

### Research Summary – Lower Extremity Motor Score (LEMS) – Lower Limb and Walking

Author Year Country Research Design Setting	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample	Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability
<a href="#">Sato et al. 2023</a>  Psychometric study to evaluate the criterion validity of the trunk assessment scale for spinal cord injury (TASS) and the construct validity of the TASS and trunk control test in individuals with SCI (TCT-SCI)  Rehabilitation hospital, Japan	N=30 Mean (SD) age 63.8 (10.7) years 5M, 25F Traumatic tetraplegia (n=15), traumatic paraplegia (n=5), non-traumatic tetraplegia (n=2), traumatic paraplegia (n=8) AIS A (n=6), AIS B (n=0), AIS C (n=8), AIS D (n=16) Mean (SD) time from onset to assessment 1142.0 (1720.7) days	Construct validity (Spearman coefficients) between TASS/TCT-SCI and LEMS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TASS: <math>r = 0.80</math> (0.63-0.90)</li> <li>• TCT-SCI: <math>r = 0.51</math> (0.30-0.79)</li> </ul>		
<a href="#">Sinovas-Alonso et al. 2023</a>  Study to assess the construct validity of the	n=85, 50 healthy volunteers and 35 adults with incomplete spinal cord injury	Correlation with LEMS: $r = .638$		

<b>Author Year Country Research Design Setting</b>	<b>Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample</b>	<b>Validity</b>	<b>Reliability</b>	<b>Responsiveness Interpretability</b>
Gait Deviation Index for Spinal Cord Injury (SCI-GDI) in adult population following incomplete SCI				
<a href="#">Rigot et al. 2022</a>  Study to evaluate the relationship between measures of neuromuscular impairment and limb accelerations (LA) collected during sleep among individuals with chronic SCI  USA	N = 40 participants with SCI 34M, 6F Mean (SD) age: 53.7 (11.4) years Level of injury: Paraplegia (n = 28), tetraplegia (n = 12) ASIA A (n = 6), ASIA B (n = 4), ASIA C (n = 15), ASIA D (n = 15) Mean (SD) time since injury: 18.1 (11.8) years	Limb accelerations (LA) features were related to measures of impairment with models explaining 69% of the variance ( $R^2$ ) in strength, and correctly classifying 81.6% (F1-score = 0.814) of the participants into spasticity categories.  The most commonly selected LA features included measures of power and frequency (frequency domain), movement direction (correlation between axes), consistency		

Author Year Country Research Design Setting	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample	Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability
		<p>between movements (relation to recent movements), and wavelet energy (signal characteristics).</p> <p>Rolling speed (change in angle of inclination) and movement smoothness (median crossings) were uniquely associated with strength.</p> <p>When LA features were included, an increase of 72% and 222% of the variance was explained for strength and sensation scores, respectively, and there was a 34% increase in spasticity classification accuracy compared to models containing only covariate features such as</p>		

Author Year Country Research Design Setting	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample	Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability
		demographics, sleep quality, and pain.		
<a href="#">Lena et al. 2021</a>  Prospective, observational study  3 Italian rehabilitation hospitals	N=140 non-traumatic SCI, 92M, 48F  Mean age: 60 ±16 years (range 15–86)  Level: Cervical: 30 Thoracic: 78 Lumbar: 32  AIS A: 32 AIS B: 11 AIS C: 33 AIS D: 64	The correlations between the LEMS and the SCIM mobility subscore was significant ( $r=0.666$ ; $p<0.001$ ). The correlations improved by considering persons with tetraplegia and paraplegia separately, dividing the assessment at admission from one at follow-up and dividing incomplete and complete lesions.	Inter-rater correlation: $r = 0.986$ (0.974-0.993), $p = 0.001$ ; Krippendorff's Alpha (95% CI) = 0.503 (0.431-0.535), $p = 0.001$  Internal consistency: Cronbach's Alpha = 0.995 (0.993-0.996)	
<a href="#">Ogonowska-Slodownik et al. 2019</a>  Reliability study to determine the reliability of peak $\text{VO}_2$ testing for	N = 17 participants with SCI 13M, 4F Mean (SD) age: 45.7 (11.6) years Level of injury: Paraplegia (n = 9), tetraplegia (n = 8) ASIA A and B (n = 5),	LEMS influenced supported deep water, peak $\text{VO}_2$ ( $B = 0.58$ , $P < 0.02$ )		

