

1    **Development and Validation of a Bedside Scale for Assessing Upper Limb**  
2    **Function Following Stroke: A Methodological Study.**

3    Dhaval Pawani MPT,<sup>1¶</sup> Abraham M Joshua PhD,<sup>1¶\*</sup> Akshatha Nayak MPT,<sup>1¶</sup> Vijayakumar  
4    Palaniswamy PhD,<sup>1¶</sup> Prasanna Mithra MD,<sup>2</sup> Ashish John Prabhakar PhD <sup>1¶</sup>, Sampath Kumar  
5    Amaravadi PhD <sup>3&</sup>

6  
7    **Author Affiliations**

8    <sup>1</sup>Department of Physiotherapy, Kasturba Medical College, Mangalore, Manipal Academy of  
9    Higher Education, Manipal, Karnataka, India

10   <sup>2</sup>Department of Community Medicine, Kasturba Medical College, Mangalore, Manipal  
11   Academy of Higher Education, Manipal, Karnataka, India

12   <sup>3</sup>Department of Physiotherapy, School of Nursing and Allied Health, Institute of Applied  
13   Sciences, University of Chichester, Bishop Otter Campus, College Lane, Chichester, West  
14   Sussex, United Kingdom.

15  
16   \*Corresponding author

17   E-mail: [abraham.joshua@manipal.edu](mailto:abraham.joshua@manipal.edu) (AMJ)

18   ¶ These authors equally contributed to the work.

19   & These authors also contributed equally to this work.

20

21   **Short Title:** Stroke Recovery Tool: Methodology for Bedside Upper Limb Evaluation

22

23

## 24 **Abstract**

25 **Objective:** This study aimed to develop and concurrently validate a simple, resource-  
26 efficient, and time-efficient bedside tool based on day-to-day movement tasks for evaluating  
27 upper limb function in stroke survivors.

28 **Methods:** The study's qualitative and cross-sectional component was conducted in 2  
29 stages. At the initial stage, a relevant literature review was carried out to conceptualize and  
30 define the theoretical framework of day-to-day movement tasks, in evaluating upper limb  
31 function. Subsequently, an initial item pool of 18 upper limb and hand movements was  
32 developed. A Delphi method was employed to verify content validity of the initial 18-item  
33 scale using an expert consensus panel of 6 subject matter experts (three neurologists, two  
34 physiotherapists, and 1 occupation therapist). At the first round, 4 items were excluded using  
35 expert panel consensus method. During the second round of the content validation phase, the  
36 remaining 14-item scale was revised and refined to a final 12-item scale by the expert panel  
37 using a 5-point Likert rating scale. A score of 2 or below by at least two experts on a 5-point  
38 Likert scale was used as the criterion to modify or remove the components. During the  
39 second stage, the final 12-item bedside upper limb evaluation tool (BUFET) scale underwent  
40 concurrent validation using purposive sampling of 25 stroke survivors. Concurrent validity  
41 was assessed by correlating the BUFET score with Wolf Motor Function (WMT) scores  
42 using Spearman's correlation coefficient and internal consistency was evaluated through  
43 Cronbach's alpha.

44 **Results:** Concurrent validity and internal consistency of the scale were supported by a  
45 high correlation coefficient ( $r = 0.937$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ) with WMFT and high Cronbach's alpha  
46 (0.948).

47 **Conclusions:** The newly developed BUFET was found to be a valid and reliable bedside  
48 tool in the evaluation of upper limb functions and can be administered in a resource and time-  
49 efficient manner.

50 **Keywords:** Stroke, Upper limb function, Outcome measures, Bedside assessment,  
51 Evaluation tool.

## 52 INTRODUCTION

53 The daily activities of individuals with stroke are significantly influenced by the upper limb  
54 (UL) and hand function[1] Evidence from several studies suggested that 85% of stroke  
55 survivors suffer UL and hand impairments. [2–5] In particular stroke survivors with middle  
56 cerebral artery infarction have been associated with muscle weakness[6], inability to control  
57 all UL segments in space and time (inter-joint coordination)[7] [8], difficulty in grasping and  
58 holding an object, reduced ability to independently move individual fingers.[3] There is  
59 significant evidence to suggest that these UL impairments contribute to loss of UL function,  
60 loss of independence in activities of daily living, and impaired quality of life.[9,10] The  
61 presence of these diverse motor impairments a few weeks after a stroke can predict future UL  
62 function.[3] Therefore, evaluation of UL function is critical in day-to-day stroke  
63 rehabilitation.[11]

64 Evaluation of UL functional movements following stroke has been performed by several  
65 types of tools ranging from observer-based scales, instrumented tests, and self-reported

66 questionnaires.[12] Some of the commonly reported reliable and valid performance  
67 assessment tools to quantify UL function in stroke survivors include the Fugl-Meyer  
68 Assessment of Upper Limb (FMA-UL), Wolf Motor Function Test (WMFT), Action  
69 Research Arm Test (ARAT), Box and Block Test (BBT), Nine Hole Peg Test (NHPT).[12–  
70 14] Although FMA-UL has been reported to have the highest level of psychometric and  
71 clinometric properties, it does not evaluate functional arm and hand movements.[15] FMA-  
72 UL mainly evaluates body function and structures as per the international classification of  
73 functioning (ICF) framework. In addition, FMA-UL and ARAT are noted to exhibit some  
74 overlap in their assessment of UL function, suggesting that they may not be entirely distinct  
75 in their evaluations of UL capabilities.[16] Clinical tools such as ARAT, WMFT, BBT, and  
76 NHPT predominantly measure grasping and displacement movements of different object  
77 sizes with less emphasis on gross movements.[17,18] ARAT involves a subjective scoring  
78 method, with poor definitions of the test item positioning and time allocation for each  
79 item.[14,19] Currently, there is no agreement on the selection of any particular tool for a  
80 particular individual with a stroke.[3]

