Title: Evaluating the clinical utility of hand performance information from at-home egocentric video in outpatient neurorehabilitation

Author names and affiliations:

Adesh Kadambi, BEng[1,2], Damian M. Manzone, PhD[1] and José Zariffa, PhD, PEng[1,2,3,4]

[1] KITE - Toronto Rehabilitation Institute, University Health Network, Toronto, Ontario;
[2] Institute of Biomedical Engineering, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario;
[3] Rehabilitation Sciences Institute, Temerty Faculty of Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario;
[4] Edward S. Rogers Sr. Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario

Corresponding author:

José Zariffa, PhD, PEng (jose.zariffa@utoronto.ca)

Abstract: (233/250 words)

Background: Restoring hand function is a primary focus of neurorehabilitation after stroke and spinal cord injury. However, monitoring hand use outside the clinic remains challenging. We developed a clinical decision support system (CDSS) using egocentric video to provide therapists with information about their patients' hand use at home and evaluated its clinical utility.

Methods: Five patient-therapist dyads were recruited. Patient-participants recorded activities of daily living using head-mounted cameras. Dashboards presenting processed video data were generated for each patient. Therapists reviewed the dashboard created for their patient and participated in semi-structured interviews and structured questionnaires. A mixed-methods approach with thematic analysis was used to evaluate the CDSS's clinical usefulness.

Results: Four themes emerged: (1) Data Interpretation Preferences, (2) Bridging the Clinic-Home Divide, (3) Tailoring Therapy Through Home Observations, and (4) Practical Realities of Implementation. Therapists strongly preferred video footage over graphical data, valuing its rich insights into their patients' real-world activities. The CDSS was perceived as useful for understanding patient performance at home and potentially influencing therapy planning.

Conclusions: This study demonstrates the potential of using egocentric video to inform clinical decision-making in neurorehabilitation. Therapists found the system useful, particularly for assessing performance in naturalistic settings, but voiced concerns about workflow integration. Despite challenges, therapists across technical familiarity levels expressed trust in the system and willingness to use it regularly, indicating it could enhance their ability to tailor therapy plans to patients' real-world activities.

Keywords: egocentric video; home monitoring; upper limb rehabilitation; stroke; spinal cord injury; usability; clinical decision support

Disclosures: The authors declare that they have no competing interests. This work was supported by the Praxis Spinal Cord Institute, the Ontario Early Researcher Award program (ER16–12-013), and the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (grant number 13556838).

Implications for Rehabilitation:

- Wearable egocentric cameras can be an effective tool for monitoring patient arm and hand function outside of the clinic, which is currently limited to in-clinic assessments and patient self-reporting.
- Information from egocentric video provides therapists with unique insights into patients' home environments and daily activities, potentially leading to more tailored interventions and home modification recommendations.
- A clinical decision support system making use of egocentric video is perceived as useful by therapists providing outpatient neurorehabilitation.

Introduction

Stroke and spinal cord injury (SCI) place a tremendous socio-economic burden on both the healthcare system and affected individuals [1,2]. These conditions often result in substantial loss of upper limb function, which greatly limits an individual's ability to perform activities of daily living (ADLs) and live independently. For individuals with SCI, regaining hand and arm function is consistently reported as the top recovery priority [3]. Similarly, for individuals who have experienced a stroke, data suggests that limited hand use persists even up to 18 months post-stroke [4]. Therefore, restoring hand function is a primary focus of rehabilitation efforts, as it directly impacts the ability to regain independence and quality of life.

Effective rehabilitation is crucial for promoting recovery of upper limb function, yet monitoring this function outside of the clinic remains a significant challenge [5,6]. Conventional outpatient therapy is typically limited to in-clinic assessments and patient self-reporting, which often fail to capture the complexity and variability of real-life hand use at home [7–10]. Patient self-reporting also relies on an individual’s ability to recall activities performed since their last therapy session and is subject to reporting biases, such as cognitive deficits and social desirability [11–14]. These limitations prevent clinicians in outpatient settings from gaining a comprehensive understanding of how patients perform ADLs in their everyday environments, thus hindering the ability to tailor therapy plans based on real-world functional performance.

Wearable technology enables measurement of human movement outside of the clinic. In particular, head-mounted egocentric cameras can provide rich, contextual insights into patients' hand function during ADLs [15–17]. While previous research has primarily used egocentric video to develop new research tools to measure outcomes in clinical studies [16–18], there is a growing need to investigate how this data might be useful to therapists in clinical practice. However, clinicians have shown reluctance to adopt new technologies, citing concerns about time constraints and uncertainty regarding clinical value [6,19–21]. Using the Technology Acceptance Model [22] information systems theory, previous work has identified these factors as the primary barriers to clinicians adopting new tools in practice [23].

Clinical decision support systems (CDSSs) have assisted providers in implementing evidence-based guidelines at the point of care and improving patient outcomes in various healthcare domains [24]. CDSSs have the potential to bridge the gap between the data collected by wearables and its practical application in clinical decision-making [25,26]. By presenting complex data from wearables in an accessible, clinically relevant format, CDSSs could address the concerns about time burden and clinical value that have hindered the adoption of new technologies in clinical practice. Therefore, exploring how clinicians interact with and value data from wearable devices is a crucial step towards creating effective support tools for rehabilitation settings.

