

Compare Therapeutic Treatment Analysis of Neuro Developmental Versus Non NDT Approach for the Management of 3-8 Years Old Little Disease

Research Article

DOI: 10.59152/ESJPH/1015

Karthikeyan T*

Physiotherapy Center, NIMHANS, Bangalore, India

Received: June 15, 2022; **Accepted:** July 04, 2022; **Published:** July 11, 2022

***Corresponding author:** Dr. T. Karthikeyan, PhD, D.LITT, Physiotherapist, NIMHANS, Bangalore-29, India

Copyright: © 2022 Dr. T. Karthikeyan. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Abstract

A type of little disease in which has prominent therapeutic symptoms of bilateral spasticity, with the lower extremities more severely affected than upper extremity. It is non progressive neurological disorder mainly affecting human locomotor system the term refereed to little disease. Little disease is not genetic or hereditary and parents do not need to worry about the condition being passed down within a family. This is the first Indian based study to find out & compare the therapeutic efficacy of NDT versus Non NDT approach of for little disease children. The objective of study is to compare the motor abilities, social function and self care skills pre to post treatment analysis in NDT approach with without NDT. The methods of data collection used 30 LD children recruited for this study. The Type of study pre to post experiment design and duration of study carried out 8 weeks duration. The pre test score is 41.33 and pre test score is 50.33 of group A. The pretest score is 38.47 and pretest score is 50.93 of group A. This study suggests that intermittent NDT that is NDT versus non NDT in LD children leads to improvement in overall gross motor abilities and self care skills. This study suggests that NDT is effective when the parents are giving more time for exercise in the home session and Non NDT will improve the overall body function which helps the LD children to perform a self-care activity of age between 3-8 years old LD children. Overall this therapeutic approach which help to improve gross motor function, health, balance, coordination, posture, mobility, self care and Social function.

Keywords: LD; GMFM; PEDI; COPM

Introduction

A type of little disease in which has prominent therapeutic symptoms of bilateral spasticity, with the lower extremities more severely affected than upper extremity. Little disease is actually an umbrella term for several different types of physical disabilities. The term “cerebral” refers to the area of the brain that is affected by the disease. The disease often includes other connections in the brain involving the cortex and parts of the cerebellum as well. The term “palsy” refers to the disorder of movement.

Little disease causes damage to the motor control centers of the brain and can occur during different parts of pregnancy and birth. Approximately 75% of little disease cases occur during pregnancy and approximately 5% occur during birth. Additionally, it can occur after childbirth up to about age three. Little disease occurs in an average of 2 to 3 babies out of 1000 live births. There has also been a slight increase in these numbers in recent years.

Gross Motor Function Classification System, is a five-level classification that differentiates children with little disease based on the child's current gross motor abilities, limitations in gross motor function, and need for assistive technology and wheeled mobility.

The damage that is caused by the disorder will not worsen over time. However, secondary orthopedic conditions are common with this disorder. It is not uncommon for patients to develop arthritis and osteoporosis much sooner than typical adults. Unfortunately, much of the information on little disease is related solely to the pediatric patient rather than the adult patient.

Little disease is not genetic or hereditary and parents do not need to worry about the condition being passed down within a family.

A group of permanent disorders of the development of movement and posture, causing activity limitations that are attributed to non-progressive disturbances that occurred in the developing fetal or infant brain. The motor disorders of little disease are often accompanied by disturbances of sensation, perception, cognition, communication and behaviour, by epilepsy and by secondary musculoskeletal problems."

Obviously this is a clinical definition meaning that little disease is a condition in which there may be abnormal brain development or injury to the brain as it develops. This can occur before, during, after birth or during early childhood.

Children with little disease have difficulties in controlling muscles and movements as they grow and develop. The nature and extent of these difficulties may change as children grow but little disease itself is not progressive: the injury or impairment in the brain does not change. However, the effects of the brain injury on the body may change over time for better or worse. Physiotherapy and other therapies can often help people with little disease reach their full potential and become more independent therefore children with little disease will often be referred to a therapist or see a multi-disciplinary team through referral to the local Child Development Centre.

Depending on the precise area of the brain that is affected, there may be associated difficulties which become obvious during development; for example, in vision, hearing, learning and behaviour.

It is not unusual for a diagnosis not to be given until the child's motor development is nearly complete as

doctors observe the child through the development stages of sitting, crawling and walking. There is currently no test before birth that will identify little disease.

