers) was 53.9% [12.8-74.4] (Table 1).

#### 217 **Table 1. Subject characteristics.**

	Population (n=98)
<b>Gender, Male/Female – n</b>	54/44

**Age category – n**

[5-11[ years old	24
[11-18[ years old	30
[18-40[ years old	15
[40-60[ years old	29

**Ambulant status, Ambulant/Non-**

**ambulant** - n (missing) 63/32 (3)

**Diagnosis – n**

Duchenne or Becker muscular dystrophy	25
Spinal muscular atrophy	16
Myotonic dystrophy	15
Progressive muscular dystrophy	13
Neuropathies	10
Congenital myopathy	10
Other myopathies	6
Congenital muscular dystrophy	3

**MFEM, % - Median [IQR]<sup>a</sup> (missing)**

D1 score	53.9 [12.8-74.4] (2)
D2 score	88.9 [77.8-97.2] (2)
D3 score	90.5 [81.0-95.2] (1)
Total score	77.1 [53.1-85.4] (2)

---

218 <sup>a</sup>IQR: interquartile range

## 220 **Agreements and disagreements between P and T-scores**

221 Agreement between scores obtained with the paper-based support and the tablet (P-scores and T-scores,  
222 respectively) as assessed by the weighted Kappa coefficient was almost perfect for the scores of items  
223 18 and 22 ( $K=0.93$ , and  $0.95$ , respectively) and substantial for item 19 ( $K=0.70$ ; Table 2).

224

225 **Table 2. Percentage agreement and weighted Kappa coefficient between evaluation using the**  
226 **paper-based support or the tablet for item 18, 19 and 22.**

	% agreement	Weighted Kappa coefficient	95% confidence interval
Item 18 (n=96)	93.7	0.93	[0.86; 1.00]
Item 19 (n=96)	74.0	0.70	[0.55; 0.85]
Item 22 (n=98)	98.0	0.95	[0.88; 1.00]

227

228

229 The agreement charts show the excellent agreement between the two modes of completion for items 18  
230 and 22 (Figs 2A and 2C) and the good agreement for item 19, with a greater difficulty to complete this  
231 item on the tablet than on the paper-based support, which is reflected in the differences in the size of  
232 rectangles and the shift in relation to the 45° diagonal (Fig 2B).

233

234

235 **Fig 2. Bangdiwala's agreement charts for item 18 (A), 19 (B) and 22 (C) comparing item scores**  
236 **between the two modes.** Each item is represented by a distinct panel in which the four levels are  
237 represented by rectangles with one to two shades of grey. A deep grey area represents an exact  
238 agreement and a light grey area a partial agreement with a 'one level away' discrepancy. The bias

239 between these two modes is shown by the deviation of the “rectangles” from the 45° diagonal line within  
240 the larger square.

241

242

243 The P-scores for items 18 and 22 were most frequently 3 (84.4% and 93.9% of cases, respectively); this  
244 was also the case for T-scores for the same items (81.2% and 91.8% of cases, respectively). For item  
245 19 the most frequent P-score and T-score was 2 (50% and 65.6% of cases, respectively), followed by 3  
246 (42.7% and 26.4% of cases, respectively (Table 3).

247 **Table 3. Agreements and disagreements between scores obtained during items 18, 19 and 22 completion using the Paper-based support (P-score)**  
 248 **or the Tablet (T-score).**

<b>Item 18</b>				<b>Item 19</b>				<b>Item 22</b>			
<b>(N=96)</b>				<b>(N=96)</b>				<b>(N=98)</b>			
<b>Agreements</b>		<b>Disagreements</b>		<b>Agreements</b>		<b>Disagreements</b>		<b>Agreements</b>		<b>Disagreements</b>	
<b>P-score /</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>P-score /</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>P-score /</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>P-score /</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>P-score /</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>P-score /</b>	<b>N</b>
<b>T-score</b>		<b>T-score</b>		<b>T-score</b>		<b>T-score</b>		<b>T-score</b>		<b>T-score</b>	
3/3	77	–	–	3/3	21	–	–	3/3	90	–	–
2/2	8	–	–	2/2	43	–	–	2/2	4	–	–
1/1	2	–	–	1/1	5	–	–	1/1	–	–	–
0/0	3	–	–	0/0	2	–	–	0/0	2	–	–
–	–	3/2	4	–	–	3/2	20	–	–	3/2	2
–	–	2/3	1	–	–	2/3	4	–	–	–	–
–	–	2/1	1	–	–	2/1	1	–	–	–	–