As a step towards developing CDSSs that integrate wearable technology into clinical practice, we created a system that consists of a head-mounted camera for patients to record ADLs at home and a

dashboard for therapists to access processed video data about patient hand use at home [27,28]. Our current study aims to understand how this novel information from egocentric video, presented through our dashboard interface [28], is perceived by therapists in the context of their clinical practice and decision making. Through this work, we seek to bridge the gap between digital health tool development and practical clinical application, ensuring that innovations can meaningfully enhance patient outcomes in the rehabilitation of stroke and SCI patients.

Methods

This study was approved by the Research Ethics Board of the University Health Network (UHN; Study #21-5019). We employed a convergent mixed methods design with a qualitative emphasis to evaluate the clinical usefulness of the information presented to therapists. This approach allowed for a detailed description of therapists' perceptions, providing valuable insights into the practical application of the information extracted from egocentric video recordings in real-world settings.

Participants

We recruited 5 patient-therapist dyads from the Toronto Rehabilitation Institute (TRI) at UHN using a snowball sampling approach. Therapist-participants were eligible if they had expertise in upper limb rehabilitation and were actively treating patients who were either adult stroke survivors or adults living with SCI. Patient-participants were eligible if they were over 18 years of age, actively receiving therapy at UHN from the therapist-participant, and had self-reported impairment of hand function from SCI or stroke while retaining the ability to use their hands in some capacity for at-home ADLs. The patient group consisted of 2 stroke survivors and 3 individuals living with SCI. This mix of stroke and SCI patients allowed us to explore the system's applicability across different types of upper limb impairments. All participants were assigned an alphanumeric code to anonymize transcript data and any excerpts in this article.

Data Collection

Our data collection process followed a three-stage pipeline consisting of patient video recordings, dashboard generation, and therapist interviews, as illustrated in Figure 1.



Figure 1: Overview of data collection pipeline. Patient-participants recorded videos at home using a head-mounted egocentric camera. A dashboard was generated from the recordings, which included

both quantitative metrics and manually curated video snippets. Therapist-participants reviewed the dashboard generated for their patient for about 10 minutes before proceeding with the interview.

Video Recordings

Patient-participants were provided with head-mounted egocentric cameras (GoPro Hero 5, GoPro, Inc., San Mateo, CA, USA) to record their ADLs at home. The cameras recorded video in .mp4 format at 1080p/30fps. Patient-participants were instructed to record typical daily activities that involved hand use (e.g., eating, cleaning, folding laundry, writing, cooking, etc.) following the protocol outlined in [27]. Patient-participants recorded an average of 231.85 ± 75.49 minutes of video. Once the recordings were completed, the patient-participants returned the cameras to the researchers.

Dashboard Generation

The recorded videos were processed to generate a dashboard [28] that provided therapists with information about their patient's hand use at home (Figure 2). *Minutes recorded per day* was computed using the metadata from the videos. We split the raw videos into 1-minute segments, extracting frames at 2 FPS, and applying the pipeline from [17] with a hand-object detection model [29] to identify object interactions. These object interactions were used to compute *percentage interaction per day*, *number of interactions per hour*, and *average interaction duration*. The *activity breakdown* was manually computed by annotating the 1-minute video segments in the previous step. *Video snippets* were also manually curated from the 1-minute video segments by AK, with a focus on tasks the patient struggled to complete, while maintaining a diverse set of activities.

Therapist Interviews

The final stage of data collection involved therapist-participants reviewing and providing feedback on the dashboards. This process began with a 10-minute dashboard review period where the therapist could familiarise themselves with the dashboard and review the information provided for their patient. This was followed by a 45-minute interview session consisting of structured questionnaires and a semi-structured interview. All interviews were conducted by AK using an interview guide provided in the Appendix. The structured questionnaires included 5-point Likert scale questions to assess technological affinity and perceptions of the CDSS's clinical utility and actionability, as well as a System Usability Scale (SUS) questionnaire to measure the usability of the CDSS. The semi-structured interview gathered in-depth qualitative feedback on the usefulness of the information and its influence on clinical decision-making, which was mostly retroactive because 4 out of 5 patients had already completed their therapy block at the time of the interview.



Figure 2: Example and definition of information provided to therapists through the dashboard [28].

Data Analysis

We analysed qualitative and quantitative data separately and then integrated the findings. The data from the semi-structured interviews were transcribed verbatim and analysed using thematic analysis [30]. This process involved two independent researchers (AK and DMM) coding the data to identify key themes and patterns related to the clinical usefulness and actionability of the information presented in the dashboard. Following initial coding, the researchers engaged in consensus coding, where they met to compare their findings, discuss any discrepancies, and reach agreement on the final set of themes and codes. JZ acted as an arbitrator for any unresolved discrepancies. This approach was employed to reduce individual bias and enhance the reliability and credibility of the analysis. The Likert scale questionnaire responses were analysed using descriptive statistics to complement the qualitative findings. The SUS scores were used to assess the usability of the dashboard format for presenting this information using the curved grading scale interpretation [31]. The results from both qualitative and quantitative analyses were then integrated to provide a comprehensive understanding of the system's clinical utility and usability.