Definition of Little disease

Little disease (LD) describe a group of permanent disorders of the development of movements & posture causing activity limitation that are attributed to non progressive disturbances that occurred in the developing fetal or the infant brain .The motor disorder of C.P are accompanied by disturbance of sensation , perception, cognition , communication & behaviour , epilepsy & by secondary musculoskeletal problems.

Incidence of LD in India

The incidence of LD is 2-2.5 cases per 1000 live births as given by government of Karnataka (Bangalore Children's Hospital) in 2002-03.

There are an estimated 25 lakhs children and people in India with LD, making it the commonest cause of disability

Medically it is important to remember that little disease:

(1) It is NOT contagious (2) It is NOT hereditary (3) It is NOT life-threatening 2

Spastic (70-80% of cases) : a) Quadriplegia (10-15%): All 4 extremities are affected equally along with the trunk b) Diplegia (30-40%): Lower extremities are affected to a greater degree than the upper extremities c) Hemiplegia (20- 30%): Involvement is observed on 1 side of the body, including an arm and a leg d) Monoplegia (rare): Involvement is noted in 1 limb, either an arm or a leg Dyskinetic (10-15% of cases).

Characterized by abnormal movements

Ataxic (<5% of cases). Characterized by unsteadiness.

No particular ethnic groups seem to be at higher risk for LD. However, people of disadvantaged back-ground are at higher risk due to poorer access to proper prenatal care and advanced medical services.

Characteristic Features of Spastic Little disease (Treatment of little disease and motor delay, Sophie levitt, 5th ed.)57

Main motor characteristics are Hypertonus of clasp knife variety:- if the spastic muscles are stretched at a particular speed they respond in an exaggerated fashion, they contract blocking the movement. The hyperactive

stretch reflex may occur at the beginning, middle or near the end of range of movement. There are increased tendon jerks, occasional clonus and other signs of upper motor neuron lesions

Abnormal postures:- they are usually associated with the antigravity muscles which are extensors in the leg and the flexors in the arm.

Hypertonus may be either spasticity or rigidity .the overlap between the two is almost impossible to differentiate rigidity is recognized by a plastic or continuous resistance to passive stretch throughout the full range of motion.

Voluntary movement:- Voluntary motion may be present but laboured. There may be weakness in the initiation of motion or during movement at different parts of its range the groups of muscles or chains of muscles used in the movement patterns are different from those used in the normal children of same age, either the muscles used in association are stereotyped and are occasionally seen in normal child, usually at an infantile level of movement or the association of muscles is abnormal. For example, extension-adduction-internal rotation is used in creeping and walking .this may be impossible in spastics who continue to use the same patterns at all times in the motor skills. Another example is shoulder flexion-adduction with some external rotation in feeding and combing one's hair in the normal arm pattern in the case of spastics the arm pattern is usually flexion-adduction with internal rotation of the elbow. In taking the step in walking the normal pattern is flexion-adduction-external rotation of hip, whereas the spastic pattern is usually flexion-adduction-internal rotation of the hip. Other abnormal movement patterns occur as co-contraction of agonist with the antagonist, instead of normal relaxation of the antagonist; this blocks the movement or makes it laboured. There is usually mass movement in which the child is unable to move the isolated joint. This absence of discrete movement is characteristic feature of many spastics.

Intelligence varies but generally more impaired than children with athetoid little disease, Perceptual problems , especially of spatial relationships , are more common in spastic type of little disease, Sensory loss occurs in the child with hemiplegia occasionally, Rib cage abnormalities and poor respiration may exist, Epilepsies are more common than in the other Types of little disease.

Classification by number of limbs involved

Quadriplegia - all 4 limbs are involved.

Diplegia - all four limbs are involved. Both legs are more severely affected than the arms.

Hemiplegia - one side of the body is affected. The arm is usually more involved than the leg.

Triplegia - three limbs are involved, usually both arms and a leg.

Monoplegia - only one limb is affected, usually an arm.

Classification by Movement Disorder

Spastic LD- Spastic muscles are tight and stiff, and have increased resistance to being stretched. They become overactive when used and produce clumsy movements. Normal muscles work in pairs: when one group contracts, the other group relax to allow free movement in the desired direction. Spastic muscles become active together and block effective movement. This muscular "tug-of-war" is called co-contraction.

Spasticity may be mild and affect only a few movements, or severe and affect the whole body. The amount of spasticity usually changes over time. Therapy, surgery, drugs and adaptive equipment may help to control spasticity. Damage to the brain's cerebral cortex is generally the cause of spastic little disease [1-5].