249 Items scoring system use a 4-point Likert scale (0 to 3) for each item, from score 0 when subject cannot initiate the task to score 3 when subject performs  
 250 the task fully with a controlled movement.

251

252 In all cases of disagreement, the difference was of one point. The most frequent disagreement concerned  
253 a P-score = 3 and a T-score = 2 for item 19 (20 disagreements). For items 18, 19, and 22, the score was  
254 identical in 71.4% of cases; the T-score was 1 point lower than the P-score in 24.5% of cases; the T  
255 score was 1 point higher than the P-score for 4.1% of cases (Table 3). For 1 subject, there was a  
256 difference in the scores of 2 items; the P-score for item 18 was 1 point higher than the T-score, and the  
257 T-score for item 19 was scored 1 point higher than the P-score.

258

### 259 **Level of difficulty as assessed by the subjects and the therapists for each** 260 **item**

261 For item 18, when the P and T-scores were identical, 44.6% of subjects found that the level of difficulty  
262 was identical (Fig 3A), and 70.5% of therapists did so (Fig 3B); 37.3% of subjects found that the task  
263 was less easy on the tablet (Fig 3A), as did 24.4% of therapists (Fig 3B).

264

265

### 266 **Fig 3. Assessment of the level of difficulty of the task from subjects (A) and therapists (B) when** 267 **using the tablet compared to the paper-based support during the item 18, 19 and 22 completions.**

268 For each item, assessments are grouped according to each pair of scoring P-score and T-score results.  
269 Black bars indicate that the subjects or therapists considered that difficulty for completion of the task  
270 was the same level for the tablet and paper-based support, hatched bars indicate that they considered  
271 that it was less easy using the tablet, and white bars that it was easier using the tablet.

272

273

274 For item 19, when the P and T-scores were identical, 25.4% of subjects found that the level of difficulty  
275 was identical (Fig 3A), and 42.1% of therapists did so (Fig 3B); 62.7% of subjects found that it was less  
276 easy on the tablet (Fig 3A), and 45.6% therapists did so. When the T-score was lower, 85.0% found that  
277 it was less easy on the tablet (Fig 3A), as did 76.5% of therapists (Fig 3B).

278 For item 22, when the P and T-scores were identical, a large majority of subjects (82.0%) and therapists  
279 (97.6%) found that the level of difficulty was identical (Fig 3); 15.7% of subjects found that the level  
280 of difficulty were easier on the tablet (Fig 3A), as did 1.2% of therapists (Fig 3B).

281 When the P and T-scores were identical and the subjects found the task to be easier on the tablet subjects,  
282 8 out of 14 subjects (57.1%) for item 18, 5 out of 7 subjects (71.4%) for item 19, and 10 out of 14  
283 subjects (71.4%) for item 22 were under 11 years of age.

284

## 285 **Analysis of automatic score (A-score)**

286 In order to assess the accuracy of TabMe2 automatic scoring procedures, we analysed from 23 subjects  
287 29 completions of item 18, 28 of item 19, and 25 of item 22 (Table 4). Agreement between scores given  
288 by therapists when using the tablet (T-score) and the corresponding scores given automatically by the  
289 TabMe2 software based on the recorded tracks (A-score) were high for item 19 (89.3% of agreement)  
290 and item 22 (88.0% of agreement), respectively, and very low for item 18 (24.1% of agreement).





