**INFLUENCE OF VESTIBULAR REHABILITATION ON BALANCE AND DUAL-TASK COSTOF WALKING IN PATIENTS WITH MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS: A RANDOMIZED CONTROLLED TRIAL**

**Bassam A. El-Nassag1, Amina Awad1**

1 Department of Physical Therapy for Neuromuscular Disorders and its Surgery, Faculty of Physical Therapy, Cairo University, Cairo, Egypt.

Corresponding Author: **Bassam A. El-Nassag**

Email**:** drbassam\_2000@yahoo.com

Faculty of Physical Therapy, Cairo University, 7 Ahmed El-Zayat Street, Dokki, Giza, Egypt

Postal Code: 12613. Fax: 202 37482979. Tel: 02-010-10085342

**Authors’ contributions**

BE and AA conceived the study, designed the study protocol drafted and wrote the manuscript. BE is the corresponding author and supervisor of the research. Both authors have reviewed the final version of the manuscript and approve it for publication.

**ABRTRACT**

**Background:** Balance dysfunction and high dual-task costs are eminent features in multiple sclerosis (MS). Vestibular rehabilitation therapy (VRT) proved to promote functional outcomes; yet, its influence on dynamic balance and dual-task cost of walking (DTCW) in MS needs further research.

O**bjective:** To investigate the effect of adding VRT to aerobic training on dynamic balance and DTCW in people with MS.

**Design:** Single blinded, parallel randomized controlled trial.

**Settings:** Out-Patient Clinic at Faculty of Physical Therapy and Kasr Al-Ainy Multiple Sclerosis Unit, Cairo University, Egypt.

**Participants:** 40 patients with remitting-relapsing multiple sclerosis.

**Intervention**: Patients were randomized to a control (n= 20) and intervention (n= 20) groups. Over four successive weeks, all patients received stationary bicycle aerobic training. Intervention group received an additional VRT program.

**Outcomes measures**: Berg Balance Scale (BBS), walking speed tested by the 10 meters timed walk test (10 m-TWT), (DTCW), and overall stability index (SI).

**Results**: Intervention group showed a remarkable improvement in BBS (p =0.02), SI at levels four (p= 0.002) and seven (p= 0.03), and DTCW (p= 0.03) compared with control group. Walking speed did not show significant changes post-treatment within or between groups comparison (P > 0.05).

**Conclusion**: Adding VRT to aerobic training has a positive effect on dynamic balance and dual-task cost of walking in MS.

**Key word:** Multiple sclerosis, vestibular rehabilitation, dynamic balance, dual task cost of walking.

**Introduction**

Multiple sclerosis (MS) is one of the most common disabling neurological disorders amongst young adults. Balance dysfunction is a frequent early problem in people with MS **[1]** affecting about 50-80% of them **[2]*.*** Impaired balance and mobility is a significant barrier to daily life activities and contributes to reduced quality of life **[3]** and increased risk of falling in people with MS **[4]**. Slowed somatosensory conduction with disturbed feedback mechanism and impaired central integration are reported as the primary causes of balance disorder in MS **[5,6].**

The cognitive–motor interaction; termed the dual-task cost or dual-task interference is one of the main contextual variables affecting the postural control of daily balance tasks**,** walking performance, and increase risk of falling in people with MS **[7,8]**.The impaired central processing mechanisms in MS requires higher mental attention with increased activation of the prefrontal cortex while doing an upright postural and complex tasks **[9,10]**. Accordingly, dual-task paradigms can be considered as sensitive methods in assessing balance control with different attentional demands in daily postural tasks, predicting risk of falling and detecting recovery of stability in people with MS **[8]*.***

Vestibular rehabilitation therapy (VRT) is the most common approach used to promote gaze and postural control as well as walking stability in MS [11,12]. Generally, VRT works through habituation of symptoms, adaptation and /or substitution for various deficits causing balance disorders [13].To date, there are limited studies investigating the benefits of vestibular training on dynamic balance and functional outcomes in people with MS [14,15]. Further, there is a lack of studies assessing the influence of VRT on dual-task cost of walking as a measure of dynamic balance in more attention requiring situation as walking in MS patients. Hence, the current work aimed to investigate the additional effect of VRT on dynamic balance measures and dual task cost of walking in people with MS.

