# The Grasp and Release Test (GRT)

#### **Assessment Overview**

#### Assessment Area

#### **ICF Domain:**

Activity

**Subcategory:** 

Mobility

#### You Will Need

#### Length:

20 minutes, 6 items

#### **Equipment:**

Peg, paperweight, fork, block, can, videotape

#### Scoring:

Clinician-administered. Subjects are scored on their ability to successfully move each of the objects; the number of successes and failures in 30 seconds is recorded. Item score is the mean number of successes in 5 trials. Total score is the sum of item scores.

The test is done separately on both hands.

### Summary

The Grasp and Release Test (GRT) is designed to assess hand neuro-prosthesis in individuals with C5-C6 SCIs, but has also been used to assess hand function prior to and following tendon transfers in people with C6-7 level injuries. It assesses the ability to pick up, move, and release six objects of varying sizes, weights and textures using a palmar or lateral grasp. Each object was chosen to represent one or more objects routinely manipulated for activities of daily living (ADL) that represented a range of difficulties.

# **Availability**

Can be found here.

Languages: English

# **Assessment Interpretability**

# Minimal Clinically Important Difference

Not established in SCI

#### Statistical Error

Not established in SCI

# **Typical Values**

Not established in SCI

# **Measurement Properties**

### Validity – Moderate to High

# **<u>Moderate</u>** to **<u>High</u>** correlation between 12 month Functional Independence Measure (FIM) Scores and:

Fork = 0.624 Can = 0.700 Videotape = 0.503

Correlation between 12-month FIM and the peg, block, paperweight and total number of objects successfully manipulated were non-significant.

(Mulchahey et al. 2004; n=19, tetraplegia, no information on chronicity)

#### *High* correlation between GRT and Van Lieshout Test:

Left hand = 0.87 Right hand = 0.90

(Post et al. 2006; n=55, 46 males, tetraplegia, mean time since injury (SD) = 11 (8.5) years)

Number of studies reporting validity data: 3

# Reliability – **High**

#### **High** Test-retest Reliability for all 6 items:

Fork: ICC = 1.00

Can: ICC = 0.99

Paperweight: ICC = 1.00 Videotape: ICC = 1.00 Block: ICC = 0.87 Peg: ICC = 0.93

(Mulchahey et al. 2004; n=19, tetraplegia, no information on chronicity)

Number of studies reporting reliability data: 2

# Responsiveness

#### Floor/Ceiling Effect:

Not established in SCI

# Change between baseline and postrehabilitation GRT scores:

Fork: z=3.05 (P<.01)

Paperweight: z=2.83 (P<.01)

Can: z=2.66 (P<.01)

Total GRT objects manipulated:

z=3.40 (P<.05)

#### z = Wilcoxon matched pairs signedrank test

(Mulchahey et al. 2004; n=19, tetraplegia, no information on chronicity)

Number of studies reporting responsiveness data: 1