294

295 When we look at the reasons for the disagreements, there are calibration issues related to the margins  
296 of error accepted for all items (see S2 Table).

297 For item 18, specifically we often find issues with instructions given during the item completion. As  
298 outlined in the MFM manual, to obtain a score of 3 for item 18, the finger must go around the large CD,  
299 and not be on the edge of the CD. On tablet, participants often tried to follow precisely the mark  
300 representing the CD, resulting in traces unexpectedly entering the large circle, what had not been  
301 anticipated. For 6 cases an issue with the use of the digital interface occurred. Indeed, to help  
302 participants, we gave them the option of moving the CD around on the screen. However, when the CD  
303 was place to short from the edge of the tablet, pixel recording failures could occurred.

304

## 305 **Discussion**

306 The present study provides evidence that supports the use of a tablet for the completion of items of the  
307 MFM dedicated to measure distal upper limb function. For the 3 studied items, the movement to be  
308 perform by the subject is the same for both modes of completion evaluated herein, and it involves the  
309 same motor compensations, making it possible to score and measure the motor task almost exactly in  
310 the same way. The strong agreements and the minimal differences in scores obtained in cases of  
311 disagreement allow the tablet to be used without a significant impact on subject follow-up. In case of  
312 differences in scoring, a maximum of one-point difference in scores when summing the scores of the 3  
313 items was observed for each individual subjects, which is far beyond the minimal clinically important  
314 difference for the MFM that is reported to be between 2.4 and 5.9 points of the MFM total score [16–  
315 18]. This study with 98 patients is essential to authorise therapists and give them the confidence to use  
316 MFM in digital mode.

317 Although substantial, the weakest agreement between P-scores and T-scores was observed for item 19  
318 (drawing loops in a predefined frame) and the item was frequently perceived as less easy when

319 performed on a tablet, even when scores are identical. The majority difference in agreement, in terms  
320 of a 1-point reduction, is favourable to improving the sensitivity to changes in the item, which tends to  
321 have a ceiling effect. The subjects and therapists who found the task of item 19 on the tablet less easy  
322 often reported difficulties related to the stylus compared to the pencil: the stylus glided more or was  
323 more sensitive in 16 subjects and 3 therapists, a lack of experience using a stylus was reported by 8  
324 subjects and 3 therapists, and a shaking problem when using the stylus was reported by 5 subjects and  
325 5 therapists (*data not shown*). In a smaller proportion than for item 19, but still notable, subjects and  
326 therapists found the task of item 18 (going around the edge of a CD) less easy on the tablet. For these  
327 the absence of the rim created by the thickness of the CD was reported in 16 cases (*data not shown*),  
328 which could be used as a guide to turn around the CD for some subjects; however, despite the lack of a  
329 rim, agreement for this item was almost perfect. The third, item 22 (placing a finger on the drawings of  
330 the diagram), required no adaptation from subjects for the completion of the task. It was the item for  
331 which the highest agreement was found. Although a majority of score 3 was obtained whether using the  
332 tablet or paper-based support, around 15% of subjects found that it was easier on the tablet. A majority  
333 of these patients were under 11 years of age and 10 of these youngest subjects explained this by “it’s  
334 more interesting”, “better visibility”, “larger”, “the tablet is cool”, “the drawings look bigger”, or “I  
335 don’t know why but I prefer” (*data not shown*), which may be explained by better motivation and a task  
336 that was more enjoyable for them. Furthermore, the meaning of this item on paper-based support is not  
337 intuitive because it represents activity of daily living carried out on digital screens or keyboards. This  
338 item is more relevant to measure in digitally in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, as is item 18.

339 The digitisation of the 3 items also paves the way for the automation of item scoring. This is all the  
340 more relevant given that items 18, 19 and 22 are part of the MFM items with the lower inter or intra-  
341 rater reliability[19]. The degree of agreements and the analysis of the disagreements between the T-  
342 score and A-score are promising for the development of very accurate automatic scoring. A score of 2  
343 for item 18 can be given to a less well executed trace (which the algorithm could analyse), but also to  
344 subjects using the trunk or the whole of the upper limbs to compensate for limited hand motor skills.