81 Despite the excellent psychometric properties of FMA-UL, WMFT, and ARAT, all these  
82 tools require a considerable amount of time and are resource-intensive due to their  
83 comprehensive nature and need for manual administration.[20] In particular, FMA-UL  
84 requires longer than 30 minutes to complete the test and needs material resources and/or tools  
85 including a standardized chair and/or desk to execute the same.[21] Furthermore,  
86 administration of these said measures can be exhaustive, cumbersome, and often impractical  
87 for bedside evaluation. The time taken to administer a tool significantly influences its  
88 probability of regular usage in clinical practice. Hence, tools that take a quicker time are  
89 more likely to be utilized.[3]

90 Emerging evidence suggests that the inclusion of non-contact gesture movements (e.g.,  
91 salute, hand waving gesture, etc.) and contact-grasping (e.g., grasping a small glass, etc.)  
92 would strengthen the representativeness and comprehensiveness of evaluation of UL  
93 movements of daily life.[2,22] In addition, analysis of gesture and grasp movements can  
94 demonstrate task-specific and impairment-specific characteristics.[22] In line with that, we  
95 propose a conceptual framework for the clinical utility of day-to-day movement tasks such as  
96 hand gesture movements, grasping movements,[23] and rhythmic finger tapping[24] in  
97 evaluating the UL function in stroke. Although previous studies have quantified the  
98 impairments in hand gestures, grasping, and finger tapping, these studies primarily employed  
99 expensive quantifiable technology to investigate such as wearable gloves for hand gesture  
100 recognition,[25,26] and ultrasound-based motion analyzer for kinetic and kinematic analysis  
101 of grasping. [27] Evidence suggests that the finger-tapping test is a useful tool in predicting  
102 recovery in stroke survivors.[28,29] Currently, there is no simple, qualitative, resource, and  
103 time-efficient tool that could be quickly administered at the bedside to evaluate UL function  
104 in stroke survivors.

105 Therefore, the primary aim of the present study was to develop a bedside tool based on day-  
106 to-day movement tasks that can be administered with ease, accuracy, minimal time  
107 consumption, and less exhaustion to measure the UL function following stroke. The  
108 secondary aim was to assess the concurrent validity of the new bedside tool.

## 109 **Materials and Methods**

110 The study comprised of 2 phases 1) scale development and content validity verification 2)  
111 concurrent validity determination with WMFT. After receiving approval from the  
112 Institutional Ethics Committee (IEC KMC MLR 1/2022/15), a dual-phasic study containing  
113 qualitative and cross-sectional elements was undertaken in teaching hospitals affiliated with

114 Kasturba Medical College, Mangalore, from February 2022 to January 2023. The qualitative  
115 phase included tool development, whereas the cross-sectional phase focused on tool  
116 validation. Purposive sampling was implemented for participant recruitment. The study  
117 participant characteristics are depicted in **Table 1**. The study included adult participants (>18  
118 years of age) diagnosed with primary infarction/hemorrhagic stroke and hemiparesis of the  
119 upper limb (UL). Exclusion criteria of the study were i) other neurological disorders, ii)  
120 severe cognitive deficits (Montreal Cognitive Assessment score < 24), iii) perceptual  
121 dysfunctions, and iv) pre-existing UL musculoskeletal conditions affecting testing.

## 122 **Scale Development**

123 The theoretical conceptualization and development of the new Bedside Upper Limb  
124 Evaluation Tool (BUFET) was guided by AMJ. Initially, the research team identified 18  
125 simple day-to-day movement tasks (**Table 2 and Table 3**) as potential scale items through a  
126 comprehensive review of relevant literature. The initial 18-items scale comprised of tasks  
127 such as UL and hand gesture movements, grasping movements, and finger tapping. All the  
128 identified movements require coordinated function of the shoulder, elbow, wrist, hand, and  
129 fingers.

## 130 **Content Validation**

131 A Delphi-method was implemented to achieve content validity, involving an expert  
132 consensus panel comprised of 6 clinical researchers with a minimum of 15 years of  
133 experience in specialized neurological clinical practice. Evidence indicates that Delphi  
134 technique is an efficient method to obtain feedback from panel of experts to reach consensus  
135 after several iterative rounds of communication.[30] The expert panel included 3 neurologist,  
136 2 physiotherapist, and 1 occupational therapist. For content validation, the 18-item was  
137 reviewed by each panelist to evaluate the construct relevance. Using the expert consensus

138 method, 4 items (**item # 15 to 18, Table 2**) were excluded from the initial 18-item scale that  
139 were identified as having non-relevance at the first round of panel discussion.  
140 The remaining 14-item scale (**Table 3**) was subsequently evaluated by the expert panel to  
141 identify redundancies and eliminate duplications by rating all the items using a 5-point Likert  
142 scale and providing critical remarks for items that need to be refined or excluded. The scale  
143 items were revised or excluded if at least two experts rated them 2 or below. Accordingly,  
144 two test items were excluded from the 14-item scale (**Table 3**). The rating systems of the  
145 remaining 12 were reviewed and a final 12-item BUFET entered subsequent concurrent  
146 validation phase. The finalized 12-item BUFET, including rating scores, is available as an  
147 appendix from <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/UFHK5>.