Results

Thematic Analysis

Four main themes emerged from our thematic analysis: (1) Data Interpretation Preferences, (2) Bridging the Clinic-Home Divide, (3) Tailoring Therapy Through Home Observations, and (4) Practical Realities of Implementation. Table 1 presents an overview of these themes and their subthemes.

Table 1: Overview of themes and subthemes for thematic analysis from semi-structured interviews.

Theme	Subthemes
Data Interpretation Preferences	1A. The Primacy of Functional Footage 1B. Navigating Novel Graph Presentations
Bridging the Clinic-Home Divide	2A. Beyond Clinic Walls 2B. Goal-Oriented Data Collection
Tailoring Therapy Through Home Observations	
Practical Realities of Implementation	4A. Clinical Integration 4B. Another Burden?

1. Data Interpretation Preferences

This theme explores how therapists interacted with and valued the different types of data presented to them in the dashboard (i.e., graphs and videos). It highlights the distinction between more familiar, observation-based representations of data and novel data visualisation techniques.

1A. The Primacy of Functional Footage

This subtheme captures therapists' strong preference for video data and its ability to provide rich, functional insights into patients' real-world activities, emphasising its alignment with how they already consume data they are presented with in the clinic (i.e., through patient observations). As one therapist highlighted:

> I would go right to the videos. The graphs were interesting in that I saw that he looked like he used his left hand more, but that probably wouldn't give me that much information. I think the videos are the most telling, at least for me. Visual, more direct application for me. (T05)

This sentiment was also echoed by others: “To be honest, I really liked the videos, because that, as much as the number tells you, it doesn't actually tell you the quality and the pattern that she's actually using her hand” (T01).

Overall, while the graphical data could be a good overview, therapists believed the real value came from the videos: “The quantitative measures would give me an idea of how much he's progressing in terms of quantity of affected hand use, [...] and then just yeah the videos give me a lot of rich information on how I can adapt therapy” (T04).

1B. Navigating Novel Graph Presentations

In contrast, therapists expressed challenges interpreting the information presented in the graphs and found it difficult to integrate into their clinical reasoning or therapy planning in any way:

> Normally I don't go through metrics or graphs or, this isn't a typical format for me to obtain or analyse information being more like a frontline clinician. So just again, my eyes aren't as familiar with this as from what my role has been in the past, like 20 years here. This isn't a regular part of how we're interpreting our patient information. [...] I think there just needs to be more specification around [the graphs] or just more defining parameters just for it to have any value. [...] like if we're using this at [intake] and then discharge, I would want it to be as comparable as possible. (T02)

2. Bridging the Clinic-Home Divide

This theme explores the unique insights that therapists gained from the CDSS about patient home environments and daily activities beyond the clinical setting. It also highlights different data collection approaches to make the information more useful to therapists.

2A. Beyond Clinic Walls

Therapists emphasised the value of seeing videos of their patients performing functional activities at home “because the clinic is limited as a simulation of what occurs at home” (T04). And since they “cannot go to every patient's home, in a way [these videos] bring the patient's home to [them]” (T03). As one therapist noted:

> Part of our OT assessment does include the physical environment, so we are asking about obviously the basic layout, and how you're getting around, and how you're accessing different rooms, but as far as, a lot of times the physical environment also does just limit the potential for how much they can do. So, yeah, that's just an extra layer I would say. But as far as thinking about whatever recommendations we might make for home modifications, or even how he most safely accesses his space, it's just that opportunity to see a patient, again, outside of a very sort of generic clinic space or setting. (T02)

2B. Goal-Oriented Data Collection

While patients were instructed to record typical daily activities following the protocol outlined in [27], therapists expressed a preference for focused data collection aligned with patients' specific goals and priorities, while also being able to compare how a patient is able to perform different functional activities across time points to better track progress over time:

> It would be useful to me to be able to see the change from one time-point to the next when it's... like if this was a pre-therapy video, then I would want to be able to compare it readily to mid-therapy and post-therapy video. And I guess it would be nice to have some alignment between what his functional goals are, because for instance one of his goals initially was to be able to like open a ring box so I would have him videotape at home like how he's performing that goal, or his approximation of that goal, like opening a box at home. I would want to see how he's progressing with things that are part of his goals. (T04)

3. Tailoring Therapy Through Home Observations

This theme discusses how the new insights gained from the CDSS could be used to adjust therapist recommendations and therapy plans based on observed real-world patient behaviour. One therapist mentioned the videos provide much greater detail than their initial assessments and could help with task specific practice:

> We have like tedious notes as far as our initial assessment, but we would still certainly not be able to get that level of like, "So, okay, when you go in your kitchen...". This really gives, if we want to break down the tasks even more, it definitely would lend itself really nicely to helping with more specific practice therapy sessions, or breaking down the task and say, "Okay, now let's work on your left hand reach and then reaching across your body with your right hand to open the microwave", or just some of the details definitely could help with the problem solving or maybe modified devices. (T02)

Another therapist described how some of the activities she observed in the videos could be a safety hazard and that they would modify exercises in clinic to prevent a fall in the future:

> I love it [...] you open my horizon as a therapist. Wow, [patient name] is doing some... one big help your project is... would be helpful in falls prevention because this patient is taking risk. I know the left leg is not working, so why not move your walker closer and then you grasp... and

> if she had... so I'm gonna modify my therapy by looking at those and improve my treatment so your project definitely will help us to improve the results. (T03)

4. Practical Realities of Implementation

This theme explores the practical considerations and potential barriers to implementing the dashboard in clinical practice. It encompasses concerns about time constraints for clinicians and the additional burdens placed on patients, highlighting the complexities of integrating new systems into existing clinical processes.