345 This type of compensation results in disagreements between T-Score and A-Score that wouldn't be  
346 capture in the case of recording on a tablet at present.

347

348 Beyond an automatic scoring, the analyses of the traces on the tablet would be interesting to exploit in  
349 order to measure more finely the subjects' hand skills [20]. While the presence of tremor is a hindrance  
350 in many activities of daily life and could lead to a reduction of scores from 3 to 2 for the 3 studied items,  
351 the characteristics of tremor are not currently assessed during the completion. Some teams have reported  
352 the possibility and the relevance of measuring it in other pathologies, such as Parkinson's disease,  
353 multiple sclerosis, and essential tremor [21–24]. In the same way, a further computerized exploitation  
354 of the digital traces of recorded items could be interesting to quantify tremor in NMD, although this  
355 data has never been inventoried to date. The movement speed and accuracy could be assess as in the  
356 tablet-based application reported by Rabah et al. where most timing measures had excellent reliability  
357 in healthy participants or in the study of dexterity of Larsen et al. [25,26].

358

359 Lastly, the change of completion mode would be all the more significant in that these items were  
360 designed in 1998 to reproduce a function of use of digital peripherals (numeric keyboard, bank card  
361 terminal, touch screen, stylus, etc.). This would also make it possible to adapt to the disappearance of  
362 the marketing of the CDs necessary for the current manufacture of the test support.

363

364 Regarding the limitations of the study, the main one concerns the under-representation of 0 and 1 scores  
365 that precluded the analysis of the differences in scoring in such cases. This is likely to be due to the 3  
366 studied items being among the easiest for subjects in MFM to complete. However, the population  
367 included in the present study reflects the targeted population for which the MFM is commonly used  
368 with all the variability of existing phenotypes, and only few very extremely weak patients were included.  
369 Another limitation is that this study concerns only an intra-rater reliability. Inter-rater reliability could

370 also have been interesting to investigate as the tablet could change the way items are presented to the  
371 subject. However, the methodological choice was driven by reasons of feasibility, as it was easier to  
372 perform the tasks with both modes (tablet and paper) with the same therapist and by proceeding in this  
373 way the therapists were able to compare the completion.

374

## 375 **Conclusion**

376 The switch from the original paper-based support to the tablet resulted in minimal and acceptable  
377 differences, and maintains a valid and reproducible measure of the 3 hand function items. We are  
378 moving forward to create a digital application called “MFM-play”, which will make it easier to facilitate  
379 patient follow-up, assist the therapist in the scoring process and integrate an interactive environment on  
380 the tablet to encourage children's participation in MFMs. The realization of the items in digital mode  
381 also makes them compatible with solutions currently deployed to support mobile health systems for  
382 remote assessment.

383

## 384 **Acknowledgments**

385 The authors acknowledge Philip Robinson from DRS (Direction de la Recherche en Santé) of Hospices  
386 Civils de Lyon for help in manuscript preparation.

387

388

## 389 **References**

- 390 1. Ricci G, Bello L, Torri F, Schirinzi E, Pegoraro E, Siciliano G. Therapeutic opportunities and  
391 clinical outcome measures in Duchenne muscular dystrophy. *Neurol Sci Off J Ital Neurol Soc*  
392 *Ital Soc Clin Neurophysiol.* 2022;43: 625–633. doi:10.1007/s10072-022-06085-w
- 393 2. Duong T, Braid J, Staunton H, Barriere A, Petridis F, Reithinger J, et al. Understanding the  
394 relationship between the 32-item motor function measure and daily activities from an individual