<b>Author Year Country Research Design Setting</b>	<b>Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample</b>	<b>Validity</b>	<b>Reliability</b>	<b>Responsiveness Interpretability</b>
individuals with SCI in deep water and on land; and to examine the relationship between these two testing conditions.	ASIA C (n = 4), ASIA D (n = 8) Mean (SD) time since injury: 13.7 (13.1) years			
<a href="#">Perez-Sanpablo et al. 2017</a>  Observational, descriptive, transversal to evaluate the validity and reliability of spatio-temporal gait parameters measured by GaitRite in patients with SCI  National Institute of Rehabilitation,	N=23 (15M/8F) Mean Age: 45.6 $\pm$ 12.6 years Mean Time since injury: 42 $\pm$ 117 months AIS D, motor subacute and chronic incomplete	Spearman correlation with LEMS: r=0.49-0.55		

Author Year Country Research Design Setting	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample	Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability
Mexico City, Mexico				
<p><a href="#">Harkema et al. 2016</a></p> <p>Prospective multicenter observational; NRS 13-item version</p> <p>6 outpatient rehabilitation centers in the Christopher and Dana Reeve Foundation NRN</p>	<p>N=152 (123M, 29F)</p> <p>Mean (SD) age: 36 (15)</p> <p>Median (range) time since SCI: 0.9 (0.1-45.2) years</p> <p>Level of Injury: 110 cervical, 42 thoracic</p> <p>AIS-A/B/C/D: 43/21/39/49</p> <p>Physician-referred outpatients without progressive lesions above T11, capable of stepping using body weight support, with ability to wean off anti-spasticity medication</p> <p>Median (range) number of sessions of NRN-standardized</p>	<p>Pearson's r (95%CI) between LEMS and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Modified Functional Reach: 0.81 (0.77, 0.85)</li> <li>Berg Balance: 0.79 (0.74, 0.85)</li> <li>6MWT: 0.7 (0.64, 0.76)</li> <li>10MWT: 0.69 (0.63, 0.75)</li> </ul> <p>Pearson's r (95%CI) between LEMS and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NRS Overall Phase: 0.70 (0.63-0.77)</li> <li>NRS Summary Score: 0.80 (0.74-0.86)</li> <li>NRS Body Weight Supported Treadmill Subscale: 0.72 (0.65, 0.80)</li> </ul>		<p><b>Responsiveness</b></p> <p>LEMS Standardized Response Means after Locomotor Training:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All individuals: 0.23</li> <li>AIS-A/B: -0.10</li> <li>AIS-C: 0.72</li> <li>AIS-D: 0.16</li> </ul> <p>Median (range) number of sessions of NRN-standardized locomotor training: 70 (23-520)</p> <p><b>Interpretability</b></p> <p>Mean (SD) LEMS: All individuals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enrollment: 16 (18)</li> <li>Discharge: 18 (19)</li> </ul> <p>AIS-A/B:</p>

Author Year Country Research Design Setting	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample	Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability
	locomotor training: 70 (23-520)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NRS Trunk &amp; Leg Subscale: 0.87 (0.84, 0.91)</li> <li>NRS Arm &amp; Shoulder Subscale: 0.38 (0.25, 0.51)</li> <li>NRS Arm &amp; Shoulder + Trunk &amp; Leg Subscales: 0.78 (0.71, 0.84)</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enrollment: 1 (6)</li> <li>Discharge: 0 (1)</li> </ul> AIS-C: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enrollment: 13 (11)</li> <li>Discharge: 20 (16)</li> </ul> AIS-D: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enrollment: 39 (8)</li> <li>Discharge: 40 (10)</li> </ul> * Enrollment = pre-intervention; discharge = post-intervention; median (range) number of sessions of NRN-standardized locomotor training: 70 (23-520)
<a href="#">Sisto et al. 2012</a>  Cross-sectional; NRS 11-item version	N=350 (267M, 83F)  AIS-C/D: 101/249  Mean (SD) age: 42 (16)			<b>Interpretability:</b> Mean (SD) initial LEMS scores: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All patients: 31 (14)</li> </ul>