Athetoid LD- Athetosis leads to difficulty in controlling and co-ordinating movement. People with athetoid little disease has many involuntary writhing movements and is constantly in motion. They often have speech difficulties. Athetoid little disease results from damage to the basal ganglia in the midbrain. It was once common as a result of blood type incompatibility, but is now rarely seen.

Ataxic LD- Ataxic LD is the least common form of little disease. People with ataxic LD have a disturbed sense of balance and depth perception. They usually have poor muscle tone (hypotonic), a staggering walk and unsteady hands. Ataxia results from damage to the cerebellum, the brain's major centre for balance and co-ordination.

Combined Classifications

The classifications of movement disorder and number of limbs involved are usually combined (e.g. spastic diplegia). These technical words can be useful in describing the type and extent of little disease, but they are only labels. A label does not describe an individual.

Premature birth is major risk factor for little disease, with infants born at the threshold of viability being 70




Figure 1: Analysis of functional skill: Self care domain within the NDT and Non NDT (Pre to post analysis)




Figure 2: Analysis of functional skill: Mobility domain within the NDT and Non NDT (Pre to post analysis)




Figure 3: Analysis of functional skill: Social function domain within the NDT and Non NDT (Pre to post analysis)

times more likely to be diagnosed with the disease than those born at term.

According to the United Little Disease, about 10% of children with little disease acquire the disorder after birth in U.S. it results from brain damage in first few months or years of life. Little disease often follows infection of brain such as bacterial meningitis or viral encephalitis or it may be result of a head injury. Due to breech births, vascular or respiratory problems in the infants during birth, physical birth defect such as faulty spinal bone formation, groin hernias or an abnormally small jaw bone, seizures shortly

after birth, a low birth weight less than 2,500 grams or 5lbs.

The most commonly used classification system describes the type of tone abnormality and the limb involvement by tone abnormalities it is classified as spastic, diskintetic, hypotonic, and mixed. By limb involvement it is diplegia, quadriplegia, triplegia, hemiplegia.

Children with little disease are treated with physical therapy to facilitate motor development and to improve their independence in motor skills, self-care, plays, leisure activities. There are different approaches have been developed (eg, NeuroDevelopmental Therapy {NDT}, the vojta method, conductive education, sensory integrative therapy) that differ in their specific treatment strategies, but aim at leading children with little disease towards the greatest degree of independence possible.

There are many approaches in the management of little disease. Out of which Neuro developmental therapy (NDT) is more important and essential aspect in spastic little disease management.

The study has been shown that NDT therapy three times of week for period of 12 weeks is effective. My aim of study is to see the same effect in five times a week in period of 8 weeks can lead to maintain motor abilities and self-care functions but three times a week for a period of 12 weeks is long term and economical and time consuming for the patient. So purpose of this study is to know whether five times a week for a period of 8 weeks is effective or not to maintain motor abilities and self-care functions.

Objective of Study

To compare the therapeutic treatment analysis of motor abilities social function and self care skills pre to post with NDT versus without NDT approach for management of little diseases children.

Methodology

Source of data

Physiotherapy Center, NIMHANS Hospital, Bangalore.

Methods of collection of data

Population: 30 children diagnosis with LD Sample

Design: Randomized block design

Type of study: pre test to post experiment design.

Duration of study: 8 weeks

Inclusion Criteria:

1. Children with diagnosis of little disease.
2. Little disease age group between 3 to 8 years.
3. Little disease Children classified in levels I-IV at the gross motor function classification system 9GMFCS0.
4. LD children are able to accept and follow verbal instructions.
5. Mild to moderate little disease.
6. Both genders.

Exclusion Criteria

1. Little disease with instable seizures
2. Little disease with surgical procedure up to 3 months
3. Little disease they have received treatment for spasticity.
4. Little disease if they are suffered from other diseases that interfered with physical activity.
5. Little disease whose family fell uncomfortable or unable to respond interview and questionnaire.
6. Children with less than normal IQ.

Material Used

1. Gross motor function major scale (GMFM)
2. The paediatric evaluation of disability inventory (PEDI)
3. Couch
4. Physio ball, mat, Canadian occupational performance measure (COPM)

Intervention to conduct participants

Informed consent taken from parents of LD child. Children who meet the inclusion criteria will be assigned two group based on randomized sampling of baseline measurement will be taken using pediatric disability inventory and gross motor functional measurement scale. The intervention will be started with both groups together with steps in discussing and formulating problems and goals with the parents using Canadian Occupational Performance Measure (COPM) and goal attainment scaling (GAS). Intervention will be in both groups carried out 5days in week for 2 months. Measurement are taken prior to intervention and after 2 months of intervention [6-10].

