

Author, Year Country Study Design Sample Size	Population Intervention Outcome Measure	Results
(Schottler, Graf et al. 2019) USA Pre-Post (N=23)	<p>Population: Age: 11.9 (7-19) yr; Gender: males=13, females=10; Level of injury: C6-L2; duration of manual wheelchair use 43.6 (3-132) mo; 26% had shoulder pain.</p> <p>Intervention: SmartWheel wheelchair training program.</p> <p>Outcome Measures: Peak force; peak backwards force; speed; push length; push frequency; peak/average force ratio; average push force; push mechanical effectiveness before and after training; Wheelchair User's Shoulder Pain Index.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. After completion of the wheelchair training program, participants showed statistically significant improvements in mean peak backwards forces (reduction of 0.71 N) and pushing effectiveness (increase of 5.6%). 2. These changes suggest training improved participants' ability to translate energy into forward propulsion, but the clinical significance is unclear. 3. The effect sizes were small for these improvements. <p>Other parameters neared statistical significance; as this was a pilot study, additional research is required as this may have been underpowered.</p>
(Slavens et al., 2015) USA Observational N=12	<p>Population: Age: 13.2±5.0 yr; Gender: males=10, females=2; Height: 137.4±29.9 cm; Weight: 41.8±13.4 kg.</p> <p>Intervention: A SmartWheel with an air tire, replaced the wheel on the dominant side of the subject's wheelchair for kinetic data collection; the SmartWheel companion wheel replaced the subject's wheel on the nondominant side. A 10-camera Vicon MX system captured the 3D marker trajectories at 120 Hz, while simultaneously the SmartWheel collected the 3D forces and moments occurring at the hand-handrim interface at 240 Hz. Vicon Nexus was used to process the marker trajectories.</p> <p>Outcome Measures: Upper Extremity Biomedical model – 3D joint angles, forces, and moments; Segment coordinate systems (SCS); wheelchair stroke cycle phases and periods; peak joint forces, angles, and moments.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The average propulsion speed was 1.23±0.26 (0.79-1.6) m/s with an average cadence of 1.1±0.2 strokes/sec. 2. The average contact phase occurred from 0-35.8% stroke cycle with a range of 25-45% stroke cycle. Within the contact phase, the initial contact period occurred on average from 0-3.6% stroke cycle, the propulsion period on average occurred from 3.6-34.1% stroke cycle, and the release period occurred on average from 34.1-35.8% stroke cycle. 3. One subject used the single-looping overpropulsion (SLOP) pattern, 3 subjects used the double-looping overpropulsion (DLOP) pattern, and 3 subjects used the recommended semicircular (SC) pattern. The remaining five subjects used a mixture of patterns making the primary pattern unidentifiable. 4. The average contact phase angle was 85.6 ± 15.7° and the average propulsion period angle was 72.6 ± 11.9°. 5. The average peak resultant handrim force was 10.1% BW ± 3.7% BW. 6. The elbow joint range of motion was statistically significantly higher than the acromioclavicular (AC; p<0.001) and thorax (p<0.001) joint ranges of motion in the sagittal plane. The elbow joint range of motion was significantly higher than the wrist (p<0.001), AC (p<0.001), sternoclavicular (SC; p<0.001) and thorax (p<0.001) joint ranges of motion in the transverse plane. 7. The glenohumeral (GH) joint range of motion was significantly higher than the elbow (p<0.001), AC (p<0.001), SC (p<0.001) and thorax (p<0.001) joint ranges of motion in the sagittal plane. The GH joint range of motion was significantly higher than the wrist (p<0.001), AC (p<0.001), and thorax (p<0.001) joint ranges of motion in the transverse plane. The GH joint range of motion was significantly higher than the AC (p<0.001), SC (p<0.001), and thorax (p<0.001) joint ranges of motion in the coronal plane. 8. The wrist joint range of motion was significantly higher than the AC (p<0.001),