## 148 **Concurrent Validation**

149 After developing the final version of scale, concurrent validation process was initiated with  
150 purposive sample of 25 stroke survivors. This phase involved recruiting 25 stroke survivors  
151 meeting inclusion criteria against the estimated minimum sample size of 20. All the  
152 participants were administered with BUFET and Wolf Motor Function Test (WMFT)  
153 randomly with a one-hour interval between the two tests. Evidence indicates that WMFT  
154 comprises 15 timed task-performance items that can assess functional ability with excellent  
155 reliability. The correlation between BUFET and WMFT scores of all 25 participants were  
156 determined using Spearman's correlation coefficient method.

## 157 **Outcome Variables**

158 The WMFT includes 15 timed tasks with each item rated on a six-point functional ability  
159 scale, assessing effort, smoothness, and overall quality. At the outset, the scale tests the  
160 unaffected side, followed by the affected limb, and generally takes 30-35 minutes to complete

161 the evaluation. Evidence suggests that WMFT exhibits excellent test-retest reliability  
162 ( $r=0.95$ ) and strong inter-rater ( $ICC=0.93$ ) and intra-rater ( $ICC=0.97$ ) reliability. Required  
163 materials for WMFT include a standardized table, chair, box, 12-oz beverage can, 7” pencil  
164 with six flat sides, 2” paper clips, lock and key, face towel, and basket.[31–33]

## 165 **Statistical Analysis**

166 Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS, Version 25.0, released 2017. IBM Armonk,  
167 NY: IBM Corp) was used for data analysis. The concurrent validity of BUFET was assessed  
168 by correlating the scores against those of WMFT using Spearman rank correlation analysis.  
169 The internal consistency of the tool was analyzed by obtaining Cronbach’s  $\alpha$ .

## 170 **RESULTS**

### 171 **Participant Characteristics**

172 A total of 25 participants (17 males, 8 females), with a mean age of 60.6 years, participated in  
173 the concurrent validation study. All participants suffered supratentorial infarction (84%) or  
174 hemorrhagic type (16%) of stroke (**Table 1**).

175 **Table 1.** Demographic and clinical Characteristics of the participants  
176

<b>Characteristics</b>	<b>Total(N=25)</b>
Gender- female/male	<b>8/17</b>
Mean age in years (SD)	<b>60.6 (9.55)</b>
Lesion Location- Supratentorial (%)	<b>25 (100%)</b>
Lesion Type-Infarction/hemorrhagic	<b>21(84%)/4 (16%)</b>
Side of Involvement-left/right	<b>9/16</b>
Mean MoCA/30 (SD)	<b>26.96 (1.65)</b>
Mean WMFT/75 (SD)	<b>52.64 (12.75)</b>
Mean BUFET/48 (SD)	<b>34.36 (7.97)</b>

177 Note: SD = standard deviation, % = percentage, N = number  
178

179



## 180 **Content Validation**

181 The principal investigator (PI) organized an initial 18-item scale focusing on essential day-to-  
182 day movement tasks including gestures, grasping, and finger tapping (**Table 2 & Table 3**).

183 This scale was subsequently revised to 14 items based on recommendations from the six  
184 subject experts who participated in the study (**Table 3**). Removal of scale item/element was  
185 considered if at least two subject experts rated a score of 2 or below for that item. According  
186 to this specified criterion, items were eliminated, as shown in **Table 2** and **Table 3**.

187 A closing agreement from the subject experts on the revised 12-item scale was carried out  
188 and the finalized BUFET comprised of 7 gesture items, 3 grasping/gripping items, 1 item for  
189 wrist movement, and 1 finger tapping item (available from  
190 <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/UFHK5>).

191 **Table 2.** Items Excluded with Delphi Method

<b>Item</b>	<b>Expert's Rationale for Exclusion</b>
<b>15.</b> Elbow flexion- Break test for strength examination	Excluded as this item focuses solely on evaluating the muscle strength rather than priority hand function. Also, its inclusion would necessitate further evaluation of multiple muscles to validate strength examination.
<b>16.</b> Make a ring by opposing thumb & index- Examiner breaks to check the strength	Excluded due to duplicity, given its similarity to the action of "Gesture 3.
<b>17.</b> Functional position of hand	Excluded as the scoring can be difficult and may resemble the typical hand posture observed in many stroke individuals.
<b>18.</b> Elbow extension- Break test for strength examination	Excluded as this item focuses solely on evaluating the muscle strength rather than priority hand function. Also, its inclusion would necessitate further evaluation of multiple muscles to validate strength examination

193

194

195 **Table 3. Content Validation for Bedside Upper Limb Functional Evaluation Tool**

Items	E-1	E-2	E-3	E-4	E-5	E-6	Remarks	Included/ Excluded
1.Salute	5	5	5	5	5	5		Included
2.Hold the nose	4	5	5	4	3	4		Included
3.Hand Waving	5	5	5	5	4	5		Included
4.Make a claw/hook	1	1	1	1	1	1	Claw being a deformity is misfit as a component	Excluded
5.Grip the examiner’s fingers	5	5	5	5	5	4		Included
6.Oppose and maintain the contact of thumb and little finger	5	5	5	5	5	4		Included
7.Point the index finger upwards with wrist in extension	4	5	5	5	5	5		Included
8.Clockwise and anticlockwise stirring action of wrist	4	5	5	4	4	5		Included
9.Snapping action of the fingers	4	5	5	4	4	4		Included
10.Hold the examiners finger using the thumb and index finger	5	5	5	4	4	3		Included
11.Gesture a scissoring action using the index and middle finger	5	5	5	5	5	5		Included
12.Interlacing of Fingers	5	4	3	4	1	1	A representation of abduction and adduction of fingers is covered in the “scissoring action” hence removed due to similarity	Excluded
13.Gesture the number 3 using middle, ring, and little finger	5	5	5	5	5	3		Included
14.Finger tapping	4	5	5	5	5	5		Included