Author Year Country Research Design Setting	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample	Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability
7 NRN outpatient rehabilitation clinics	<p>Median (range) time since SCI: 0.9 (0.1-53.1)</p> <p>Incomplete SCI Presence of nonprogressive lesion above T11 No current inpatient rehabilitation</p> <p>No anti-spasticity medication use in the past 3 months Capable of stepping using body weight support Referred to PT by physician</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cervical SCI: 33 (14)</li> <li>• High Thoracic SCI: 26 (14)</li> <li>• Low Thoracic SCI: 27 (15)</li> </ul> <p>Median (range) initial LEMS scores:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All patients: 34 (0-50)</li> <li>• Cervical SCI: 36 (0-50)</li> <li>• High Thoracic SCI: 28 (0-50)</li> <li>• Low Thoracic SCI: 32 (2-50)</li> </ul>
<a href="#">Tester et al. 2016</a>  Prospective; testing the Neuromuscular Recovery Scale 14-item version	<p>N = 72 (57M, 15F) completing 20 sessions of standardized locomotor training Mean (SD) age: 36 (15) Median (range) time since SCI: 0.7 (0.1-14.7) years</p>			<p><b>Interpretability</b> LEMS Smallest Real Difference (SRD): 1.3</p>



Author Year Country Research Design Setting	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample	Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability
6 outpatient sites in the Christopher and Dana Reeve Foundation NeuroRecovery Network	N=45 longer than 6 months 44 cervical, 28 thoracic AIS-A/B/C/D: 17/10/20/25			
<a href="#">Scivoletto et al. 2013</a> Analysis of prospectively collected data  Studying the ISNCSCI N=600  SCI unit of a rehab hospital in central Italy	N = 600 (440M)  Mean age 50.35±18.8  Mean time from lesion 51.6±36.8 days Mean time in rehab 123.6±86.3 days 334 traumatic, 266 nontraumatic  Lesion level: cervical 192, thoracic 289, 110 lumbar  233 AIS-A, 67 B, 158 C, 142 D			<b>Interpretability</b> LEMS: Admission mean =13.8, SD=16.8, Discharge mean = 20.2, SD=19.7 MCID=3.66, ES-based estimate for small change=3.36, substantial change = 8.4 <b>Mean (SD) LEMS scores Admission to Discharge:</b> Cervical B = 0(0) to 11.5(16.6) Cervical C = 19.4(11.8) to 37.3(12.7) Cervical D = 39.2(9.2) to 44.8(6.5)

Author Year Country Research Design Setting	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample	Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability
				<p>Thoracic A = 0(0) to 0.76(3.1)  Thoracic B = 0(0) to 10.3(12.4)  Thoracic C = 14.6(8.6) to 27.4(12.3)  Thoracic D = 34.6(7.2) to 40.8(5.8)  Lumbar A = 6.6(9.6) to 11.9(12.8)  Lumbar B = 6.9(9.4) to 14.4(11.3)  Lumbar C = 16.3(7.9) to 28.7(9.4)  Lumbar D = 36.6(7.6) to 41.6(9.4)</p> <p><b>MID by Injury Level and Severity:</b>  Cervical B = 2.35  Cervical C = 2.45  Cervical D = 1.5  Thoracic A = 0.44  Thoracic B = 1.75  Thoracic C = 2.12  Thoracic D = 1.31  Lumbar A = 2.26  Lumbar B = 2.08  Lumbar C = 1.73</p>