		<p>and thorax ($p < 0.001$) joint ranges of motion in the sagittal plane. The wrist joint range of motion was significantly higher than the thorax joint range of motion in the transverse plane ($p < 0.001$) and the AC ($p < 0.001$) SC ($p < 0.001$), and thorax ($p < 0.001$) joint ranges of motion in the coronal plane.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9. The AC joint range of motion was significantly higher than the thorax joint range of motion in the transverse plane ($p = 0.015$) and the coronal plane ($p = 0.002$), while the SC joint range of motion was significantly higher than the thorax joint range of motion in the transverse plane ($p = 0.002$). 10. The GH joint forces were statistically significantly higher than the wrist joint forces directed superiorly ($p < 0.001$), laterally ($p = 0.019$), and posteriorly ($p < 0.001$). The wrist joint forces in the anterior ($p = 0.033$) and inferior ($p = 0.046$) directions were significantly greater than those at the GH joint. 11. The GH joint experienced significantly higher joint forces directed superiorly ($p < 0.001$) and posteriorly ($p < 0.001$) than the elbow joint. 12. The elbow joint experienced significantly higher forces than the wrist in the superior ($p < 0.001$) and posterior ($p < 0.001$) directions. 13. The GH joint experienced significantly greater moments in flexion ($p = 0.009$) and extension ($p < 0.001$) than the wrist joint. 14. The elbow was significantly greater than the wrist in the extension moment ($p < 0.001$). 15. The GH joint experienced significantly higher moments than the elbow joint in internal rotation ($p = 0.043$) and extension ($p = 0.002$). The elbow experienced significantly higher flexion moment than the GH joint ($p = 0.001$).
<p>(Schnorenberg, Slavens, Graf, et al., 2014) USA Observational N=12</p>	<p>Population: Age: 13.2 ± 5.0 yr; Gender: males=10, females=2; Height: 137 ± 30 cm; Weight: 42 ± 13 kg. Intervention: A SmartWheel (Out-Front, Mesa, AZ) replaced the wheel on the dominant side of the subject's wheelchair for kinetic data collection. A 14-camera Vicon MX System captured the 3D marker trajectories at 120 Hz, while the SmartWheel simultaneously collected 3D forces and moments occurring at the hand-hand-rim interface at 240 Hz. Outcome Measures: UE model – 3D joint angles, forces and moments; stroke cycles; peak forces and moments.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The average propulsion speed was 1.23 ± 0.26 m/s. The average contact and recovery phases occurred from 0-35.8% stroke cycle and 35.8-100% stroke cycle, respectively. The relative transition time between phases occurred on average at 35.8% stroke cycle, with a range of 25-45% stroke cycle. 2. Within the contact phase, the initial contact period occurred on average from 0-3.6% stroke cycle, and the release period occurred on average from 34.1-35.8% stroke cycle. 3. One subject used the single looping over-propulsion (SLOP) pattern, 3 subjects used the double looping over-propulsion (DLOP) pattern, and 3 subjects used the semicircular (SC) pattern, which is recommended in the literature. The remaining 5 subjects used a variety of patterns. 4. The GH joint demonstrated the highest average peak forces, with 6.5% BW in the posterior direction and 6.1% BW in the superior direction, which were significantly higher ($p < 0.001$) than the posteriorly and

		<p>superiorly directed forces at the elbow and wrist joints.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. The highest average joint moment was 1.36% BWxH of elbow flexion, with the GH joint flexion moment significantly less than both the elbow and wrist joint flexion moments ($p < 0.01$). 1. The highest average peak GH joint moment was 1.2% BWxH of extension, which was significantly higher than the average peak extension moment of the elbow and wrist joints ($p < 0.01$).
<p>(Schnorenberg, Slavens, Wang, et al., 2014) USA Case Report N=1</p>	<p>Population: 17 yr, male, C7 SCI. Intervention: None. Measurements taken during wheelchair propulsion using a SmartWheel manual wheelchair system and passive reflective markers applied to the bilateral upper extremity joints. Outcome Measures: Bilateral upper extremity joint dynamics (for motion and loading patterns).</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Asymmetry in joint forces and range of motion is common across the UE joints during manual wheelchair propulsion, but the clinical significance of this is unclear.