4A. Clinical Integration

Therapists expressed varied perspectives on how they could use this system in their current practice. One therapist viewed the tool as being akin to reviewing patient charts in the electronic health record (i.e., EPIC) prior to a session:

> I'd prefer to first look at it when I'm not in therapy. I think it's very quick to extract information from this, so I don't think this takes me any longer than you know, logging into EPIC and doing all these things I have to do to document the session. [...] Yeah, I don't think it's too time-consuming. I think it's very valuable information. (T04)

While another believed they did not "have a ton of time for it" (T02), but considered "[looking] at it with the patient and [reviewing] it during the session" (T02). As a result, one therapist questioned how often they would even use it: "I don't know how often I would do it. If it was available, if there was something you really wanted to know, how are you actually doing this? Then I could see that coming into play." (T05).

4B. Another Burden?

Therapists also mentioned potential challenges for patients:

> So for someone who doesn't really have any support, and for someone who doesn't have support and a low level arm, like there's no way they're gonna get a GoPro on their head and strap it properly and turn it on and make sure it's on and off, and you're not gonna get them to do that for four weeks. So I think it's, it's great if, if you pick the right person to do it with, if not, I don't know how helpful it would be. (T01)

Quantitative Findings

In addition to the qualitative interviews, therapists completed a questionnaire about technology affinity and the clinical usefulness of this system in their practice (Figure 3). The first six questions aimed to understand a therapist's affinity towards technology, while the remaining questions targeted their thoughts on our CDSS. Regardless of therapists having varying levels of technology use and affinity in their lives (Q1-6), they all found the CDSS to be a useful tool for understanding patient

performance at home (Q12), would use it regularly (Q7), and indicated that it had the potential to influence therapy planning (Q15).



Figure 3: Therapist responses to the questionnaire regarding technology use and affinity (Q1-Q6) and clinical utility and actionability of the CDSS (Q7-Q16). Mean Likert scale scores are represented by black filled circles and the responses from each participant are represented by individually connected coloured lines. Likert score interpretations for the different questions are provided in Appendix. Statements with an asterisk (*) are reverse coded.

Our participants reported a mean SUS score of 80.0 (95% CI [65.95, 94.05]), placing our system in the 85-89th percentile range [31]. All individual participants scored above 68 (Figure 4), which represents the 50th percentile SUS score [31]. These results indicate above-average usability for our system overall.



Figure 4: System Usability Scale (SUS) results. The left panel displays the total SUS scores. The mean score is represented by a black circle with error bars representing 95% CI. Individual participant scores are represented by the smaller grey circles. The dashed line is displayed at a total SUS score of 68, which is considered the average score at the 50th percentile [31]. The right panel displays the distribution of responses for all participants and for all statements. Note that the titles over each graph have been abbreviated for simplicity.

Discussion

This study aimed to evaluate whether information about hand use in the home environment derived from egocentric video was perceived by therapists as being clinically useful in the context of outpatient upper limb neurorehabilitation. The information presented was well-received and gave therapists the ability to view patients performing functional activities and ADLs in their home environment, with the potential to result in more tailored therapy in the clinic. However, there were clear preferences for specific types of data and practical challenges for implementation.

Therapists consistently expressed a strong preference for video footage over graphical representations of data. The videos enabled therapists to observe real-world hand use and understand patients' functional capabilities in their home environments, allowing them to adapt therapy based on direct observation of performance. For example, therapists reported the videos helped them break down tasks into specific movements performed at home, or provide more specific recommendations based on safety concerns they observed in the videos. This preference is

supported by the high Likert scores related to the dashboard's usefulness in assessing patient performance (Q7, Q12). This aligns with existing literature that underscores the importance of direct observation in clinical decision-making, where functional video footage provides critical context, such as movement quality, that is often lost in abstract numerical data [32,33].

Conversely, several therapists found the graphical data more challenging to interpret and reported that the metrics were unclear and less directly applicable to their clinical reasoning. Concerns were raised about how quickly someone could learn how to use this information (Q14), suggesting a lack of clarity in how the data were presented, and its potential to disrupt workflow (Q10). The reliance on observational data may also indicate clinicians may not have the training or time to effectively engage with more technical data presentations. Many therapists reported that graphical representations were unfamiliar to them as frontline clinicians, alluding to potentially broader issues of data literacy within healthcare settings [34,35]. While quantitative metrics remain essential as outcome measures in clinical research, our results emphasise the need for customised data visualisations tailored to different audiences.

The single most useful aspect of this system was its ability to bridge the gap between the clinical and home environments. Therapists unanimously agreed that the clinic could never fully simulate the complexity of patients' home environments and while they "cannot go to every patient's home, in a way [these videos] bring the patient's home to [them]" (T03). Videos of patients performing functional activities at home gave therapists crucial insights into the physical and environmental barriers that patients encounter while performing real activities, which might not be evident in the controlled setting of the clinic. This ability to remotely observe home environments offers a promising alternative to traditional home visits, which are often limited by time and resource constraints even though they result in better patient outcomes [36–39]. The high score for statements indicating trust in the information (Q9) and the belief that it would influence future therapy plans (Q15) demonstrates the overall utility of our system in clinical settings.