**Materials and Methods**

***Study design***

A prospective, parallel randomized, single-blind, pre–post-test, controlled trial was conducted following the Guidelines of Declaration of Helsinki on the conduct of human research. The study was approved from the institutional review board at Faculty of Physical Therapy, Cairo University (No: P.T. REC/012/00685), and registered at the Pan African Clinical Trial Registry database [www.pactr.org](http://www.pactr.org) (PACTR201611001853408).

***Participants***

A convenient sample of 50 patients with remitting-relapsing multiple sclerosis (RRMS), were screened for study eligibility, 40 patients were included in the study **(Fig.1)**. Patients were recruited from Kasr Al-Ainy Multiple Sclerosis Unit (KAMSU) as well as Outpatient Clinic at the Faculty of Physical Therapy, Cairo University, Egypt. To be included in the study, individuals should be, clinically defined RRMS, 20 to 40 years old, and having no relapses three months before commencing the study, scored between 2.5 and 5.5 on the Expanded Disability Severity Score (EDSS), able to walk 100 meter, and having balance dysfunction (a score < 52 on the Berg balance scale). Patients were excluded if they had other neurological or orthopedic abnormalities interfering with their postural control, secondary musculoskeletal complication, peripheral vestibulopathy, cognitive dysfunction, or hearing deficits. Pregnant ladies and patients who are already receiving a planned physiotherapy program were also excluded. Subjects criteria were based on previously published studies **[16,17]**.


******

Figure 1: Participants flow chart throughout the study.

***Randomization***

Informed consent was obtained from each participant after explaining the purpose and benefits of the study. Participants were informed about the confidentiality of obtained information and their right to refuse or withdraw at any time. Patients were randomly assigned into two groups; control group (n=20) and intervention group (n=20) by a blinded and an independent research assistant who opened sealed envelopes that contained a computer generated randomization card.

***Interventions***

The intervention period lasts for a total of four successive weeks for both groups. All patients were treated for 55 minutes at a frequency of three times per week; regularly every other day (12 therapeutic sessions) as follows:

The control group was treated by two (15 minutes sessions) of aerobic exercise in the form of submaximal stationary endurance bicycle training with intensity of 65% to 75% of the age predicted maximum heart rate (MHR). The first session started by five minutes of warming up followed by 15 minutes of continuous training (with the intensity mentioned above) and finally five minutes for cooling down. After 5 minutes rest, the second session was repeated with the same procedure of the first one. The level of intensity and duration of cycling were based on the recommended capacity for people with MS and previous literature **[18,9]**.

The intervention group was treated by one (15 minutes session) of aerobic exercises; prescribed as in the control group and a designed VRT in addition. The VRT consists of eye movement exercises and upright postural control training***.*** Each exercise was applied for 1-2 minutes with a total of 30 minutes for the whole VRT program **[19,9]**. The VRT is reported to induce significant changes when applied for four weeks **[20]*.*** All patients were treated by one physiotherapist who is experienced in the field of neurological rehabilitation for 10 years.

***Outcome Measures***

All patients were evaluated before and after the completion of treatment program by the following measures:

1. ***Walking speed; the 10 meters timed walk test (10 m-TWT):***

Walking speed, is the most common finding described in the studies with dual-task condition **[21,22]**. The 10 m-TWT test is a valid and reliable tool for patients with neurologic impairment and found to have a good test-retest and inter-rater reliability in people with MS **[23]**. Participants were instructed to walk bare feet along a 14 meters walkway at their preferred speed, as a recommended in the vestibular outcome measure **[24]*.*** Walking speed was only calculated for the 10 meters distance between the starting and finish lines.

1. ***Dual task cost of walking (DTCW):***

DTCW is expressed as the percentage change of walking speed between the single and dual-task walks **[25]**. The single task was represented by the 10 m-TWT. For dual-task trials, the patients were instructed to accomplish 10 m-TWT while executing an arithmetic task, by counting aloud backwards from 100, subtracting by 3. This task was selected because it is commonly recommended in many studies examining the DTCW. Participants walked three times under each condition (single and dual task walking) to achieve the main score of trials. For the dual task, an examiner walked alongside the patients to provide the needed help in case of losing their balance **[21,22]**. The dual task cost is calculated through the following equation**:** DTC= (single-task − dual-task)/single-task x100 **[8]**

1. ***Berg-Balance Scale (BBS):***

The scale consists of 14 items used to evaluate balance and performance in various daily living tasks. It rates the subject performance of each item from 0 (cannot perform) to 4 (normal performance) with a maximum total score of 56 **[26]**. It is a valid instrument used for quantitatively describing the function and evaluating the effectiveness of interventions in clinical practice and research. Its validity and reliability have been evaluated on people with MS **[27]**.