- 395 with spinal muscular atrophy and their caregivers' perspective: a two-part study. *BMC Neurol.*  
396 2021;21: 143. doi:10.1186/s12883-021-02166-z
- 397 3. Mercuri E, Messina S, Montes J, Muntoni F, Sansone VA, Antonaci L, et al. Patient and parent  
398 oriented tools to assess health-related quality of life, activity of daily living and caregiver burden  
399 in SMA. Rome, 13 July 2019. *Neuromuscul Disord.* 2020;30: 431–436.  
400 doi:10.1016/j.nmd.2020.02.019
- 401 4. Pellegrini N, Pelletier A, Orlikowski D, Lolierou C, Ruquet M, Raphaël J-C, et al. Hand versus  
402 mouth for call-bell activation by DMD and Becker patients. *Neuromuscul Disord NMD.*  
403 2007;17: 532–536. doi:10.1016/j.nmd.2007.03.016
- 404 5. Pellegrini N, Guillon B, Prigent H, Pellegrini M, Orlikovski D, Raphael J-C, et al. Optimization  
405 of power wheelchair control for patients with severe Duchenne muscular dystrophy.  
406 *Neuromuscul Disord NMD.* 2004;14: 297–300. doi:10.1016/j.nmd.2004.02.005
- 407 6. Reilly MM, Shy ME, Muntoni F, Pareyson D. 168th ENMC International Workshop: outcome  
408 measures and clinical trials in Charcot-Marie-Tooth disease (CMT). *Neuromuscul Disord NMD.*  
409 2010;20: 839–846. doi:10.1016/j.nmd.2010.08.001
- 410 7. Bendixen RM, Butrum J, Jain MS, Parks R, Hodsdon B, Nichols C, et al. Upper extremity  
411 outcome measures for collagen VI-related myopathy and LAMA2-related muscular dystrophy.  
412 *Neuromuscul Disord NMD.* 2017;27: 278–285. doi:10.1016/j.nmd.2016.11.017
- 413 8. Bérard C, Payan C, Hodgkinson I, Fermanian J, MFM Collaborative Study Group. A motor  
414 function measure for neuromuscular diseases. Construction and validation study. *Neuromuscul*  
415 *Disord NMD.* 2005;15: 463–470.
- 416 9. Bérard C, Payan C, Fermanian J, Girardot F, Groupe d'Etude MFM. [A motor function  
417 measurement scale for neuromuscular diseases - description and validation study]. *Rev Neurol*  
418 *(Paris).* 2006;162: 485–493.
- 419 10. Ribault S, Rippert P, Jain M, Le Goff L, Genod DV, Barriere A, et al. Psychometric  
420 Characteristics of the Motor Function Measure in Neuromuscular Diseases: A Systematic  
421 Review1. *J Neuromuscul Dis.* 2023;10: 301–314. doi:10.3233/JND-230001
- 422 11. de Lattre C, Payan C, Vuillerot C, Rippert P, de Castro D, Bérard C, et al. Motor Function  
423 Measure: Validation of a Short Form for Young Children With Neuromuscular Diseases. *Arch*  
424 *Phys Med Rehabil.* 2013;94: 2218–2226. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2013.04.001
- 425 12. de Vet HCW, Terwee CB, Mokkink LB, Knol DL. *Measurement in Medicine: A Practical*  
426 *Guide.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2011. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511996214
- 427 13. Fleiss JL, Cohen J. The Equivalence of Weighted Kappa and the Intraclass Correlation  
428 Coefficient as Measures of Reliability. *Educ Psychol Meas.* 1973;33: 613–619.  
429 doi:10.1177/001316447303300309
- 430 14. Landis JR, Koch GG. The Measurement of Observer Agreement for Categorical Data.  
431 *Biometrics.* 1977;33: 159–174. doi:10.2307/2529310
- 432 15. Bangdiwala SI, Shankar V. The agreement chart. *BMC Med Res Methodol.* 2013;13: 97.  
433 doi:10.1186/1471-2288-13-97