Author Year Country Research Design Setting	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample	Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability
				<p>Lumbar D = 1.71</p> <p>Effect size-based estimate for small/large changes in LEMS scores:</p> <p>Cervical B = 0/0</p> <p>Cervical C = 2.36/5.9</p> <p>Cervical D = 1.84/4.6</p> <p>Thoracic A/B = 0/0</p> <p>Thoracic C = 1.72/4.3</p> <p>Thoracic D = 1.44/3.6</p> <p>Lumbar A = 1.92/4.8</p> <p>Lumbar B = 1.88/4.7</p> <p>Lumbar C = 1.58/3.95</p> <p>Lumbar D = 1.52/3.8</p>
<a href="#">Burns et al. 2011</a>  Cross-sectional validation of WISCI II  Canada	<p>Patients who are able to ambulate <math>\geq 10</math>m N = 76 (79%M)</p> <p>Mean age: 43.3<math>\pm</math>13.8</p> <p>Mean post-injury time: 6.32<math>\pm</math>5.99 years</p> <p>45% paraplegia, 55% tetraplegia</p>	<p>Spearman correlations between LEMS (N=76) and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Self-selected WISCI level: 0.704 (p&lt;0.0001)</li> <li>Self-selected WISCI Speed: 0.509 (p&lt;0.05)</li> </ul>		

Author Year Country Research Design Setting	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample	Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability
	AIS-A/B/C/D: 3%/1%/8%/88%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Max WISCI level: 0.717 (p&lt;0.0001)</li> <li>Max WISCI speed: 0.572 (p&lt;0.0001)</li> </ul> <p>More details of paraplegic/tetraplegic values available in article.</p>		
<a href="#">Ditunno et al. 2008</a>  Prospective cohort study to demonstrate validation for the formulation of hierarchical rankings  Prospective Cohort in Denmark, Germany, Italy and the USA.	N = 150 (USA = 112; Europe = 38)  AIS A: Tetra = 18, Para = 41 AIS B: Tetra = 12, Para = 7 AIS C: Tetra = 22, Para = 10 AIS D: Tetra = 32, Para = 8	WISCI II Total Spearman correlation w/ Lower Extremity Motor Score (LEMS) (p<0.001): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Initial = 0.47</li> <li>Final = 0.91</li> <li>Improvement = 0.59</li> <li>Final for those who progressed = 0.71</li> </ul>		

Author Year Country Research Design Setting	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample	Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability
<a href="#">Marino et al. 2008</a>  Inter-rater and intra-rater reliability study.  Inpatients and outpatients from the Kessler Institute for Rehabilitation.	N = 16 patients with SCI (2 inpatient, 14 outpatient) 10 men, 6 women, age range from 18-65 years  N = 16 examiners (8 physicians, 8 physical therapists) > 2 years of experience in field of SCI		<b>Inter-rater reliability:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All patients: ICC = n/a</li> <li>Complete: ICC = n/A</li> <li>Incomplete: ICC = 0.98</li> </ul>	
<a href="#">Ditunno et al. 2007</a>  Single-blinded, parallel-group, multicenter randomized clinical trial  6 regional SCI inpatient rehab. USA	N = 146 (114M, 32F)  Mean age = 32 years (range 16 – 69 years)  Incomplete spinal cord injury patients who had a Functional Independence Measure locomotor score for walking of < 4 on entry.	WISCI Spearman correlation w/ LEMS (P < 0.001): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At 3 months: = 0.85</li> <li>At 6 months: = 0.85</li> <li>At 12 months: r = 0.88</li> </ul> WISCI @ 12 months Spearman correlation w/ LEMS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Baseline: 0.73</li> <li>At 3 months: 0.81</li> </ul>		

<b>Author Year Country Research Design Setting</b>	<b>Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample</b>	<b>Validity</b>	<b>Reliability</b>	<b>Responsiveness Interpretability</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At 6 months: 0.86</li> </ul>		
<a href="#">Graves et al. 2006</a>  Retrospective medical record analysis  USA	N = 6,116  AIS motor scores 80% male 48% paraplegia	Separate UE/LE motor scores more accurately represented motor function than a single combined score: P<.0001 (82% in 1D model and 87% of variance in 2-D model)		
<a href="#">van Hedel et al. 2006</a>  Longitudinal study  European Multicenter Study of Human Spinal Cord Injury	N = 22 (18M, 4F)  Mean age = 45.5 years (range 17 – 78 years)  Incomplete spinal cord injury patients who were able to stand or walk within the first month after SCI.	Spearman correlation of ASIA LEMS with other measures at various post-injury time: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WISCI II:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Within 1 month: 0.49 (P=0.02)</li> <li>After 3 months: 0.50 (P=0.02)</li> <li>After 6 months:</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