1. ***Stability Index (SI):***

Biodex Balance System (BSS) (Biodex Crop. Shirley, Ny, USA) is a system which uses a circular platform that is free to move in the antero-posterior and medio-lateral axes simultaneously. It allows up to 20° of foot platform tilt so the patient is challenged to maintain his/her center of gravity over his base of support by keeping the platform leveled. The Biodex Balance System offers several levels of difficulty from L1 (most difficult) to L8 (least difficult), which determines the rate of deflection of the platform. Reliability of the BSS has repeatedly been proven **[28]**. The testing was conducted in dynamic conditions, with eyes open through two levels of stability; seven (moderately stable) and four (unstable). Test duration was settled by the system on 20 seconds. Each test was repeated three times with rest intervals. The overall stability index (SI) was measured considering the mean of (COP) displacement during the three test trials. Higher values of stability indices indicate greater difficulty in maintaining balance **[29]*.***

***Statistical analysis***

Descriptive and t-test were conducted for comparison of subject characteristics between both groups. Normal distribution of data was tested using the Shapiro-Wilk test for all variables. Levene’s test for homogeneity of variances used to test homogeneity between groups. Mixed MANOVA was performed to compare within and between groups effects on 10 m-TWT, BBS and SI. Dual task cost of walking was compared between groups by Mann–Whitney U test and within each group by Wilcoxon Signed Ranks. Level of significance for all statistical tests was set at p value < 0.05. Statistical package for social studies (SPSS) version 25 for windows (IBM SPSS, Chicago, IL, USA) was used for statistical analysis.

***Results***

**Subjects characteristics:**

There was no significant difference between both groups in the mean age, weight, height, duration of illness and EDSS score (p< 0.05), see table (1).

**Table 1. Basic characteristics of participants.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Intervention group**  **(n=20)** | **Control group**  **(n=20)** | **p-value** |
|  | **x̄±SD** | **x̄±SD** |  |
| **Age (yrs)** | **34.57± 9.58** | **34.06± 8.63** | **0.86** |
| **Weight (kg)** | **76.94 ± 16.61** | **77.13 ± 12.4** | **0.97** |
| **Height (cm)** | **164.5 ± 8.23** | **165.66 ± 7.74** | **0.65** |
| **Duration of illness (yrs)** | **5.34± 3.55** | **5.66± 3.3** | **0.77** |
| **EDSS** | **2.51 ± 0.83** | **3.03 ± 1.27** | **0.11** |
| **Sex**  **Male**  **Female** |  |  |  |
| **6** | **8** |
| **14** | **12** |

**Values were expressed as (means± standard deviation) (means± SD), except for sex which is expressed as nominal counts, EDSS: Expanded Disability Severity Scale, yrs: years, Kg: kilogram, cm: centimeters. P: probability.**

**Results of treatment effect on** **10 m-TWT speed, BBS and stability index**

Mixed MANOVA revealed a significant interaction effect of treatment and time (Wilks’ Lambda = 0.69, F (4,38) = 4.24, p = 0.006) and main effect of time (Wilks’ Lambda = 0.19, F (4,38) = 40.62, p = 0.001),while there was no significant main effect after treatment (Wilks’ Lambda = 0.84, F (4,38) = 1.72, p = 0.16).Table (2) showed descriptive statistics of 10 m-TWT speed, BBS and SI; and the comparisons within and between groups before and after treatment.

***Within and between group comparison***

As represented in table (2), both groups showed a significant difference (p<0.05) in the results of BBS, SI at level four and seven post-treatment when compared with pre-treatment. The walking speed (10 m-TWT) did not show significant changes in either group after treatment (p > 0.05). Before treatment, there was no significant difference between both groups in all measures (p > 0.05). After treatment, the intervention group showed a remarkable improvement in the measures of BBS (p = 0.02), SI at level 4 (p= 0.002), and SI at level 7 (p=0.03) when compared with the control group.

**Results of the effect of treatment on dual task cost of walking DTCW:**

***Within and between groups comparison***

As seen in table 3, within group pre-post treatment comparison showed a significant decrease in the DTCW in each group; the intervention (p=0.001) and control (p=0.002) groups. Furthermore, there was a remarkable significant difference of the DTCW between the groups after treatment in favor to the intervention one (p = 0.03).