196 Note: E = Expert.

## 197 **Correlation Analysis**

198 Correlation analysis was utilized to confirm the concurrent validity of the proposed BUFET  
199 scale by comparing them to WMFT which was used as reference standard. The normality of  
200 BUFET scores suggested a normal distribution and WMFT scores revealed absence of  
201 normal distribution. Since one of the variables was not normally distributed, Spearman rank  
202 method was used for correlation coefficient analysis. The results of analysis indicated a high  
203 significant correlation coefficient ( $r = 0.937$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ) as presented in the **Figure 1**.  
204 Additionally, the BUFET demonstrated high internal consistency, as reflected by a  
205 Cronbach's alpha value of 0.948.

206 **Fig 1. This is the Fig 1 Correlation between BUFET and WMFT Scores.**

## 207 **DISCUSSION**

208 In the current study, evidence is provided for the contention that day-to-day movement  
209 gestures, grasping activities, and rhythmic wrist and finger movements constitute a  
210 significant tool for the evaluation of UL function in stroke survivors. Previous research  
211 primarily focused on investigating the therapeutic efficacy of gesture, grasping, and finger-  
212 tapping movements to enhance UL function using quantitative and expensive methods.[2,27]  
213 Nonetheless, there is an apparent significant gap in the literature regarding the development  
214 and validation of a qualitative bedside tool utilizing daily gesture, grasping, and finger  
215 tapping movements for evaluating UL function in stroke survivors. Existing tools in  
216 assessment of shoulder, elbow, wrist, and hand motor impairment require specific materials,  
217 training, and excessive amount of time. Consequently, a simple, inexpensive, resource (no  
218 resources) and time-efficient (<10 mins) Bedside Upper Limb Evaluation Tool (BUFET) was  
219 developed and validated with methodological study design. Such a qualitative bedside tool

220 that can be implemented in clinical, research, or home settings could be a critical component  
221 in stroke rehabilitation.

222 Evaluation of UL and hand function is pivotal for the comprehensive rehabilitation of stroke  
223 survivors. The newly developed BUFET serves as a qualitative instrument that can be  
224 efficiently administered at the bedside. This tool facilitates the observation of intricate  
225 patterns in shoulder, elbow, hand, and wrist movements during the execution of gestures,  
226 grasping, and fine finger movements. According to Michael Roth, symbolic hand gestures are  
227 predominantly upper arm and hand movements, conceptualized as originating from ergotic  
228 hand movements associated with object manipulation and epistemic hand movements related  
229 to sensing activity.[34] In general, hand orientation assumed by the grasping hand depends on  
230 the initial hand position, location, shape, and orientation of the object to be grasped.[35]  
231 However, stroke survivors often exhibit impaired gesture imitation, influencing the  
232 performance of specific arm and hand segments (limb apraxia).[36]

233 Kinematic studies have indicated that complex hand gestures and grasp movements in stroke  
234 survivors are associated with altered joint rotation patterns, hand orientations, and impaired  
235 inter-joint coordination of grasp and twist.[2,7] Evidence also suggests that impaired hand  
236 gesture imitation is linked to posterior lesions in the left inferior parietal lobule (LIPL) and  
237 temporal-parietal-occipital junction (TPOJ), while impaired finger gesture imitation is  
238 associated with lesions in the inferior frontal gyrus (IFG).[37,38] These brain regions are  
239 responsible for motor planning, coordination, and the integration of sensory-motor  
240 information.[7]

241 Consequently, prompt qualitative movement analysis of gestures, grasping, and fine finger  
242 movements using BUFET at the bedside empowers the examiner to raise clinical suspicion  
243 regarding the potential location of brain lesions in stroke survivors. This tool facilitates early

244 and timely interventions. In particular, the qualitative assessment focused on UL motor  
245 function can reveal distinctive patterns that correlate with the left inferior parietal lobule  
246 (LIPL) and temporal-parietal-occipital junction (TPOJ), enabling differentiation between  
247 stroke groups and offering valuable insights into the functional abilities of stroke survivors.  
248 Furthermore, it may provide indications of specific brain lesion types, distinguishing between  
249 posterior (LIPL) and anterior (IFG) lesions.

250 The BUFET covers a wide range of UL, hand, and finger movements. The first component-  
251 salute evaluates the ability to produce a movement pattern away from the typical attitude of  
252 the affected limb.[39] The second and the third components (holding the nose and hand  
253 waving, respectively) help to assess the quality of control of shoulder flexors and external  
254 rotators which are reported to be considerably impaired among stroke subjects.[40] Also, the  
255 second item (holding the nose) reflecting hand-to-mouth function is reported to be a  
256 significant method to evaluate UL in subjects with stroke.[41] The functional ability of the  
257 intermediate joint (i.e., elbow), to achieve complete flexion is also tested in the first and  
258 second components while the elbow extension is tested in the third component. Levin et al  
259 emphasized that the movement amplitudes at the shoulder and elbow joints were significantly  
260 impaired during the excursion of the hemiparetic arm.[42] In particular, during reach-out  
261 tasks, effective shoulder movements with inter-joint coordination are paramount. [43] Hence,  
262 hand waving has been included as a third component to evaluate shoulder function.

