

# Graded Redefined Assessment of Strength, Sensibility and Prehension (GRASSP)

## Assessment Overview

### Assessment Area

**ICF Domain:**

Body Function & Structures

**Subcategory:**

Neuromusculoskeletal & Movement-Related Functions & Structures

**Subscales (domains):**

Sensation

Strength

Prehension

### You Will Need

**Length:**

Sensation: 3 dorsal locations and 3 palmar locations for each hand

Strength: 10 arm and hand muscles for each arm

Prehension: 3 grasping tasks; 6 prehension tasks for each arm

**Equipment:**

GRASSP kit and manual muscle test equipment

**Scoring:**

Scores for tasks in each section are summed for each subscale score. There is no total score.

**Training:**

Reading the GRASSP manual is recommended.

### Summary

The Graded Redefined Assessment of Strength, Sensibility and Prehension (GRASSP) is a clinical impairment measure that incorporates three domains vital to upper limb function: sensation, strength, and prehension. It is a multimodal test comprising 5 subtests for each upper limb: dorsal sensation, palmar sensation, strength, prehension ability and prehension performance. The GRASSP results in 5 numerical scores that provide a comprehensive profile of upper-limb function.

A remote version (rGRASSP) and a version for people with degenerative cervical myelopathy have been developed. Further, a GRASSP v.2 was modified from its original version to improve objectivity, reduce assessment time, and improve usability:

- GR-Str: Isotonic Manual Muscle Testing (MMT) changed to isometric MMT.
- GR-Sens: Reduction of 6 test locations to 3 per hand (elimination of dorsal sensation).
- GR-PP: Reduction of 6 items to 4 items.
- Instruction manual revised for clarity and standardization.

### Availability

**Worksheet:** Can be purchased [here](#).

**Language:** English.

## Assessment Interpretability

### Minimal Clinically Important Difference

Not established in SCI

### Statistical Error

**Standard Error of Measurement:**

Strength: Right=1.8, Left=1.9

Sensation: No data available

Prehension ability: R=0.6, L=0.6

Prehension performance: R=2.5, L=1.8

**Minimal Detectable Change:**

Strength: Right=5.1, Left=5.3

Sensation: No data available

### Typical Values

**Mean (SD) Scores:**

Strength: Right=24.3 (13),

Left=25.1 (13.5)

Dorsal Sensation: R=6.5 (3.2), L=6.7 (3.1)

Palmar Sensation: R=7.1 (3.6),

L=7.2 (3.3)

Prehension ability: R=4.9 (4.5),

L=5.1 (4.3)

Prehension ability: R=1.8, L=1.7  
Prehension performance: R=7.0,  
L=4.9

(Kalsi-Ryan et al. 2012; n=72; mean (SD) age: 39.7 (10.7) years; traumatic tetraplegia; 38.8% ASIA A, 25.2% ASIA B, 16.6% ASIA C, and 19.4% ASIA D; mean (SD) time since injury: 7.6 (6.1) years)

Prehension performance: R=15.6  
(9.6), L=14.7 (8.9)

(Kalsi-Ryan et al. 2012; n=72; mean (SD) age: 39.7 (10.7) years; traumatic tetraplegia; 38.8% ASIA A, 25.2% ASIA B, 16.6% ASIA C, and 19.4% ASIA D; mean (SD) time since injury: 7.6 (6.1) years)

## Measurement Properties

### Validity – **Moderate** to **High**

#### **Moderate** to **High** correlation between the GRASSP subtests, SCIM-self care, & ASIA UEMS:

*At 1-month post-injury:*

Strength & SCIM-self-care:  $r = 0.78$

Strength & ASIA UEMS:  $r = 0.95$

Sensation & SCIM-self-care:  $r = 0.63$

Prehension performance & SCIM-self-care:  $r = 0.85$

*At 12-month post-injury:*

Strength & SCIM-self-care:  $r = 0.82$

Strength & ASIA UEMS:  $r = 0.88$

Sensation & SCIM-self-care:  $r = 0.56$

Prehension performance & SCIM-self-care:  $r = 0.82$

#### **Moderate** to **High** predictive validity:

ROC analysis AUC:  $r = 0.71-0.86$

(Velstra et al. 2015; n=74, 51 males, 23 females; mean (SD) age: 49 (18) years; traumatic and non-traumatic; 18 ASIA A, 12 ASIA B, 10 ASIA C, and 34 ASIA D; tetraplegia; and 16-40 days post-injury)

#### **Moderate** to **High** correlation between GRASSP and CUE-Q:

$r=0.40-0.84$

#### **Moderate** to **High** correlation between GRASSP and SCIM/SCIM-SC:

SCIM:  $r=0.37-0.70$

SCIM-SC:  $r=0.40-0.84$

(Mulcahey et al. 2017; n=47; 28 males, 19 females; children (3-17 years); tetraplegia; 14 ASIA A, 4 ASIA B, 10 ASIA C, 8 ASIA D, and 11 unknown)

#### **Moderate** to **High** correlation to SCIM

0.530–0.830,  $P < 0.0001$

(Kalsi-Ryan et al. 2019; Crosssectional: n=72, AIS 28A, 18B, 14C, 12D; Longitudinal: n=127, AIS: 29A, 17B, 26C, 55D)

**Number of studies reporting validity data: 9**

### Reliability – **High**

#### **High** Test-retest Reliability for all domains of the GRASSP:

ICC = 0.86-0.99

(Kalsi-Ryan et al. 2012; n=72; mean (SD) age: 39.7 (10.7) years; traumatic tetraplegia; 38.8% ASIA A, 25.2% ASIA B, 16.6% ASIA C, and 19.4% ASIA D; mean (SD) time since injury: 7.6 (6.1) years)

(Mulcahey et al. 2017; n=47; 28 males, 19 females; children (3-17 years); tetraplegia; 14 ASIA A, 4 ASIA B, 10 ASIA C, 8 ASIA D, and 11 unknown)

#### **High** Inter-rater Reliability for all domains of the GRASSP:

ICC = 0.84-0.96

(Kalsi-Ryan et al. 2012; n=72; mean (SD) age: 39.7 (10.7) years; traumatic tetraplegia; 38.8% ASIA A, 25.2% ASIA B, 16.6% ASIA C, and 19.4% ASIA D; mean (SD) time since injury: 7.6 (6.1) years)

#### **High** Inter-rater Reliability comparison r-GRASSP total score to examiner 1 vs 2:

ICC = 0.99 (range: 0.98, 0.99) 95% CI

(Voss et al. 2023, n=61; 43 males, 18 females; mean (SD) age: 49 (15) years; 6 ASIA A, 7 ASIA B, 12 ASIA C, 35 ASIA D; level of injury: C1-T1; and mean (SD) time since injury: 0.6 (44.3) years)

**Number of studies reporting reliability data: 4**

---

## Responsiveness

---

**Floor/Ceiling Effect:**

Not established in SCI

**Effect Size:**

*Between 1-12 months post-injury:*

Strength: 1.48

Sensation: 0.64

Prehension ability: 0.99

Prehension performance: 1.03

(Velstra et al. 2015; n=74, 51 males, 23 females; mean (SD) age: 49 (18) years; traumatic and non-traumatic; 18 ASIA A, 12 ASIA B, 10 ASIA C, and 34 ASIA D; tetraplegia; and 16-40 days post-injury)

**Number of studies**

**reporting responsiveness  
data: 2**