**Table 2.** **Results of the 10 m-TWT speed, BBS and SI at pre & post-treatment in both groups.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Between Groups** | | | | |  | **Within group** | |
|  | **Before treatment** | | | **After treatment** | |  | **Before vs After** | |
|  | **Intervention group** | **Control group** |  | **Intervention group** | **Control group** |  | **Intervention group** | **Control group** |
|  | **x̄±SD** | **x̄±SD** | **P value** | **x̄±SD** | **x̄±SD** | **P value** | **P value** | **P value** |
| **10mTWT** | **0.58 ± 0.17** | **0.57 ± 0.1** | **0.8** | **0.61 ± 0.21** | **0.58 ± 0.12** | **0.56** | **0.07** | **0.74** |
| **BBS** | **50.6 ± 4.01** | **48.26 ± 5** | **0.1** | **52.71 ± 3.2** | **49.93 ± 4.83** | **0.02\*** | **0.001\*** | **0.002\*** |
| **SI- 7** | **3.62 ± 0.84** | **3.86 ± 0.94** | **0.4** | **2.82 ± 0.76** | **3.34 ± 0.77** | **0.03\*** | **0.001\*** | **0.001\*** |
| **SI- 4** | **4.36 ± 0.91** | **4.55 ± 0.72** | **0.48** | **3.15 ± 0.87** | **4.09 ± 0.86** | **0.002\*** | **0.001\*** | **0.008\*** |

**Mean; SD, Standard deviation; p-value, level of significance; \* Significant**

**Table 3.****The dual task cost of walking pre and post-treatment of intervention and control groups.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Intervention group** | **Control group** |  |  |
|  |  | **U- value** | **p-value** |
| ***DTCW*** |  |  |  |  |
| **Before treatment** | **19.87** | **18.5** | **183.5** | **0.49** |
| **After treatment** | **8.03** | **11.05** | **128** | **0.03*\**** |
| **Z- value** | **3.94** | **3.17** |  |  |
| **p-value** | **0.001\*** | **0.002\*** |  |  |

**U- value, Mann-Whitney test value; Z- value, Wilcoxon signed ranks test value; p-value, level of significance; \*Significant**

***Discussion:***

This study was designed to investigate the additional effect of VRT on dynamic balance measures as well as on dual task cost of walking in people with MS. Results revealed that adding the VRT to aerobic exercises can remarkably improve dynamic balance measures(BBS & SI) and reduce the DTCW in comparison to using conventional aerobic training only.

According to the published review; VRT is mostly examined through its effect on gaze, postural stabilization, vertigo and dizziness in people with MS **[30]**. Up to our knowledge, limited randomized controlled trials (RCT) have been conducted to evaluate the effect of the VRT on dynamic balance and dual task cost in MS. Recent RCTs come in agreement with our results as they reported significant improvements in the score of sensory organization test **[11,12]**, and in BBS scores **[31]**; following participation in a vestibular based rehabilitation protocol. The resulted progress of SI in the current work is consistent with the result of **Abou Shady et al. [32]** in which people with MS showed a remarkable improvement in their SI at a moderately stable level (6) after participating in a VRT program.

Vestibular system activity is enhanced in antigravity positions and shows the greatest activation during standing and walking **[33]**. Vestibular rehabilitation is reported to provide task-specific stimuli essential for promoting neural reorganization and central sensory integration **[34],** that subsequently improve the upright postural control in people with MS **[9]*.*** Connection of vestibular system to reticular formation, through the vestibulospinal and ipsilateral recticulospinal pathways, produces selective activation of axial muscles and promotes cortical arousal and general body awareness **[33].** Optimal alignment of trunk, hip, ankle, and foot which are essential elements for sufficient ankle and hip strategies **[33,35]**, together with a proper somatosensory input and dynamic adaptation to variable base of support; are all addressed during practicing the VRT program. This working design allows patients to integrate somatosensory with vestibular inputs and becoming less reliant on visual input [**36]**. In addition, VRT program could modulate the gamma and alpha motor neurons firing which increases excitability of lower extremity antigravity muscles and activates the feedback mechanism **[37,38]*.*** Furthermore, the ocular motor and gaze stabilization training involved in the VRT program plays a key role in improving neuromuscular reorganization**[39]*,***and the vestibule-ocular reflex adaptation mechanism **[40]**; that could enhances postural control in people with MS **[9,12]**.