However, despite recognizing the clinical value of the information provided by this system, therapists also highlighted several practical challenges related to its implementation such as clinical time constraints and patient burden. While some therapists felt the dashboard was easy to integrate into their existing chart review time, others worried that reviewing the data would add too much to their already busy schedules (Q10). There were also concerns about the burden on patients with limited physical or technological support. Some therapists noted that certain patients might struggle to use the necessary equipment to capture their daily activities. These concerns echo the existing implementation science literature on barriers to adoption of mobile health and remote patient monitoring devices in healthcare, with disruption to clinician workflows and patient training and/or willingness to use these technologies playing the largest role in adoption rates [40–43]. Therefore, future iterations will explore ways to automatically highlight interesting video snippets for therapists to view. Additionally, future work should aim to design egocentric cameras that are easier to use by

individuals with hand impairments and increase the willingness to use and record (i.e., lighter, less bulky, etc.).

While this study provides valuable insights into the clinical potential of the information presented by the CDSS, there are several limitations to consider. First, the small sample size of only five clinicians from a single hospital network limits the generalizability of our findings. This sample size was partly constrained by the number of eligible participants at our institution and the complexity of recruiting patient-therapist dyads, which is more challenging than recruiting therapists alone. Despite this limitation, the choice of 5 dyads was reasonable given that this study has a specific research question and a single analytically relevant participant 'category' (i.e., therapists) [44]. Additionally, there is a potential for selection bias, as therapists more inclined to engage with and adopt new technologies may have been more likely to participate. While the quantitative questionnaire showed a wide range of responses in the technology affinity section (Q1-6), suggesting a variety of comfort levels with technology, it's noteworthy that even therapists with lower technology affinity provided positive feedback on the CDSS. This indicates that the CDSS's potential value was recognized across different levels of technological comfort. However, it's important to acknowledge that the overall positive reception may not fully capture the perspectives of therapists who are generally less comfortable with technology and chose not to participate in the study. Finally, although the CDSS was well-received in interviews, therapists did not have extended opportunities to integrate it into their daily practice. This limited exposure means that the feedback gathered may not fully capture the tool’s long-term usability or the practical challenges it might pose once embedded in everyday workflows.

Conclusion

This study demonstrates the potential of a system that uses egocentric video to provide therapists with home-based hand use data about their patients to inform clinical decision-making in a neurorehabilitation setting. While therapists found the information useful—particularly video data for assessing patient performance in a naturalistic setting—challenges related to integrating the system into clinical workflows were evident. The primary concerns centred around the clarity of graphical data and the perceived time burden that regular use might impose on therapists. Despite these hurdles, therapists across varying levels of technical familiarity expressed trust in the information provided by the system, indicated that they would use it regularly to assess patient performance, and believed it could enhance their ability to tailor therapy plans to real-world patient activities.

Reducing time demands through features like interpretations of graphical data or providing more emphasis on video data may help mitigate the barriers identified. Ultimately, the adoption of wearable egocentric cameras could facilitate a more seamless connection between in-clinic assessments and real-world functionality, contributing to more effective and personalised rehabilitation. However, further research is necessary to explore the long-term impact of this system in diverse clinical environments and its role in broader healthcare settings.

References

1. Virani SS, Alonso A, Benjamin EJ, Bittencourt MS, Callaway CW, Carson AP, et al. Heart Disease and Stroke Statistics-2020 Update: A Report From the American Heart Association. Circulation. 2020;141: e139–e596. doi:10.1161/CIR.0000000000000757

2. Krueger H, Noonan VK, Trenaman LM, Joshi P, Rivers CS. The economic burden of traumatic spinal cord injury in Canada. Chronic Dis Inj Can. 2013;33: 113–122. Available: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23735450

3. Anderson KD. Targeting recovery: priorities of the spinal cord-injured population. J Neurotrauma. 2004;21: 1371–1383. doi:10.1089/neu.2004.21.1371

4. Welmer A-K, Holmqvist LW, Sommerfeld DK. Limited fine hand use after stroke and its association with other disabilities. J Rehabil Med. 2008;40: 603–608. doi:10.2340/16501977-0218

5. Singh H, Musselman K, Colella TJF, McGilton KS, Iaboni A, Bayley M, et al. Exploring the perspectives of outpatient rehabilitation clinicians on the challenges with monitoring patient health, function and activity in the community. Disabil Rehabil. 2022;44: 2858–2867. doi:10.1080/09638288.2020.1849422

6. Jones M, Collier G, Reinkensmeyer DJ, DeRuyter F, Dzivak J, Zondervan D, et al. Big Data Analytics and Sensor-Enhanced Activity Management to Improve Effectiveness and Efficiency of Outpatient Medical Rehabilitation. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2020;17. doi:10.3390/ijerph17030748