263

264 Wrist circumduction movement is usually described as flexion-extension motion in function  
265 of radio-ulnar deviation. Most daily activities of life can be performed through an arc from  
266 10<sup>0</sup> flexion to 35<sup>0</sup> extensions. Evidence suggests that static flexion posture of finger  
267 significantly influences wrist circumduction with a linear relationship between wrist and  
268 finger movements.[44] This phenomenon is particularly implicated in wrist drop observed

269 among people with unilateral stroke. A Rasch model analysis of the psychometric properties  
270 of wrist and hand subscales of FMA-UL in stroke reported a higher/large positive factor  
271 loading (0.846) for wrist circumduction representing the unidimensional construct of UL and  
272 hand motor function.[45] Thus, inclusion of clockwise and anti-clockwise stirring action of  
273 the wrist as one of the items demonstrated that BUFET is unidimensional. Furthermore,  
274 reduced selectivity of the muscles that control isolated index finger extension, a deficit in the  
275 ability to perform isolated finger extension, has also been studied.[46] Hence, inclusion of  
276 pointing the index finger upwards with the wrist in extension is considered significant.  
277 Maximum grip force is generated with the wrist held in extension,[23] and lack of recovery of  
278 grasp efficiency may suggest the inability of the descending pathways to control the distal  
279 muscles.[47] Additionally, the radial aspect of the hand plays a significant role in fine motor  
280 tasks such as gripping, which require greater dexterity and strength. Liu et al. stated that the  
281 thumb, index, and middle fingers that are controlled by the radial aspect of the hand are more  
282 prone to impairment compared to other fingers.[48] Due to these reasons, the evaluation of  
283 the grip strength through the radial aspect is considered.  
284  
285 The opposition of thumb is essential for daily activities like picking up small objects. The  
286 opposition was noted to be reduced in stroke subjects when compared to healthy.[49]  
287 Nijland et al. reported that the ability to extend the finger within 72 hours post-stroke can  
288 predict functional recovery in the hemiplegic arm at 6 months.[50] While attempting to move  
289 a specific digit, inappropriate contractions of muscles in other digits were noted among stroke  
290 subjects.[46] Prior research also stated an increased level of motor impairment with ulnar  
291 fingers i.e., middle, ring, and little finger.[51] Since specific digit(s) movements are likely to  
292 be impaired in stroke subjects pointing the index finger upwards and gesturing the number  
293 “3” are included.

294 Studies have reported impaired thumb movements and reduced velocity in finger flexion  
295 movements among stroke subjects.[52] To evaluate thumb and middle finger control, the  
296 snapping action of the finger that requires quick flexion of the middle finger against the  
297 thumb is selected as a component. In addition, finger abduction/adduction was reported to be  
298 greatly impaired compared to flexion/extension.[46] Thus, BUFET included the scissoring  
299 action of the index and middle fingers as a test item to evaluate the finger abduction and  
300 adduction movements. Reduced individual finger movement is associated with greater hand  
301 impairment and the same study also reported unwanted extra finger movements during finger  
302 individuation that correlated with lower ARAT and Moberg Pick-Up Test scores.[53] Hence,  
303 finger-tapping that assesses individual movement of the digits is incorporated.

304

305 WMFT assesses the functional ability of the UL. Out of the 15 items, 6 components (40%)  
306 focus exclusively on the proximal joints. Contrary to that, 3 components of BUFET (25%)  
307 assess proximal control, thus ensuring a larger proportion of the scale to focus on diverse  
308 hand functions. All the test components of BUFET were administered at ease at the bedside.  
309 The BUFET required an average of 10 minutes to complete its administration when  
310 compared to the 30–35-minute requirement for WMFT. [13,54]

311

312 Our results for the correlation analysis between BUFET and WMFT revealed a high  
313 correlation coefficient ( $r = 0.937, p < 0.001$ ) which suggest that both tools measure similar,  
314 unidimensional construct. The BUFET also demonstrated a high internal consistency with  
315 Cronbach's alpha value of 0.948 ( $p < 0.001$ ) which is consistent with the alpha scores of  
316 WMFT-0.92[32], FMA-U -0.98 [55], and ARAT -0.98 [56] . The results imply that the  
317 BUFET is capable of detecting motor functions nearly identical to the WMFT. In addition to

318 the above, it also suggests that BUFET can be used as an easy-to-administer bedside outcome  
319 measure for UL function post-stroke.

## 320 **Limitations**

321 Firstly, the items on the scale were narrowed down based on subject experts' opinions and  
322 clinical acumen. An alternative could have been based on direct administration of the  
323 components on a limited number of study participants. Secondly, the minimum requirement  
324 to carry out the test is that the subject should be made to sit either at the bedside or on a chair  
325 which might make its administration difficult for those with a greater degree of motor  
326 involvement.

## 327 **Future scope**

328 Studies should aim at analyzing other psychometric properties including intra-rater and inter-  
329 rater reliability based on observations made by multiple observers. The prognostic value of  
330 the tool can also be assessed through well-designed prospective studies. A Rasch analysis  
331 may help in identifying the key components of the scale to further narrow down the  
332 components if indicated.