Author Year Country Research Design Setting	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample	Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>0.38 (P=0.08) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ After 12 months: 0.32 (P=0.15)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 6 Minute Walk Test: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Within 1 month: 0.54 (P=0.01)</li> <li>○ After 3 months: 0.34 (P=0.12)</li> <li>○ After 6 months: 0.49 (P=0.02)</li> <li>○ After 12 months: 0.55 (P&lt;0.01)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 10 Meter Walk Test: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Within 1 month: - 0.45 (P=0.04)</li> <li>○ After 3 months: -</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

Author Year Country Research Design Setting	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample	Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability
		<p>0.30 (P=0.18)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ After 6 months: -0.40 (P=0.06)</li> <li>○ After 12 months (P=0.07)</li> </ul>		
<p><a href="#">Morganti et al. 2005</a></p> <p>Retrospective analysis</p> <p>A large rehabilitation hospital in the center of Italy.</p>	<p>N = 284 patients (184M, 100F)</p> <p>Mean age: 50.4±19.3 years</p> <p>Mean (SD) time since SCI at admission to spinal unit: 56.9(43.9) days</p> <p>Concurrent validity sample: N=76</p> <p>“Traumatic or non-traumatic SCLs admitted between 1997-2001. Non-</p>	<p>“The initial ASIA [impairment] grade was predictive of mobility outcome in WISCI”</p> <p>Correlation between ASIA LEMS and WISCI:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For all patients (N=200): 0.58 (P&lt;0.001)</li> <li>• For WISCI levels 1-19 only (N=63): 0.57 (P&lt;0.001)</li> <li>• For patients aged &lt;50</li> </ul>		



Author Year Country Research Design Setting	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample	Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability
	traumatic etiology was present in the majority of the patients (177/284): inflammatory (40), vascular (36), neoplastic (39), degenerative (62); traumatic lesions (107/284): car accident (38), motorcycle accident (15), sport accident (7), act of violence (6), suicide attempts (6), and accidental falls (31)."	<p>(N=35): 0.50 (P&lt;0.01)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For patients aged <math>\geq 50</math> (N=28): 0.64 (P&lt;0.01)</li> <li>For traumatic SCI patients (N=37): 0.49 (P&lt;0.01)</li> <li>For non-traumatic SCI patients (N=26): 0.58 (P&lt;0.01)</li> </ul>		
<a href="#">Marino &amp; Graves 2004</a>  Secondary analysis of prospectively collected data  Model Spinal Cord Injury Systems centers.	<p>N = 4338 (3443M, 895F)</p> <p>People with traumatic SCI discharged between Jan. 1994 and Mar. 2003</p> <p>Median age: 33 (IQR= 22~46)</p> <p>Median time from injury to rehab</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><math>R^2 = 0.59</math> for total ASIA motor score in predicting total FIM motor.</li> <li><math>R^2 = 0.71</math> for separate UE/LE ASIA scores in predicting total FIM motor.</li> <li><math>R^2 = 0.44</math> for predicting FIM UE</li> </ul>		<p><b>Interpretability:</b> Normative data (N=4338):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Median ASIA Motor at discharge: 50 (IQR= 31~70)</li> <li>Median Upper Extremity Motor Score at</li> </ul>