Investigating the effect of VRT on dual tasking as an outcome measure for balance is poorly studied in the literature review. However, The remarkable reduction of DTCW in the intervention compared to control group in this study, could be correlated with the reported role of VRT program in enhancing neural processing in different brain areas as; the cerebellum, basal ganglia, thalamus, hippocampus and inferior parietal cortex **[41]**. Some of those brain regions along with the middle frontal lobe, superior temporal and posterior cingulate gyrii are verified to be involved in the vestibular neural processing activated by different vestibular stimulation approaches **[42,43]*.*** A significant vestibular connectivity primarily with frontal cortex (responsible for attention) was found mainly during saccade eye movements**[44]**, which may explain the influence of VRT on reducing attentional demands of balance during dual-task walking demonstrated in this study. **Hall and Heusel-Gillig [44],** revealed similar results of significant improvement in balance measures; as balance-related confidence, dual-task ability, walking speed, fall risk, and sensory integration after a standard balance training program in older adults. **Miller et al. [45]**, reported that, aerobic exercise training is an efficient easy tool for enhancing cognition and functional status in MS. Aerobic training is also reported to improve the dual-task walking in older adults **[46]***.*

The insignificant change of the walking speed (10 m-TWT) in either group post-treatment in current study, is consistent with results of **Hebret et al. [9],** who reported insignificant effect of either VRT or aerobic exercises on walking distance measured by a similar test; the 6-minute walk test. **Arntzen et al. [17]**, also reported non-significant difference in preferred walking speed (10m-TWT) after a core stability and balance training program in MS. However, **Hall and Heusel-Gillig [44]**, revealed an improvement in walking speed and other measures of balance as balance-related confidence and fall risk, after a standard balance training program in older adults.

A possible explanation for the insignificant change in walking speed in the current work could be that walking impairment in MS is multifactorial; as the lack of postural control, sensory impairment, muscle weakness, incoordination, lack of flexibility, spasticity, and fear of falling, that was not all addressed in the present study **[47]**. Moreover, locomotion is controlled by different motor control mechanisms and promoting walking performance requires numerous elements to be covered to induce neuroplastic changes. Hence, an approach such as the task-specific gait training might be a suitable therapeutic ap­proach in enhancing in gait performance compared to aerobic, resistance or universal physiotherapy exercises alone **[48].**

It could be concluded that; adding the VRT to aerobic training can positively improves not only the dynamic balance control in people with MS, but also reduces the cost of adding a cognitive task to a highly demanding balance task as the ambulation. The finding of our study could highlight the role of VRT in enhancing the central sensorimotor processing which is recommended for further studies. Larger sample sizes that include participants with greater level of disability and different levels of cognitive impairments should be undertaken to confirm the present results.