## 333 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

334 Thanks to the Manipal Academy of Higher Education, Manipal for permitting us to carry out  
335 this research. Sincere thanks go to all the study participants and special thanks to all the  
336 subject experts - Dr. Z.K. Misri, Dr. Shivananda Pai and Dr. Rohit Pai, Department of  
337 Neurology, Kasturba Medical College, Mangalore, Dr. Shovan Saha, Department of  
338 Occupational Therapy, Manipal College of Health Professions, Manipal and Dr. K Vijaya  
339 Kumar and Dr. Shyam Krishnan, Department of Physiotherapy, Kasturba Medical College,  
340 Mangalore.

341



## 342 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

343 DP was the principal investigator (PI) for this study. The conceptualization and the initial  
344 development of tool were by AMJ. A copyright certificate (Reg # L-137026/2023) has been  
345 obtained for BUFET (Appendix 1) and the corresponding author (AMJ) holds the copyright  
346 for the proposed tool. The tool is made freely available for teaching and clinical purpose. For  
347 research and publication purpose, it is mandatory to credit the corresponding author with  
348 relevant citation. Supervision of the trial and the data collection were performed by AN, AJP,  
349 and VP. The study was designed, and the data analysis was executed by PM and SA. All the  
350 authors equally contributed to the preparation and editing of this manuscript.

## 351 **DATA AVAILABILITY**

352 The research data associated with this paper and the appendix contents are available from  
353 <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/UFHK5>

354

## 355 **CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

356 The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest in this study.

## 357 **REFERENCES**

- 358 1. Pan B, Huang Z, Jin T, Wu J, Zhang Z, Shen Y. Motor Function Assessment of Upper  
359 Limb in Stroke Patients. 2021 [cited 26 Nov 2023]. doi:10.1155/2021/6621950
- 360 2. Schwarz A, Bhagubai MMC, Nies SHG, Held JPO, Veltink PH, Buurke JH, et al.  
361 Characterization of stroke-related upper limb motor impairments across various upper  
362 limb activities by use of kinematic core set measures. 2022. doi:10.1186/S12984-021-  
363 00979-0
- 364 3. Lang CE, Bland MD, Bailey RR, Schaefer SY, Birkenmeier RL. Assessment of upper  
365 extremity impairment, function, and activity after stroke: foundations for clinical  
366 decision making. *Journal of Hand Therapy*. 2013;26: 104–115.  
367 doi:10.1016/J.JHT.2012.06.005
- 368 4. Raghavan P. The nature of hand motor impairment after stroke and its treatment. *Curr*  
369 *Treat Options Cardiovasc MedJun*; 2007;9: 221–228.

- 370 5. Jørgensen HS, Nakayama H, Raaschou HO, Stroke OTS. Neurologic and functional  
371 recovery the Copenhagen Stroke Study. *Phys Med Rehabil Clin N Am*Nov; 1999;10:  
372 887–906.
- 373 6. Hatakenaka M, Miyai I, Sakoda S, Yanagihara T. Proximal paresis of the upper  
374 extremity in patients with stroke. *Neurology*Jul. 2007;24: 4.
- 375 7. Raghavan P, Santello M, Gordon AM, Krakauer JW. Compensatory motor control  
376 after stroke: an alternative joint strategy for object-dependent shaping of hand posture.  
377 *J Neurophysiol.* 2010;103: 3034–3043. doi:10.1152/JN.00936.2009
- 378 8. Santello M, Lang CE. Are movement disorders and sensorimotor injuries pathologic  
379 synergies? When normal multi-joint movement synergies become pathologic. *Front*  
380 *Hum Neurosci.* 2015;8: 109123. doi:10.3389/FNHUM.2014.01050/BIBTEX
- 381 9. Nichols-Larsen DS, Clark PC, Zeringue A, others. Factors influencing stroke  
382 survivors' quality of life during subacute recovery. *Stroke*Jul; 2005;36: 1480–1484.
- 383 10. Kwakkel G, Kollen BJ, van der Grond J, Prevo AJ. Probability of regaining dexterity  
384 in the flaccid upper limb: impact of severity of paresis and time since onset in acute  
385 stroke. 2003;34: 2181–2186.
- 386 11. Reenen ETK Van, Post MWM, Mulder-Bouwens K, Visser-Meily JMA. A simple  
387 bedside test for upper extremity impairment after stroke: validation of the Utrecht  
388 Arm/Hand Test. *Disabil Rehabil.* 2009;31: 1338–1343.  
389 doi:10.1080/09638280902846855
- 390 12. Murphy MA, Resteghini C, Feys P, Lamers I. An overview of systematic reviews on  
391 upper extremity outcome measures after stroke. *BMC Neurol.* 2015;15.  
392 doi:10.1186/S12883-015-0292-6
- 393 13. Santisteban L, Tr?metz M, Bleton JP, others. Upper Limb Outcome Measures Used in  
394 Stroke Rehabilitation Studies: A Systematic Literature Review. *PLoS One.* 2016;11: 5.
- 395 14. Ashford S, Slade M, Malaprade F, Turner-Stokes L. Evaluation of functional outcome  
396 measures for the hemiparetic upper limb: a systematic review. *J Rehabil Med*Nov;  
397 2008;40: 787–795.
- 398 15. Murphy MA, Häger C. Kinematic analysis of the upper extremity after stroke – how  
399 far have we reached and what have we grasped? 2015.  
400 doi:10.1179/1743288X15Y.0000000002
- 401 16. Hoonhorst MH, Nijland RH, Van Den Berg JS, Emmelot CH, Kollen BJ, Kwakkel G.  
402 How Do Fugl-Meyer Arm Motor Scores Relate to Dexterity According to the Action  
403 Research Arm Test at 6 Months Poststroke? *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2015;96: 1845–  
404 1849. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2015.06.009
- 405 17. Schwarz A, Veerbeek J, Held J, Buurke J, Luft A. Measures of Interjoint Coordination  
406 Post-stroke Across Different Upper Limb Movement Tasks. *Front Bioeng Biotechnol.*  
407 2021. doi:10.3389/FBIOE.2020.620805
- 408 18. Schwarz A, Bhagubai MMC, Nies SHG, Held JPO, Veltink PH, Buurke JH, et al.  
409 Characterization of stroke-related upper limb motor impairments across various upper