Group A-Ndt Approach

Concept was developed by Dr. k. bobath is based on neuro developmental techniques and it views development as dynamic, sequential cephalo caudal, proximal distal, automatic before conscious responsive and lastly adaptive.

Bobath believed in inhibiting the primitive reflex pattern using promotion movements in normal patterns as well as combination.

GROUP B-Non NDT

In the non NDT group intervention focuses primarily on improving body function and structure as the starting point of intervention children will be treated with normal movement pattern and postural handling, maintaining ROM and joint alignment through stretching, co-ordination, balance, casting and splinting.

Out Come Measure

1. Gross motor functional measure scale (GMFMS)
2. The paediatrics of disability inventory (PEDM)
3. Functional skills, caregiver, assistance and modification of the environment.

The outcome variables will be analyzed using a one-tailed repeated- measures analysis of variance. Alpha will be set as 0.05

To compare the groups' improvements, effect sizes will be calculated using the difference scores (the score on last follow-up assessment minus the score on the pretest measurements) of both groups with Cohen's Guidelines as the reference





Table 1: Gender distribution of Subjects

Gender	Group B (No. of Subjects)	Percentage of distribution	Group A (No. of Subjects)	Percentage of distribution
Males	9	60%	7	46.67%
Females	6	40%	8	53.33%
Total	15	100%	15	100%
Chi-square	P<0.001**		P<0.001** P=0.782	

Table 2: Age Distribution of the LD children studied

Age in years	NDT (No of subjects)	Percentage	Non NDT (No of subjects)	Percentage
3-4	1	6.67%	0	0%
4-5	5	33.33%	0	0
5-6	2	13.33%	5	33.33%
6-7	4	26.67%	6	40%
7-8	3	20%	4	26.67%
Total	15	100%	15	100%
Mean	5.26±1.32	-	5.89±0.63	-
Min-Max	3-8	-	5-7	-

Table 3: GMFM level of the little disease children

Level	NDT (No of subjects)	Percentage	Non NDT (No of subjects)	Percentage
II	2	13.3%	6	40%
III	6	40%	5	33.3%
IV	7	46.7%	4	26.7%
Total	15	100%	15	100%

Results

Group A: NDT

Group B: Non NDT

The above table shows that the study is carried out on total of 15 children in each group consisting 9 male and 6 female subjects in Non NDT; 8 females and 7 male subjects in NDT with statistically significant difference in subjects taken with p<0.001. The above table shows that 40% of females and 60% of males were studied in group B.

The above table shows that in NDT there were 1 subject in age group between 3-4 years and 5 in age group between 4-5 years, 2 in age group between 5-6 years, 3 in age group between 7-8 years with mean age of the subjects were 5.26 years. Non-NDT there were 5 subjects in age group between 5-6 years and 6 in age group between 6-7 years, 4 in age group between 7-8 years with mean age of the subjects were 5.89 years.

** Statistically Significant difference p<0.05 a. Pared t test. b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test; NS- Not significant

The above table shows that when means of parameters analyzed from pre to post intervention, there is a statistically significant improvement in means of Self care domain, Mobility domain and Social function domain within the NDT and Non NDT when analyzed from pre intervention to post intervention with p<0.000.

The above graph shows that there is a statistically significant difference in means of Self Care domain within NDT and Non NDT when analyzed within in groups from pre intervention to post intervention.

The above graph shows that there is a statistically significant difference in means of mobility domain score within NDT and Non NDT when analyzed within in groups from pre intervention to post intervention.