- 434 16. Vuillerot C, Payan C, Girardot F, Fermanian J, Iwaz J, Bérard C, et al. Responsiveness of the  
435 Motor Function Measure in Neuromuscular Diseases. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2012;93: 2251-  
436 2256.e1. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2012.05.025
- 437 17. Huang M, Chen T, Wang Y, Zhou C, Cao J, Lu X. Responsiveness and Minimal Clinically  
438 Important Difference of the Chinese Version of the Motor Function Measure-32 in Children and  
439 Adolescents with Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy. *Dev Neurorehabilitation.* 2022;25: 370–377.  
440 doi:10.1080/17518423.2021.2020352
- 441 18. Le Goff L, Meilleur KG, Norato G, Rippert P, Jain M, Fink M, et al. Responsiveness and  
442 Minimal Clinically Important Difference of the Motor Function Measure in Collagen VI-Related  
443 Dystrophies and Laminin Alpha2-Related Muscular Dystrophy. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.*  
444 2021;102: 604–610. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2020.10.116
- 445 19. Huang M, Cao J, Sun J, Li W, Qin L, Li H, et al. Cross-cultural Adaptation and Multi-centric  
446 Validation of the Motor Function Measure Chinese Version (MFM-32-CN) for Patients with  
447 Neuromuscular Diseases. *Dev Neurorehabilitation.* 2020;23: 210–217.  
448 doi:10.1080/17518423.2019.1642413
- 449 20. Gopal A, Hsu W-Y, Allen DD, Bove R. Remote Assessments of Hand Function in Neurological  
450 Disorders: Systematic Review. *JMIR Rehabil Assist Technol.* 2022;9: e33157.  
451 doi:10.2196/33157
- 452 21. Haubenberger D, Kalowitz D, Nahab FB, Toro C, Ippolito D, Luckenbaugh DA, et al. Validation  
453 of digital spiral analysis as outcome parameter for clinical trials in essential tremor. *Mov Disord*  
454 *Off J Mov Disord Soc.* 2011;26: 2073–2080. doi:10.1002/mds.23808
- 455 22. Zham P, Kumar DK, Dabnichki P, Poosapadi Arjunan S, Raghav S. Distinguishing Different  
456 Stages of Parkinson’s Disease Using Composite Index of Speed and Pen-Pressure of Sketching a  
457 Spiral. *Front Neurol.* 2017;8: 435. doi:10.3389/fneur.2017.00435
- 458 23. Maillart E, Labauge P, Cohen M, Maarouf A, Vukusic S, Donzé C, et al. MSCopilot, a new  
459 multiple sclerosis self-assessment digital solution: results of a comparative study versus standard  
460 tests. *Eur J Neurol.* 2020;27: 429–436. doi:10.1111/ene.14091
- 461 24. Godinho C, Domingos J, Cunha G, Santos AT, Fernandes RM, Abreu D, et al. A systematic  
462 review of the characteristics and validity of monitoring technologies to assess Parkinson’s  
463 disease. *J NeuroEngineering Rehabil.* 2016;13: 24. doi:10.1186/s12984-016-0136-7
- 464 25. Rabah A, Le Boterff Q, Carment L, Bendjemaa N, Térémetz M, Dupin L, et al. A novel tablet-  
465 based application for assessment of manual dexterity and its components: a reliability and  
466 validity study in healthy subjects. *J NeuroEngineering Rehabil.* 2022;19: 35.  
467 doi:10.1186/s12984-022-01011-9
- 468 26. Larsen LH, Jensen T, Christensen MS, Lundbye-Jensen J, Langberg H, Nielsen JB. Changes in  
469 corticospinal drive to spinal motoneurons following tablet-based practice of manual dexterity.  
470 *Physiol Rep.* 2016;4: e12684. doi:10.14814/phy2.12684

471

472

473 **Supporting information**

474 **S1 File. Mathematical representation and processing carried out by TabMe2 software.**


475 **S2 Table. Illustrations of A-score for disagreements between scores of the therapist's score on the**

476 **tablet (T-score) and the automatic score (A-score) from the TabMe2 software**


477




A



B




C



D



E




F





Figure 1



**A****B**

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.19.24307604>; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

**C**

**Figure 2**



**A****B**

Figure 3