**References**

1. Boes MK, Sosnoff JJ, Socie MJ, et al. Postural control in multiple sclerosis: Effects of disability status and dual task. Journal of the neurological sciences, 2012, 315 (1-2): 44-48.
2. Cameron MH and Nilsagard Y. Balance, gait, and falls in multiple sclerosis. Handb Clin Neurol., 2018, (159): 237-250. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-444-63916-5.00015-X.
3. Sutliff MH. Contribution of impaired mobility to patient burden in multiple sclerosis. Curr Med Res Opin., 2010, (26): 109–19.
4. Matsuda PN, Shumway-Cook A, Ciol MA, et al. Understanding falls in multiple sclerosis: association of mobility status, concerns about falling, and accumulated impairments. PhysTher., 2012, (92): 407–15.
5. Cameron MH, Horak FB, Herndon RR, et al. Imbalance in multiple sclerosis: a result of slowed spinal somatosensory conduction. Somatosens Mot Res., 2008, 25(2):113.
6. Cameron MH and Lord S. Predicting falls in people with multiple sclerosis: fall history is as accurate as more complex measures. Mult Scler Int., 2013 (2013): 496325.
7. Wajda DA, Motl RW and Sosnoff JJ. Dual task cost of walking is related to fall risk in persons with multiple sclerosis. J Neurol Sci., 2013 (335): 160–163.
8. Leone C, Patti F and Feys P. Measuring the cost of cognitive-motor dual tasking during walking in multiple sclerosis. Multiple Sclerosis Journal, 2015, 21(2): 123– 131. DOI: 10.1177/1352458514547408.
9. Hebert JR, Corboy JR, Manago MM, et al. Effects of vestibular rehabilitation on multiple sclerosis-related fatigue and upright postural control: A randomized controlled trial. Phys Ther., 2011, (91): 1166–1183.
10. Hernandez ME, Holtzer R, Chaparro G, et al. Brain activation changes during locomotion in middle-aged to older adults with multiple sclerosis. J Neurol Sci., 2016, (370): 277–83.
11. Garg H, Dibble LE, Schubert MC, et al. Gaze stability, dynamic balance and participation deficits in people with multiple sclerosis at fall-risk. Anat Rec., 2018, 301(11):1852–60.
12. Hebert JR, Corboy JR, Vollmer T, et al. Efficacy of balance and eye-movement exercises for persons with multiple sclerosis (BEEMS). Neurology, 2018, 90(9): e797–807.
13. Han BI, Song HS and Kim JS. Vestibular rehabilitation therapy: review of indications, mechanisms, and key exercises. J Clin Neurol., 2011, 7(4): 184-96.
14. Kasser SL and Jacobs JV. Understanding and Treating Balance Impairment in Multiple Sclerosis. Journal of Clinical Outcomes Management, 2014, 21(9): 419-32.
15. Loyd BJ, Fangman A, Peterson DS, et al. Rehabilitation to improve gaze and postural stability in people with multiple sclerosis: study protocol for a prospective randomized clinical trial. BMC Neurol., 2019, 19, 119.doi:10.1186/s12883-019-1353-z.
16. Forsberg A, von Koch L and Nilsagård Y. Effects on Balance and Walking with the CoDuSe Balance Exercise Program in People with Multiple Sclerosis: A Multicenter Randomized Controlled Trial. Multiple Sclerosis International, 2016, (2016), Article ID 7076265. doi.org/10.1155/2016/7076265.
17. Arntzen EC, Straume B, Odeh F, et al. Group‐based, individualized, comprehensive core stability and balance intervention provides immediate and long‐term improvements in walking in individuals with multiple sclerosis: A randomized controlled trial. Physiother Res Int., 2019, e1798. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pri.1798>.
18. White LJ and Dressendorfer RH. Exercise and multiple sclerosis. Sports Med., 2004, (34): 1077–1100.
19. Herdman SJ. Vestibular Rehabilitation*.* 3rd ed. Philadelphia, 2007: F.A. Davis Co.
20. Whitney SL and Rossi MM. Efficacy of vestibular rehabilitation. Otolaryngol Clin North Am., 2000, 33 (3): 659-672.
21. Nogueira LAC, dos Santos LT, Sabino PG, et al. Walking execution is not affected by divided attention in patients with multiple sclerosis with no disability, but there is a motor planning impairment. Arq. Neuro-Psiquiatr., 2013, 71 (8): 521-526.
22. Nogueira LAC, dos Santos LT, Sabino PG, et al. “Factors for Lower Walking Speed in Persons with Multiple Sclerosis,” Multiple Sclerosis International, 2013 (2013), Article ID 875648, 8 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2013/875648>.
23. Kempen J, de Groot V, Knol D, Polman C, Lankhorst G, and Beckerman H (2011). “Community walking can be assessed using a 10 meter timed walk test”. Multiple Sclerosis, 17 (8): 980–990.
24. Hall CD, Herdman SJ, Whitney SL, et al. Vestibular rehabilitation for peripheral vestibular hypofunction: an evidence-based clinical practice guideline. J Neurol Phys Ther., 2016, 40(2):124–55.
25. Gunn H, Creanor S, Haas B, et al. Risk factors for falls in multiple sclerosis: an observational study. Multiple Sclerosis Journal, 2013, 19(14): 1913–1922.
26. Berg KO, Wood-Dauphinee SL, Williams JI, et al. Measuring balance in the elderly: preliminary development of an instrument. Physiother Can., 1989, 41 (6): 304–11. DOI: 10.3138/ptc.41.6.304.
27. Cattaneo D, Jonsdottir J and Repetti S. Reliability of four scales on balance disorders in persons with multiple sclerosis. Disabil Rehabil., 2007, 29 (24): 1920–5.
28. Parraca JA, Olivares PR, Carbonell-Baeza A, et al. Test Retest reliability of Biodex Balance SD on physically active old people. J. Hum. Sport Exerc., 2011, 6 (2): 444-51.
