Quantitative Muscle Analysis Measurements in Low Disability Multiple Sclerosis



¹1Neuroimmunology Clinic, National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke, ² Physical Therapy Section, ³Functional and Applied Biomechanics Laboratory, Rehabilitation Medicine Department, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD

INTRODUCTION

Multiple Sclerosis patients with minimal disability commonly experience motor fatigability not appreciated during standard neurological assessment, which can nevertheless be severely limiting. Quantitative Muscle Analysis (QMA) using strain gauges with computer-assisted technology can be used to sensitively measure strength and motor fatigue. Using similar methodology, people with MS and moderate disability have previously been shown to have significantly greater motor fatigue as compared to healthy volunteers (HV).

HYPOTHESIS

QMA will detect measurable differences in static fatigue between subjects with MS and low disability and HV.

10 male subjects with MS and low disability (EDSS 1-2.5) and 10 age/gender-matched HV participated in this study. The subjects with MS were highly functioning and physically active but reported experiencing motor fatigue when performing intense physical activity. QMA was used to test participants' handgrip and knee extensor muscle strength on the dominant side. Maximal voluntary isometric contraction (MVIC), a measure of strength, and static fatigue test (SFT), a measure of motor fatigue, were calculated for each muscle group.



QMA testing for evaluating grip strength (1A) and knee extension strength (1B)



Age, y

Disease Duratio EDSS,

Height

Weight

Chevaz Thomas, BS¹, Joan Ohayon, RN, MSN, CRNP, MSCN¹, J Shrader, PT, CPed², Julie Rekant, BS², Cristiane Zampieri, PT, PhD³, Kaylan Fenton, RN, MSN, CRNP, MSCN¹, and Irene Cortese, MD¹



METHODS

cipant teristics	Patient (Average)	Patient (Range)	Healthy (Average)	Healthy (Range)	P-V
	40.5 ± 8.9	(27 – 60)	41.0 ± 8.8	(25 – 58)	0.9
e n, y	8.1 ± 3.7	(2 – 12)	_	_	
median	1.8 ± 0.5	(1.0 – 2.5)	-	_	
(cm)	176.0 ± 6.3	(170 – 192)	181.1 ± 7.1	(172 – 195)	0.
(kg)	84.8 ± 11.2	(69.5 – 103.0)	82.1 ± 14.7	(66.0 – 116.0)	0.

Study Participants

Strength and effort measures

Knee MVIC, kg Knee MVIC predicted, Knee SFT effort, % Grip MVIC, kg Grip MVIC predicted, ⁶ Grip SFT effort, %

Fatigue Index, Exhaustion Time, Slope

Fatigue- related measures	(Knee) Patient	(Knee) Healthy	(Knee) P-value	(Grip) Patient	(Grip) Healthy	(Grip) P-value
FI peak – 30	24.7 ± 5.4	15.7 ± 5.6	0.002	34.8 ± 6.8	22.5 ± 5.3	0.000
FI 5-30	27.1 ± 6.2	17.0 ± 6.3	0.003	38.9 ± 7.5	24.4 ± 6.4	0.000
FI 30-60	46.5 ± 9.3	34.5 ± 18.5	0.104	56.5 ± 8.9	49.4 ± 8.6	0.097
FI 60-100	62.1 ± 9.4	63.4 ± 14.8	0.818	62.4 ± 9.4	63.9 ± 7.0	0.695
Time to peak	1.52 ± 0.86	2.00 ± 1.14	0.310	0.67 ± 0.53	2.40 ± 1.85	0.024
Exht-25	17.9 ± 11.3	36.1 ± 18.6	0.025	9.6 ± 5.9	17.7 ± 5.8	0.008
Exht-50	49.3 ± 14.2	55.7 ± 15.0	0.384	33.7 ± 22.7	47.0 ± 13.0	0.143
Slope 5-30	-0.37 ± 0.18	-0.26 ± 0.39	0.415	-0.50 ± 0.22	-0.59 ± 0.21	0.371
Slope 30- 60	-0.39 ± 0.22	-0.57 ± 0.45	0.277	-0.09 ± 0.09	-0.27 ± 0.11	0.001
Slope 60-100	-0.10 ± 0.13	-0.26 ± 0.18	0.032	-0.05 ± 0.06	-0.13 ± 0.09	0.029

Table 3: Between group comparison of fatigue-related measures on grip and knee extensor muscle groups. Values displayed as average ± standard deviation.

- Grip strength in subjects with MS was weaker than matched controls, but within normal range compared to a normative reference group. There were no group differences in knee extension strength. These results indicate the individuals with MS were not weak. (Table 2)
- Motor fatigability was significantly greater in subjects with MS compared with healthy subjects for knee and grip during the first 30 seconds of sustained contraction. (Figure 1) Subjects with MS began to fatigue significantly earlier than healthy subjects during knee and grip
- contractions; 50% exhaustion time was reached earlier in subjects with MS however this did not reach statistical significance. (Figure 1)
- Initial time to reach maximum contraction was significantly shorter for subjects with MS compared to healthy subjects in the grip muscles, but not in knee extensors. (Table 3) No significant correlations were seen between MVIC and FI at the knee extensors (r= -0.38, p= 0.11) or at the grip muscles (r= -0.32, p= 0.18), indicating that, in our cohort, strength and fatigue were not associated.

CONCLUSIONS

Our findings suggest that static muscle fatigue measurements may be useful to detect motor impairments before substantial muscle weakness or disability emerges, potentially signaling an opportunity for earlier intervention. These subclinical motor deficits may explain the subjective difficulties in performing at previously attained levels reported by some patients. QMA-derived SFT may be a useful biomarker to predict functional prognosis or track disease progression as it relates to long-term disability. Such instrumented measures of function may prove useful for targeted rehabilitation interventions as well as outcomes measures in clinical trials.

901

091

657





Max Force/SFT of MS vs HV

	Patient	Healthy	P-value
	52.1 ± 12.8	54.8 ± 18.5	.718
6	96.4 ± 21.6	102.4 ± 28.2	.609
	98.3 ± 8.2	104.9 ± 17.4	.323
	40.1 ± 6.9	47.5 ± 6.6	.030
	86.2 ± 14.0	101.0 ± 15.9	.045
	93.8 ± 14.2	98.6 ± 3.2	.317

Table 2: Maximum voluntary isometric contraction values, predicted values and static fatigue testing effort. Values displayed as average ± standard deviation.

RESULTS