Author Year Country Research Design Setting	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample	Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability
USA	admission: 15 (IQR= 9~28) days  Median time in rehab: 46 (IQR= 29~73) days  AIS-A/B/C/D: 2049/511/655/1123  Neurologic category:  Complete tetraplegia: 854  Incomplete tetraplegia: 1464  Complete paraplegia: 1195  Incomplete paraplegia: 825	score with total ASIA motor score <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <math>R^2=0.72</math> for predicting FIM LE score with separate UE/LE ASIA scores</li> <li>• <math>R^2=0.60</math> for predicting FIM LE score with total ASIA motor score</li> <li>• <math>R^2=0.65</math> for predicting FIM UE score with separate UE/LE ASIA scores</li> </ul>		discharge: 44 (IQR= 23~50) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Median Lower Extremity Motor Score at discharge: 0 (IQR= 0~30)</li> </ul> <b>Floor and ceiling effect:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UEMS: 42% of participants at ceiling (50)</li> <li>• LEMS: 53% of participants at floor (0)</li> </ul>
<a href="#">Field-Fote et al. 2001</a>  Methodological study testing reliability, validity, and sensitivity of the	N=22 (5F, 17M) Age: 32±13 Incomplete SCI 14 Cervical, 5 Thoracic, 3 Lumbar Ability to independently maintain stance on	Correlation between % change in gait score and in change lower extremity motor scores (LEMS): $r=0.58$		

Author Year Country Research Design Setting	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample	Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability
Spinal Cord Injury Functional Ambulation Inventory (SCI- FAI)  University of Miami, USA	the weight-bearing limb and ability to take at least 8 steps.  Sensitivity: N=19 (6 female, 13 male) Age: 31.7±9.4 13 tetraplegia, 6 paraplegia			
<a href="#">Curt et al. 1998</a>  Correlation study on a prospective cohort  SCI center, university hospital.  Switzerland	N = 70  Acute=36 M/F = 31/5  Median age = 40.5y (17-77)  Chronic=34 M/F = 26/8  Median age = 32y (18-73) Level of Injury SCI : C2- T1	LE (lower extremity) ASIA MS correlated with nonstandardized ambulatory capacity = 0.79 (acute), 0.78 (chronic)		<b>Interpretability</b> ASIA scores – mean (SD) – of acute and chronic patient groups with cervical SCI  Please see Table 5 below
<b>Table 5</b>				
	<b>ASIA scores</b>	<b>Acute SCI – Initial Examination</b>	<b>Acute SCI - Increment after 6 months</b>	<b>Chronic SCI</b>

Author Year Country Research Design Setting	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample		Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability	
		<b>Motor (total)</b>	39 (30.4)	18.4 (19.1)	44.8 (27.3)	
		<b>Upper limb</b>	23.6 (15)	8.1 (7.7)	28.4 (13.2)	
		<b>Lower limb</b>	15.4 (19.9)	10.3 (14.4)	14.4 (17.2)	
		<b>Light touch</b>	65.2 (33.4)	8 (16.8)	60.4 (34.9)	
		<b>Pin prick</b>	53.3 (36.2)	12.1 (21.4)	49.3 (34.9)	
<a href="#">Marino et al. 1993</a>  Cross-sectional  SCI centre	N=22 (all male) Avg. age = 33 years (range 10 to 63 years) Inpatients traumatic quadriplegia C4-C7 injury		Best FIM predictive model was using separate ASIA upper extremity motor score (UEMS) and lower extremity motor score (LEMS) (model 3). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ASIA UEMS and FIM motor score: <math>t=91.0</math> (<math>P&lt;.001</math>)</li> <li>ASIA LEMS and FIM motor score: <math>t=33.2</math> (<math>P&lt;.001</math>)</li> </ul> Use of separate ASIA UEMS and LEMS improved prediction of motor FIM scores ( $R^2 = .71$ ) over that of total ASIA motor scores ( $R^2 = .59$ )			

Author Year Country Research Design Setting	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample	Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability
		<p>ASIA UEMS and FIM upper cord score: t=101.7 (P&lt;.001)</p> <p>ASIA LEMS and FIM upper cord score: t=8.4 (P&lt;.001) R<sup>2</sup> = .72</p> <p>ASIA UEMS and FIM lower cord score: t=73.0 (P&lt;.001)</p> <p>ASIA LEMS and FIM lower cord score: t=41.0 (P&lt;.001)</p> <p>R<sup>2</sup> = .75</p>		