29. Wikstrom EA, Tillman MD, Smith AN et al. A new force-plate technology measure of dynamic postural stability: The dynamic postural stability index, Journal of Athletic Training, 2005, 40 (4): 305-9.
30. Danicic J, Williams K, Semciw A, et al. The efficacy of vestibular rehabilitation in people reporting dizziness with multiple sclerosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery and Psychiatry, 2017, 88 (5): e1.[doi.org/10.1136/jnnp-2017-316074.42](http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/jnnp-2017-316074.42).
31. [Ozgen G](https://europepmc.org/search?query=AUTH:%22Ozgen+G%22&page=1), [Karapolat H](https://europepmc.org/search?query=AUTH:%22Karapolat+H%22&page=1), [Akkoc Y](https://europepmc.org/search?query=AUTH:%22Akkoc+Y%22&page=1), et al. Is customized vestibular rehabilitation effective in patients with multiple sclerosis? A randomized controlled trial. [European Journal of Physical and Rehabilitation Medicine](https://europepmc.org/search?query=JOURNAL:%22Eur+J+Phys+Rehabil+Med%22&page=1), 2016, 52(4): 466-478.
32. Abou Shady NA, Shalaby NM, El Fayoumy NM, et al. Effect of vestibular rehabilitation on stability functions in patients with remitting relapse multiple sclerosis: A Randomized Controlled Trial. J Adv Pharm Edu Res., 2018, 8(4): 39-44.
33. Gjelsvik B and Syre L. The Bobath concept in adult neurology (2nd ed.). Beaverton, 2016: Ringgold Inc.
34. Lacour M and Demanze LB. Interaction between vestibular compensation mechanisms and vestibular rehabilitation therapy: 10 recommendations for optimal functional recovery. Frontiers in Neurology, 2015, DOI: 10.3389/fneur.2014.00285.
35. Shumway-Cook A and Woollacott MH. Motor control: Translating research into clinical practice (5th ed.). Philadelphia, 2017: Wolters Kluwer.
36. Gandolfi M, Geroin C, Picelli A, et al. Robot-assisted vs. sensory integration training in treating gait and balance dysfunctions in patients with multiple sclerosis: A randomized controlled trial. Front Hum Neurosci., 2014, (8): 318.
37. Dakin CJ, Inglis JT, Chua R, et al. Muscle specific modulation of vestibular reflexes with increased locomotor velocity and cadence. J Neurophysiol., 2013, (110): 86e94.
38. Schniepp R, Mohwald K and Wuehr M. Gait ataxia in humans: Vestibular and cerebellar control of dynamic stability. J Neurol., 2017, (264): 87-92.
39. Schor CM. Neuromuscular plasticity and rehabilitation of the ocular near response. Optom Vis Sci., 2009, 86 (7): E788–E802.
40. Meldrum D. and Jahn K. Gaze stabilisation exercises in vestibular rehabilitation: review of the evidence and recent clinical advances. J Neurol., 2019, 266 (Suppl 1): 11. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00415-019-09459-x>.
41. Surgent OJ, Dadalko OI,  [Pickett](https://scholar.google.com/citations?user=HTv3qqYAAAAJ&hl=ar&scioq=effect+of+vestibular+rehabilitation+program+on+cortical+activation+&oi=sra) KA, et al. Balance and the brain: A review of structural brain correlates of postural balance and balance training in humans. [Gait & Posture](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/journal/09666362), 2019, [(71](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/journal/09666362/71/supp/C)): 245-252.
42. zuEulenburg P, Caspers S, Roski C, et al. Meta-analytical definition and functional connectivity of the human vestibular cortex. Neuroimage., 2012, (60): 162–169. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage>. 12.032 PMID: 22209784.
43. Lopez C, Blanke O and Mast FW. The human vestibular cortex revealed by coordinate-based activationlikelihood estimation meta-analysis. Neuroscience., 2012, (212): 159–79. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j>.neuroscience.2012.03.028PMID: 22516007.
44. Hall CD and Heusel-Gillig L. Balance rehabilitation and dual-task ability in older adult Journal of Clinical Gerontology & Geriatrics, 2010, [1(1](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/journal/22108335/1/1)): 22-26.
45. [Miller](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877065718306493#!) E, [Niwald](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877065718306493#!) M and [Redlicka](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877065718306493#!) J. Aerobic training enhances cognition and functional status in depressive multiple sclerosis patients. A case-control study. Pilot study. [Annals of Physical and Rehabilitation Medicine](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/journal/18770657), 2018, [(61):](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/journal/18770657/61/supp/S) e247-e248.
46. Fraser SA, Li KZ-H, Berryman N, et al. Does Combined Physical and Cognitive Training Improve Dual-Task Balance and Gait Outcomes in Sedentary Older Adults? Front. Hum. Neurosci., 2017, (10): 688. doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2016.00688.
47. Motl RW and Learmonth YC. Neurological disability and its association with walking impairment in multiple sclerosis: brief review. Neurodegenerative Disease Management, 2014, 4 (6): 491-500.
48. Prosperini L, Piattella C, Giannì C, et al. Functional and struc­tural brain plasticity enhanced by motor and cognitive rehabilitation in multiple sclerosis. Neural plasticity, 2015, (2015): 481574. doi: 10.1155/2015/481574. Epub 2015 May 6.