7. Waddell KJ, Strube MJ, Bailey RR, Klaesner JW, Birkenmeier RL, Dromerick AW, et al. Does Task-Specific Training Improve Upper Limb Performance in Daily Life Poststroke? Neurorehabil Neural Repair. 2017;31: 290–300. doi:10.1177/1545968316680493

8. Doman CA, Waddell KJ, Bailey RR, Moore JL, Lang CE. Changes in upper-extremity functional capacity and daily performance during outpatient occupational therapy for people with stroke. Am J Occup Ther. 2016;70: 7003290040p1–7003290040p11. doi:10.5014/ajot.2016.020891

9. Rand D, Eng JJ. Disparity between functional recovery and daily use of the upper and lower extremities during subacute stroke rehabilitation. Neurorehabil Neural Repair. 2012;26: 76–84. doi:10.1177/1545968311408918

10. Fleming MK, Newham DJ, Roberts-Lewis SF, Sorinola IO. Self-perceived utilization of the paretic arm in chronic stroke requires high upper limb functional ability. Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 2014;95: 918–924. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2014.01.009

11. Adams SA, Matthews CE, Ebbeling CB, Moore CG, Cunningham JE, Fulton J, et al. The effect of social desirability and social approval on self-reports of physical activity. Am J Epidemiol. 2005;161: 389–398. doi:10.1093/aje/kwi054

12. Adams AS, Soumerai SB, Lomas J, Ross-Degnan D. Evidence of self-report bias in assessing adherence to guidelines. Int J Qual Health Care. 1999;11: 187–192. doi:10.1093/intqhc/11.3.187

13. Tatemichi TK, Desmond DW, Stern Y, Paik M, Sano M, Bagiella E. Cognitive impairment after stroke: frequency, patterns, and relationship to functional abilities. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry. 1994;57: 202–207. doi:10.1136/jnnp.57.2.202

14. Sachdeva R, Gao F, Chan CCH, Krassioukov AV. Cognitive function after spinal cord injury: A systematic review. Neurology. 2018;91: 611–621. doi:10.1212/WNL.0000000000006244

15. Cartas A, Radeva P, Dimiccoli M. Activities of Daily Living Monitoring via a Wearable Camera: Toward Real-World Applications. IEEE Access. 2020;8: 77344–77363. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2990333

16. Tsai M-F, Wang RH, Zariffa J. Validity of novel outcome measures for hand function performance after stroke using egocentric video. Neurorehabil Neural Repair. 2023;37: 142–150. doi:10.1177/15459683231159663

17. Bandini A, Dousty M, Hitzig SL, Craven BC, Kalsi-Ryan S, Zariffa J. Measuring Hand Use in the Home after Cervical Spinal Cord Injury Using Egocentric Video. J Neurotrauma. 2022;39: 1697–1707. doi:10.1089/neu.2022.0156

18. Dousty M, Zariffa J. Tenodesis Grasp Detection in Egocentric Video. IEEE J Biomed Health Inform. 2020;PP. doi:10.1109/JBHI.2020.3003643

19. Lang CE, Barth J, Holleran CL, Konrad JD, Bland MD. Implementation of wearable sensing technology for movement: Pushing forward into the routine physical rehabilitation care field. Sensors (Basel). 2020;20: 5744. doi:10.3390/s20205744

20. Dunn J, Runge R, Snyder M. Wearables and the medical revolution. Per Med. 2018;15: 429–448. doi:10.2217/pme-2018-0044

21. Morris J, Jones M, Thompson N, Wallace T, DeRuyter F. Clinician Perspectives on mRehab Interventions and Technologies for People with Disabilities in the United States: A National Survey. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2019;16. doi:10.3390/ijerph16214220

22. Holden RJ, Karsh B-T. The technology acceptance model: its past and its future in health care. J Biomed Inform. 2010;43: 159–172. doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2009.07.002

23. Wu J-H, Wang S-C, Lin L-M. Mobile computing acceptance factors in the healthcare industry: a structural equation model. Int J Med Inform. 2007;76: 66–77. doi:10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2006.06.006

24. Sutton RT, Pincock D, Baumgart DC, Sadowski DC, Fedorak RN, Kroeker KI. An overview of clinical decision support systems: benefits, risks, and strategies for success. NPJ Digit Med. 2020;3: 17. doi:10.1038/s41746-020-0221-y

25. Qin Z, Armijo-Olivo S, Woodhouse LJ, Gross DP. An investigation of the validity of the Work Assessment Triage Tool clinical decision support tool for selecting optimal rehabilitation interventions for workers with musculoskeletal injuries. Clin Rehabil. 2016;30: 277–287. doi:10.1177/0269215515578696

26. Chae SH, Kim Y, Lee K-S, Park H-S. Development and Clinical Evaluation of a Web-Based Upper Limb Home Rehabilitation System Using a Smartwatch and Machine Learning Model for Chronic Stroke Survivors: Prospective Comparative Study. JMIR Mhealth Uhealth. 2020;8: e17216. doi:10.2196/17216

27. Tsai M-F, Bandini A, Wang RH, Zariffa J. Capturing Representative Hand Use at Home Using Egocentric Video in Individuals with Upper Limb Impairment. J Vis Exp. 2020. doi:10.3791/61898