- 410 limb activities by use of kinematic core set measures. 2022. doi:10.1186/S12984-021-  
411 00979-0
- 412 19. Thompson-Butel AG, Lin G, Shiner CT, PA. M. Comparison of three tools to measure  
413 improvements in upper-limb function with poststroke therapy. *Neurorehabil Neural*  
414 *Repair* May; 2015;29: 341–348.
- 415 20. Otten P, Kim J, Son SH. A Framework to Automate Assessment of Upper-Limb Motor  
416 Function Impairment: A Feasibility Study. *Sensors* 2015, Vol 15, Pages 20097-20114.  
417 2015;15: 20097–20114. doi:10.3390/S150820097
- 418 21. Lin JH, Hsu MJ, Sheu CF, Wu TS, Lin RT, Chen CH, et al. Psychometric comparisons  
419 of 4 measures for assessing upper-extremity function in people with stroke. *Phys Ther.*  
420 2009;89: 840–850. doi:10.2522/PTJ.20080285
- 421 22. Schwarz A, Bhagubai MMC, Wolterink G, Held JPO, Luft AR, Veltink PH.  
422 Assessment of Upper Limb Movement Impairments after Stroke Using Wearable  
423 Inertial Sensing. *Sensors* 2020, Vol 20, Page 4770. 2020;20: 4770.  
424 doi:10.3390/S20174770
- 425 23. Nowak DA. The impact of stroke on the performance of grasping: Usefulness of  
426 kinetic and kinematic motion analysis. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev.* 2008;32: 1439–1450.  
427 doi:10.1016/J.NEUBIOREV.2008.05.021
- 428 24. Barut Ç, Kiziltan E, Gelir E, Köktürk F. Advanced analysis of finger-tapping  
429 performance: a preliminary study. *Balkan Med J.* 2013;30: 167–171.  
430 doi:10.5152/BALKANMEDJ.2012.105
- 431 25. Oudah M, Al-Naji A, Chahl J. Hand Gesture Recognition Based on Computer Vision:  
432 A Review of Techniques. *J Imaging.* 2020;6. doi:10.3390/JIMAGING6080073
- 433 26. Anastasiev A, Kadone H, Marushima A, Watanabe H, Zaboronok A, Watanabe S, et  
434 al. Supervised Myoelectrical Hand Gesture Recognition in Post-Acute Stroke Patients  
435 with Upper Limb Paresis on Affected and Non-Affected Sides. *Sensors.* 2022;22:  
436 8733. doi:10.3390/S22228733/S1
- 437 27. Nowak DA. The impact of stroke on the performance of grasping: Usefulness of  
438 kinetic and kinematic motion analysis. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev.* 2008;32: 1439–1450.  
439 doi:10.1016/J.NEUBIOREV.2008.05.021
- 440 28. Susanto EA, Tong RKY, Ockenfeld C, Ho NSK. Efficacy of robot-assisted fingers  
441 training in chronic stroke survivors: A pilot randomized-controlled trial. *J Neuroeng*  
442 *Rehabil.* 2015;12: 1–9. doi:10.1186/S12984-015-0033-5/FIGURES/3
- 443 29. De Groot-Driessen D, Van De Sande P, Van Heugten C. Speed of Finger Tapping as a  
444 Predictor of Functional Outcome After Unilateral Stroke. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.*  
445 2006;87: 40–44. doi:10.1016/J.APMR.2005.09.022
- 446 30. Graham B, Regehr G, Wright JG. Delphi as a method to establish consensus for  
447 diagnostic criteria. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2003;56: 1150–1156. doi:10.1016/S0895-  
448 4356(03)00211-7