**الملخص العربي**

**تأثير برنامج إعادة التأهيل الدهليزي على الإتزان والمهارات المزدوجه للمشي في مرضى التصلب المتعدد: دراسه عشوائية محكمه.**

**الخلفية:**

يعد إضطراب وظيفة الإتزان و المهارات المزدوجة من السمات المميزة لمرض التصلب المتعدد. وعلى الرغم من ثبوت قدرة برنامج إعادة التأهيل الدهليزي على تحسين النتائج الوظيفية إلا أن تأثيره على الإتزان الديناميكي و المهارات المزدوجه للمشي في مرض التصلب المتعدد يحتاج الى مزيدا من البحث مستقبلا.

**هدف الدراسة**: التحقق من تأثير إضافة برنامج إعادة التأهيل الدهليزي الى تدريب التمرينات الهوائية على الإتزان الديناميكي و المهارات المزدوجه للمشي لدى الأشخاص الذين يعانون من مرض التصلب المتعدد.

**نوع الدراسة**: دراسة أحادية عشوائية محكمه ومعمية.

**الإعداد**: أجريت هذه الدراسة بالتعاون بين كلية العلاج الطبيعي ووحدتي التصلب المتعدد بالقصر العيني – جامعة القاهرة.

**عينة الدراسة**: 40 مريضا يعانون من التصلب المتعدد من النوع الانتكاسي .

**التدخل العلاجي :** أجريت هذه الدراسة لمده أربعة أسابيع متتالية على 40 مريضا مقسمون الى مجموعتين و هم مجموعة الدراسة والمجموعة الضابطة .وقد تكونت كل مجموعة من 20 مريضا حيث تلقت مجموعة الدراسة برنامج التمرينات العلاجية الهوائية بإستخدام العجلة الثابتة و أيضا برنامج إعاده التأهيل الدهليزي. أما المجموعة الضابطة فقد تلقت برنامج التمرينات العلاجية الهوائية بإستخدام العجلة الثابتة فقط .

**القياسات:** تم تقييم الإتزان بإختبارات مختلفة وهي مقياس بيرج للإتزان (BBS)، وتقييم سرعة المشي عن طريق إستخدام إختبارالمشي عشره أمتار (10 m-TWT ) و(DTCW) وأيضا معامل الإتزان (SI) بإستخدام جهاز البيوديكس.

**النتائج:** أظهرت نتائج البحث تحسنا ملحوظا وذو دلالة إحصائية لصالح مجموعة الدراسة في كل من مقياس بيرج للاتزان(BBB, p =0.02) ومعامل الإتزان (SI) للمستوى الرابع (p= 0.002) والمستوى السابع للتقييم (p= 0.03) ،وأيضا المهارات المزدوجه للمشي (DTCW, p= 0.003) .أما فيما يخص سرعة المشي (10 m-TWT ) فلم تظهر تحسنا ذو دلالة احصائية لأي من المجموعتين.

**الخلاصه :** فاعلية إضافة برنامج إعادة التأهيل الدهليزي الى التمرينات الهوائية على كل من الإتزان الديناميكي و المهارات المزدوجه للمشي لمرضى التصلب المتعدد.

**الكلمات الدالة :** التصلب المتعدد، برنامج إعادة التأهيل الدهليزي ، الإتزان الديناميكي، المهارات المزدوجه للمشي.