28. Kadambi A, Bandini A, Ramkalawan RD, Hitzig SL, Zariffa J. Designing an Egocentric Video-Based Dashboard to Report Hand Performance Measures for Outpatient Rehabilitation of Cervical Spinal Cord Injury. Top Spinal Cord Inj Rehabil. 2023;29: 75–87. doi:10.46292/sci23-00015S

29. Shan D, Geng J, Shu M, Fouhey DF. Understanding human hands in contact at internet scale. 2020 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). IEEE; 2020. doi:10.1109/cvpr42600.2020.00989

30. Braun V, Clarke V, Hayfield N, Terry G. Thematic Analysis. In: Liamputtong P, editor. Handbook of Research Methods in Health Social Sciences. Singapore: Springer Singapore; 2019. pp. 843–860. doi:10.1007/978-981-10-5251-4_103

31. Sauro J, Lewis JR. Quantifying the User Experience: Practical statistics for User Research. Oxford, England: Morgan Kaufmann; 2016. Available: https://books.google.com/books/about/Quantifying_the_User_Experience.html?id=USPfCQAAQBAJ

32. Haig J. Assessment tools used by occupational therapists with head injured patients in a rehabilitation setting. Br J Occup Ther. 1997;60: 541–545. doi:10.1177/030802269706001210

33. Robertson L, Blaga L. Occupational therapy assessments used in acute physical care settings. Scand J Occup Ther. 2013;20: 127–135. doi:10.3109/11038128.2012.737369

34. Kuek A, Hakkennes S. Healthcare staff digital literacy levels and their attitudes towards information systems. Health Informatics J. 2020;26: 592–612. doi:10.1177/1460458219839613

35. Tegegne MD, Tilahun B, Mamuye A, Kerie H, Nurhussien F, Zemen E, et al. Digital literacy level and associated factors among health professionals in a referral and teaching hospital: An implication for future digital health systems implementation. Front Public Health. 2023;11: 1130894. doi:10.3389/fpubh.2023.1130894

36. Lockwood KJ, Harding KE, Boyd JN, Taylor NF. Home visits by occupational therapists improve adherence to recommendations: Process evaluation of a randomised controlled trial. Aust Occup Ther J. 2020;67: 287–296. doi:10.1111/1440-1630.12651

37. Read J, Jones N, Fegan C, Cudd P, Simpson E, Mazumdar S, et al. Remote Home Visit: Exploring the feasibility, acceptability and potential benefits of using digital technology to undertake occupational therapy home assessments. Br J Occup Ther. 2020;83: 648–658. doi:10.1177/0308022620921111

38. Cumming RG, Thomas M, Szonyi G, Salkeld G, O'Neill E, Westbury C, et al. Home visits by an occupational therapist for assessment and modification of environmental hazards: a randomized trial of falls prevention. J Am Geriatr Soc. 1999;47: 1397–1402. doi:10.1111/j.1532-5415.1999.tb01556.x

39. Gitlin LN, Hauck WW, Winter L, Dennis MP, Schulz R. Effect of an in-home occupational and physical therapy intervention on reducing mortality in functionally vulnerable older people: preliminary findings: Effect of occupational and physical therapy. J Am Geriatr Soc. 2006;54: 950–955. doi:10.1111/j.1532-5415.2006.00733.x

40. Gagnon M-P, Desmartis M, Labrecque M, Car J, Pagliari C, Pluye P, et al. Systematic review of factors influencing the adoption of information and communication technologies by healthcare professionals. J Med Syst. 2012;36: 241–277. doi:10.1007/s10916-010-9473-4

41. Christodoulakis C, Asgarian A, Easterbrook S. Barriers to adoption of information technology in healthcare. Conf Cent Adv Stud Collab Res. 2017; 66–75. Available: http://www.cs.utoronto.ca/~sme/papers/2017/Christodoulakis-etal-2017.pdf

42. Zakerabasali S, Ayyoubzadeh SM, Baniasadi T, Yazdani A, Abhari S. Mobile health technology and healthcare providers: Systemic barriers to adoption. Healthc Inform Res. 2021;27: 267–278. doi:10.4258/hir.2021.27.4.267

43. Khong PCB, Holroyd E, Wang W. A Critical Review of the Theoretical Frameworks and the Conceptual Factors in the Adoption of Clinical Decision Support Systems. Comput Inform Nurs. 2015;33: 555–570. doi:10.1097/CIN.0000000000000196

44. Nielsen J, Landauer TK. A mathematical model of the finding of usability problems. Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems - CHI '93. New York, New York, USA: ACM Press; 1993. doi:10.1145/169059.169166

Appendix

Therapist Interview Guide

Structured Interview - Context & Affinity Questions (filled out **before** CDSS use)

(1) Strongly disagree; (2) Disagree; (3) Neither agree nor disagree; (4) Agree; (5) Strongly agree.

1. I predominantly deal with technical systems because I am forced to.
2. I enjoy spending time becoming acquainted with a new technical system.
3. It is enough for me that a technical system works; I don't care how or why.
4. I try to understand how a technical system exactly works.
5. It is enough for me to know the basic functions of a technical system.
6. I try to make full use of the capabilities of a technical system.

Structured Interview - Usability Questions (filled out **after** CDSS use)

(1) Strongly disagree; (2) Disagree; (3) Neither agree nor disagree; (4) Agree; (5) Strongly agree.