Table 4: Analysis of functional skill within the NDT and Non NDT (Pre to post analysis)

	Pre intervention (Mean±SD) min-max	Post intervention (Mean±SD) min-max	Percent age of change	t value a (Paramet ric)	Z valueb (Non paramet ric)	95%Confidence interval of the difference		Significance (2-tailed) P value
						Lower	Upper	
GROUP A								
Self care domain	39.67± 5.39 (30 -47)	47.20± 4.98 (40-56)	-2.31%	-7.203	-3.376	-9.777	-5.290	P <0.000**
Mobility domain	33.67± 4.60 (25 -40)	42.87± 1.92 (40-46)	- 44.89%	-7.357	-3.411	-11.882	-6.518	P <0.000**
Social function domain	41.33± 2.71 (37- 48)	50.33± 6.28 (41-62)	- 52.42%	-5.077	-3.327	-12.802	-5.198	P <0.000**
GROUP B								
Self care domain	32.00± 5.34 (21- 40)	42.67± 5.39 (32-50)	-1.60%	-7.375	-3.411	-13.769	-7.564	P <0.000**
Mobility domain	29.07± 3.55 (24 -38)	40.27± 5.17 (32 -49)	- 47.36%	-11.084	-3.417	-13.367	-9.033	P <0.000**
Social function domain	38.47± 4.43 (30 -45)	50.93± 5.33 (40-56)	- 43.68%	-12.979	-3.411	-14.527	-10.407	P <0.000**

The above graph shows that there is a statistically significant difference in means of Social function domain within NDT and Non NDT when analyzed within in groups from pre intervention to post intervention.

The above table shows that when means of parameters were compared between NDT and Non NDT before intervention, there is a statistically significant in means of Self care domain, Mobility domain and no statistical significance in Social function domain between the NDT and Non NDT. There is a statistically significant in means of Self-care domain, Mobility domain and no statistical significance in Social function domain between the NDT and Non NDT. When means of parameters were compared between group A and group B post intervention, there is no statistically significant in means of Self care domain, Mobility domain and Social function domain between the NDT and Non NDT.

Discussion

This study aimed to compare the effectiveness of NDT versus non NDT therapeutic approach. The study has focused the role of non NDT and NDT in the 3-8 years old little disease children. The following outcome variables of scale GMFM- 66 (p=0.00) and PEDI (p=0.00) between the group was found to be highly significant at 6 months.

Thus all the children with Spastic LD in both the groups were assessed on GMFM-66 I areas of Lying and Rolling, sitting, standing, walking, running and jumping At 3 months and 6 months. Highly significant differences are seen in between control and experimental groups [11].

GMFM is consistent in the measurement of gross motor skills and those children with little disease exhibit stable gross motor skills during repeat measurement when the time of day, therapists, and evaluation setting were held constant. The GMFM was administered twice, within a

Table 5: Comparison of domains of functional skills between the NDT and Non NDT

	NDT(Mean±SD) min-max	Non NDT(Mean±SD) min-max	Percentage of change	t value a (Parametric)	Z valueb (Non parametric)	95%Confidence interval of the difference		Significance (2-tailed) P value
						Lower	Upper	
PRE INTERVENTION COMPARISON								
Self care	39.67± 5.39 (30 -47)	32.00± 5.34 (21- 40)	0.43%	3.910	-3.179	3.650	11.683	P =0.001**
Mobility	33.67± 4.60 (25 -40)	29.07± 3.55 (24 -38)	0.0%	3.061	-2.601	1.522	7.678	P=0.005*
S o c i a l function	41.33± 2.71 (37- 48)	38.47± 4.43 (30 -45)	9.83%	2.134	-1.749	0.115	5.619	P =0.042 (NS)
POST INTERVENTION COMPARISON								
Self care	47.20± 4.98 (40-56)	42.67± 5.39 (32-50)	-1.13%	2.390	-1.893	0.647	8.419	P =0.024 (NS)
Mobility	42.87± 1.92 (40-46)	40.27± 5.17 (32 -49)	1.69%	1.824	-1.332	-0.320	5.520	P=0. 079 (NS)
S o c i a l function	50.33± 6.28 (41-62)	50.93± 5.33 (40-56)	3.93%	-0.282	-.727	-4.962	3.762	P =0.780 (NS)

one-week time period, to twenty-one children with little disease. So this proves that this scale will be helpful in future analysis of treatment efficacy using the GMFM as an outcome measure. Neurodevelopment treatment used in this study consisted of handling techniques, inhibition and facilitation techniques, weight shifting and weight bearing, integration of activities, positioning and adaptive equipment.

Throughout the trial, NDT intervention for both groups was based on the fundamental and current principles of the approach, as it has evolved more recently (Bobath and Bobath (1984)9; Bly (1991)23; Mayston (2001a, 2001b) 43;44.

In this study parents are taught correct handling techniques, positioning the child in ant deformity position in bed, chair and on floor, activities which improves gross and fine motor hand functions , play activities which improve gross motor and visual perceptual skills like ball catching and throwing, ball kicking, memory games etc. Are given as a home programme. Treatment strategies involving both parents and children have been shown to be most effective in achieving an enhanced developmental outcome.