- 449 31. Woodbury M, Velozo CA, Thompson PA, others. Measurement structure of the Wolf  
450 Motor Function Test: implications for motor control theory. *Neurorehabil Neural*  
451 *Repair*Nov-Dec; 2010;24: 791–801.
- 452 32. Morris DM, Uswatte G, Crago JE, Cook EW, Taub E. The reliability of the wolf motor  
453 function test for assessing upper extremity function after stroke. *Arch Phys Med*  
454 *Rehabil.* 2001;82: 750–755. doi:10.1053/APMR.2001.23183
- 455 33. Whittall J, Savin DN, Harris-Love M, Waller SMC. Psychometric Properties of a  
456 Modified Wolf Motor Function Test for People With Mild and Moderate Upper-  
457 Extremity Hemiparesis. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2006;87: 656–660.  
458 doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2006.02.004
- 459 34. Roth WM. From action to discourse: The bridging function of gestures. *Cogn Syst*  
460 *Res.* 2002;3: 535–554. doi:10.1016/S1389-0417(02)00056-6
- 461 35. Roby-Brami A, Jacobs S, Bennis N, Levin MF. Hand orientation for grasping and arm  
462 joint rotation patterns in healthy subjects and hemiparetic stroke patients. *Brain Res.*  
463 2003;969: 217–229. doi:10.1016/S0006-8993(03)02334-5
- 464 36. Schwarz A, Bhagubai MMC, Wolterink G, Held J, Luft A, Veltink P. Assessment of  
465 Upper Limb Movement Impairments after Stroke Using Wearable Inertial Sensing.  
466 *Italian National Conference on Sensors.* 2020. doi:10.3390/S20174770
- 467 37. Andric M, Smal SL. Gesture’s neural language. *Front Psychol.* 2012;3: 16740.  
468 doi:10.3389/FPSYG.2012.00099/BIBTEX
- 469 38. Kleineberg NN, Schmidt CC, Richter MK, Bolte K, Schloss N, Fink GR, et al. Gesture  
470 meaning modulates the neural correlates of effector-specific imitation deficits in left  
471 hemisphere stroke. *Neuroimage Clin.* 2023;37: 103331.  
472 doi:10.1016/J.NICL.2023.103331
- 473 39. Als G, Mello FF, Cocicov Neto J, others. Can the positions of the spastic upper limb in  
474 stroke survivors help muscle choice for botulinum toxin injections? *Arq*  
475 *Neuropsiquiatr*Sep. 2019;5: 8.
- 476 40. Starosta M, Kostka J, Miller E. Force analysis of shoulder joint muscles in the early  
477 phase of brain stroke. *Acta Bioeng Biomech.* 2018;20: 107–113.
- 478 41. Caimmi M, Guanziroli E, Malosio M, others. The Reaching and Hand to Mouth  
479 method for an instrumental functional assessment of the upper limb. *Gait Posture*Jun;  
480 2014;39: S139–S140.
- 481 42. MF. L. Interjoint coordination during pointing movements is disrupted in spastic  
482 hemiparesis. *Brain*Feb; 1996;119: 281–293.
- 483 43. Cirstea MC, Mitnitski AB, Feldman AG, MF. L. Interjoint coordination dynamics  
484 during reaching in stroke. *Exp Brain Res*Aug; 2003;151: 289–300.
- 485 44. Gehrman S V., Kaufmann RA, Li ZM. Wrist Circumduction Reduced by Finger  
486 Constraints. *J Hand Surg Am.* 2008;33: 1287–1292. doi:10.1016/J.JHSA.2008.04.034


- 487 45. Woodbury ML, Velozo CA, Richards LG, PW. D. Rasch analysis staging  
488 methodology to classify upper extremity movement impairment after stroke. Arch  
489 Phys Med RehabilAug; 2013;94: 1527–1533.
- 490 46. Schieber MH, Lang CE, Reilly KT, others. Selective activation of human finger  
491 muscles after stroke or amputation. Adv Exp Med Biol. 2009;629: 559–575.
- 492 47. Lang CE, Wagner JM, Edwards DF, others. Recovery of grasp versus reach in people  
493 with hemiparesis poststroke. Neurorehabil Neural RepairDec; 2006;20: 444–454.
- 494 48. Liu X, Rajan S, Ramasarma N, others. Finger-Worn Sensors for Accurate Functional  
495 Assessment of the Upper Limbs in Real-World Settings. Annu Int Conf IEEE Eng  
496 Med Biol SocJul; 2018;2018: 4440–4443.
- 497 49. Langhorne P, Bernhardt J, Kwakkel G. Stroke rehabilitation. Lancet. 2011;377: 1693–  
498 1702. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(11)60325-5
- 499 50. Nijland RH, Wegen EE van, Wel BCH der, Kwakkel G. Presence of finger extension  
500 and shoulder abduction within 72 hours after stroke predicts functional recovery. Early  
501 prediction of functional outcome after stroke: the EPOS cohort study. Stroke. 2010;41:  
502 745–750.
- 503 51. Friedman N, Chan V, Reinkensmeyer AN, others. Retraining and assessing hand  
504 movement after stroke using the MusicGlove: comparison with conventional hand  
505 therapy and isometric grip training. J Neuroeng RehabilApr. 2014;30: 11.
- 506 52. Eschmann H, H?roux ME, Cheetham JH, others. Thumb and finger movement is  
507 reduced after stroke: An observational study. PLoS One. 2019;14: 6.
- 508 53. Wolbrecht ET, Rowe JB, Chan V, others. Finger strength, individuation, and their  
509 interaction: Relationship to hand function and corticospinal tract injury after stroke.  
510 Clin NeurophysiolApr; 2018;129: 797–808.
- 511 54. Wolf SL, Catlin PA, Ellis M, Archer AL, Morgan B, Piacentino A. Assessing Wolf  
512 Motor Function Test as Outcome Measure for Research in Patients After Stroke.  
513 Stroke. 2001;32: 1635–1639. doi:10.1161/01.STR.32.7.1635
- 514 55. Roman N, Miclaus R, Repanovici A, Nicolau C. Equal Opportunities for Stroke  
515 Survivors’ Rehabilitation: A Study on the Validity of the Upper Extremity Fugl-Meyer  
516 Assessment Scale Translated and Adapted into Romanian. Medicina (B Aires).  
517 2020;56: 1–11. doi:10.3390/MEDICINA56080409
- 518 56. Nijland R, van Wegen E, Verbunt J, others. A comparison of two validated tests for  
519 upper limb function after stroke: The Wolf Motor Function Test and the Action  
520 Research Arm Test. J Rehabil MedJul; 2010;42: 694–696.

521

## 522 **Supporting information**

## 523 **Appendix 1. Bedside Upper Limb Functional Evaluation Tool (BUFET)®**

**Spearman Rho = 0.937,  $p < 0.01$  .**



Figure