7. I would personally use this CDSS regularly to understand and assess patient performance.
8. I found the CDSS easy to use overall, and the various functions in this CDSS were well integrated.
9. I felt like I could trust the metrics and information provided to me by the CDSS.
10. Using this CDSS regularly would substantially interrupt my workflow.
11. I feel apprehensive about using this CDSS with future patients.
12. Using this CDSS is useful in understanding and assessing patient performance.
13. I found the CDSS very cumbersome to use, and the presented metrics weren't clear.
14. I would imagine that most people would learn to use this CDSS very quickly.
15. The information presented by the CDSS would potentially influence patient therapy plans.
16. Presenting the information in this format is NOT useful to me or my assessment of patients.

Semi-Structured Interview - Debrief Questions (open ended questions asked **after** CDSS use)

1. Before starting this study, what were your expectations for the kind of information you would receive after having your patients record themselves performing activities of daily living at home?
    a. What do you think this CDSS would do? What did you hope to gain from it, if anything? What concerns, if any, did you have?
2. At your last session(s) with [patient name], what did you ask them to work on at home?
    a. What exercises did you prescribe and why? Did you make any suggestions related to reported challenges in their environment?
3. After reviewing the information from the CDSS, can you think of any relevant information that you did not get from your session(s) with [patient name]?
    a. Did the activities in the videos match the capabilities that you saw in the clinic? Did you become aware of any additional challenges that [patient name] was facing at

home? Did you become aware of any additional strategies that [patient name] was using at home?

4. After reviewing the information from the CDSS, would you change anything to what you asked [patient name] to work on at home at your last session?
    a. Would you recommend additional or alternative exercises or remove exercises? Would you make any additional suggestions about how to deal with challenges in their environment? Would you make any additional recommendations around the use of compensatory postures?
5. Did the CDSS present information that was meaningful?
    a. What metrics were the most interesting or useful to you? What didn't make sense? How useful were the metrics compared to watching video segments? How could the information be made more useful?
6. When using software of this nature, what is your primary goal or what do you hope to achieve?
    a. What would prevent you from achieving [primary goal]? What improvements could be made to make [primary goal] easier or better? Does this CDSS adequately meet these goals?
7. After briefly playing around with it, what is your overall impression of this CDSS?
    a. Is there anything that stands out as something that doesn't make sense? On the flip side, what are some of the things you liked or thought were intuitive?
8. How would/could you use the information and metrics presented by this CDSS?
    a. Would you ever need to share these metrics with others? If yes - who, what format, method? Would you ever need to export the information presented? If yes - when, why, what format? What metrics were the most interesting or useful to you? What didn't make sense?
9. What would be some of the reasons you would want to check a patient's profile on this CDSS?
    a. How long do you expect to look at each patient's profile weekly?
    b. Under what circumstances would you want to receive an alert or notification? Through what channels (i.e. email, text, in the application, etc.)?
10. In a magical world with no limits on money or technology, how would you ideally want to use wearable technology and/or CDSS to help you do hand function assessments in outpatient settings?


Patient Video Recordings
1. Camera Handoff
2. Recording Protocol
3. Camera Return
Dashboard Generation
Quantitative Metrics
Minutes recorded per day
Percentage interaction per day
Number of interactions per hour
Average interaction duration (seconds)
Activity breakdown (minutes)
Video snippets (manually curated)
Therapist Interviews
1. Structured Questionnaire (Q1-6)
2. Dashboard Review (10 min)
3. Interview (45 min)
a. Structured Questionnaire (Q7-16)
b. System Usability Scale
c. Semi-Structured Interview

Minutes recorded per day

Sum of video length by date from metadata.



Percentage interaction

Number of frames with an interaction detected divided by the total number of frames.



Number of interactions

The number of interactions per hour of video, where a single interaction is defined as a set of consecutive frames where the hand is interacting with an object.



Average interaction duration

The average interaction duration in seconds, where a single interaction is defined as a set of consecutive frames where the hand is interacting with an object.



Activity breakdown

Manually computed breakdown of ADLs in minutes across all dates from 1-minute video snippets.



Video snippets

Manually curated to provide a wide range of activities, with a focus on tasks the patient struggled to complete.

Statement

* (1) I predominantly deal with technical systems because I am forced to

(2) I enjoy spending time becoming acquainted with a new technical system

* (3) It is enough for me that a technical system works; I do not care how or why

(4) I try to understand how a technical system exactly works

* (5) It is enough for me to know the basic functions of a technical system

(6) I try to make full use of the capabilities of a technical system

(7) I would personally use this CDSS regularly to understand and assess patient performance

(8) I found the CDSS easy to use overall, and the various functions in this CDSS were well integrated

(9) I felt like I could trust the metrics and information provided to me by the CDSS

* (10) Using this CDSS regularly would substantially interrupt my workflow

* (11) I feel apprehensive about using this CDSS with future patients

(12) Using this CDSS is useful in understanding and assessing patient performance

* (13) I found the CDSS very cumbersome to use, and the presented metrics were not clear

(14) I would imagine that most people would learn to use this CDSS very quickly

(15) The information presented by the CDSS would potentially influence patient therapy plans

* (16) Presenting the information in this format is NOT useful to me or my assessment of patients