Respective studies have suggested that Parent/ caregiver education is one of the main elements of the intervention which is intended to facilitate the parent-

child relationship, enable the parent to handle/assist with their child's difficulties, and give an intensive period for practice of activities.

The parent's journey of adjustment and their capacity to participate in activities to improve their child's abilities. Initially, parents were coming to grips with the diagnosis, and this precluded their full involvement in home activities. However, at a point of breakthrough, they entered a phase of high participation interpreted as striving to maximize. Parental participation is necessary in promoting the psychosocial well-being of children. After reviewing the literature concerning people with little disease and the effects of strength training on muscle strength, mobility, gait function, spasticity, and self-concept, there seems to be a positive correlation between "progressive, task-oriented strength training" in a community setting and improvements in the dependent variables. There is also evidence of the relationship between lower body strength training and motor functioning, while there wasn't any evidence of strengthening exercises increasing spasticity. It is important that parents as well as physical educators have an idea of where weaknesses generally are in children with little disease, and what exercises work on those areas of concern. It is in accordance with the study conducted by T.Dolenc Velinkovi et.al (2005) that followed the same sequence and concluded that with early treatment we have the chance to integrate active normal sensory-motor experiences before abnormal movement patterns have become a habit. NDT is a successful approach but we should not think that we can cure a brain lesion or little disease, or that we can change all cases to only "minimal" little disease. If the treatment is started before abnormal patterns of movement have become established, we can help the child to organize his potential abilities in what for him is the most normal way.

Conclusion

The author found that both therapeutic techniques which help to improve self-care, mobility, social function for little disease 3-8 years old children. But statistical analysis of NDT which support & providing superior treatment effects than Non NDT therapeutic approach. This study suggests that intermittent NDT that is NDT versus non NDT in LD children leads to improvement in

overall gross motor abilities and self care skills. If there is no carryover immediately following treatment session, the positive effects of NDT is debatable. Outcomes as seen on components of Gross Motor Function Measure at three and six months, the physical Therapist has been able to establish higher scores in gross motor skills and self care activities.

This study suggests that NDT is effective when the parents are giving more time for exercise in the home session. And Non NDT improves the overall body function which help the LD children to perform a self-care activity. Overall this therapeutic approach which help to improve gross motor function, health, balance, coordination, posture, mobility, self care and Social function.

References

1. Kuban kc. Leviton A. C.P. n ENG j med. 1994; 330: 188-195.
2. Hirtz D, Thurman DJ. Gwinn-Hardy K, Mohamed M, Chaudhri AR, et al. How common are the "common neurologic disorders? Neurology. 2007; 68: 326-337.
3. Cummins SK, Nelson KB, Grether JK veli EM. Little disease in four northern California counties birth through 1983 through 1985. J Peadiatr. 1993; 123: 230-237.
4. Pellegrino L, c.p. in MZ batshaw et al. children with disability, 6th edition 2007; 307-408.
5. Bax M. Terminology and classification of little disease in childhood. Der med child neurol. 1964; 6: 295-297.
6. Majolijnketelaar, Adri Vermeer, Harm't Hart. Effects of functional therapy program on motor abilities of children with little disease, physical therapy. 2001; 81: 1534-1545.
7. Charlene Butler, Johnne Darrah. Effects of NDT for little disease: an AALDDM evidence report. Development medicine and child neurology. 2001; 43: 778-790.
8. Anne Brit Sorsdal, Rolf Moe-nilssen, Helga K Kaale2. Change in basic motor abilities, quality of movement and every day activities following intensive, goal-directed, activity- focused physiotherapy in a group setting for children with LD. BMC Pediatrics. 2010; 10: 26.
9. Sigrid Ostensj O, IngvilOien, BjOrgFallang. Goal-oriented rehabilitation of pre-schoolers with little disease- a multi-case study of combined use of the Canadian Occupational Performance measure (COPM) and the Goal Attainment Scaling (GAS). 2008; 11: 252-259.
10. Mary Law, Johanna Darrah, nancy Pollock. Focus on Functional randomized controlled trial comparing two rehabilitation interventions for young children with little disease. BMC Pediatrics. 2007; 7: 31.
11. E Beckung, Carlsson G. The natural history of gross motor development in children with little disease aged 1 to 15 years. Dev Med & Child Neurol. 2007; 49: 751-756.