# **Complementary physical therapies for movement** disorders in Parkinson's disease: a systematic review

P. ALVES DA ROCHA<sup>1, 2</sup>, J. MCCLELLAND<sup>3</sup>, M. E. MORRIS<sup>1</sup>

Background. The growth and popularity of complementary physical therapies for Parkinson's disease (PD) attempt to fill the gap left by conventional exercises, which does not always directly target wellbeing, enjoyment and social participation.

Aim. To evaluate the effects of complementary physical therapies on motor performance, quality of life and falls in people living with PD.

Design. Systematic review with meta-analysis.

Population. Outpatients - adults diagnosed with idiopathic PD, male or female, modified Hoehn and Yahr scale I-IV, any duration of PD, any duration of physical treatment or exercise.

Methods. Randomized controlled trials, non-randomized controlled trials and case series studies were identified by systematic searching of health and rehabilitation electronic databases. A standardized form was used to extract key data from studies by two independent researchers.

Results. 1210 participants from 20 randomized controlled trials, two non-randomized controlled trials and 13 case series studies were included. Most studies had moderately strong methodological quality. Dancing, water exercises and robotic gait training were an effective adjunct to medical management for some people living with PD. Virtual reality training, mental practice, aerobic training, boxing and Nordic walking training had a small amount of evidence supporting their use in PD.

Conclusion. On balance, alternative physical therapies are worthy of consideration when selecting treatment options for people with this common chronic disease. Clinical Rehabilitation Impact. Complementary physical therapies such as dancing, hydrotherapy and

Corresponding author: P. Alves da Rocha, Department of Physiotherapy, College Science, Health and Engineering, School Allied Health, La Trobe University, Bundoora, VIC 3086, Australia. E-mail: prialves\_fisio@yahoo.com.br

Department of Physiotherapy, College Science Health and Engineering, School Allied Health, La Trobe University, Bundoora, Australia CAPES Foundation, Ministry of Education of Brazil Brasília, Brazil

<sup>3</sup>Department of Rehabilitation, Nutrition and Sport College of Science. Health and Engineering La Trobe University, Bundoora, Australia

#### robotic gait training appear to afford therapeutic benefits, increasing mobility and quality of life, in some people living with PD.

KEY WORDS: Parkinson disease - Rehabilitation - Exercise therapy - Complementary therapies.

Parkinson's disease (PD) is a common neurodegenerative disorder, especially in older adults.<sup>1</sup> The worldwide prevalence per 100,000 is around 425 for people aged 65-74 years, and above 1900 for those older than age 80.2 People with PD can experience a range of movement disorders such as slowness, reduced movement amplitude, difficulty walking and balance problems.3, 4 These movement disorders can be associated with falls 5, 6 and reduced quality of life.7 If not carefully managed, movement disorders can lead to considerable disability.8

Worldwide, there is a trend towards including exercise, physical activity and movement rehabilitation alongside medical and surgical management of PD.9-12 Physical therapies and movement rehabilitation are frequently recommended for people with

Publisher.

proprietary information of the

PD and is received by around 7% people with PD in the UK and around 60% in the Netherlands.13 Physical therapy incorporates a variety of methods and techniques such as movement strategies,<sup>14</sup> cueing,<sup>11</sup> progressive resistance strength training,<sup>15</sup> gait and balance training<sup>16</sup> and falls prevention program.<sup>5</sup> There are now several large systematic reviews on the outcomes of conventional physiotherapy for PD showing improvements in gait speed, step length, walking and turning, balance and motor disabilities 3, 15-21

In recent years, some complementary physical activities have been proposed for people with PD with the goal of optimizing mobility whilst at the same time being enjoyable, and enhancing quality of life, social inclusion and wellbeing.<sup>22</sup> These include activities such as dancing, boxing, tai chi, virtual reality training, robotic gait training, whole body vibration and hydrotherapy.<sup>23-28</sup> The growth and popularity of complementary therapies attempt to fill the gap left by conventional exercise therapy, which does not always directly target wellbeing, enjoyment and social participation. This might be one reason why conventional physical therapies for PD are sometimes associated with poor adherence and compliance over the longer term.

The aim of this systematic review was to evaluate the effects of complementary physical therapies aimed at improving motor disabilities in people living with PD. We have focused our review of alternative therapies on dancing, tai chi and re- Exclusion criteria lated activities, martial arts, hydrotherapy, whole body vibration, robotic gait training, virtual reality training and mental practice, given that these are the most frequent approaches used in recent literature.

# Materials and methods

Published articles meeting the following criteria were included in this systematic review:

Design:

— randomized controlled trials (RCTs);

non-randomized controlled trials (NRCTs);

- case series studies.

NRCTs and case series studies were included to increase the representability and generality of the findings.

Participants:

— people diagnosed with idiopathic PD;

— adults (>18 years old);

— male or female;

- modified Hoehn and Yahr Scale I-IV (H&Y);29

— any duration of PD;

any duration of physical treatment or exercise. Interventions:

- "alternative" physical therapy compared with no treatment;

- "alternative" physical therapy compared with conventional physical therapy (e.g. cueing, strength training, gait training, balance training, hand training, physiotherapy);

"alternative" physical therapy compared with another "alternative" method of physical therapy.

Dependent variables:

- mobility (Timed up and Go, five times sit to stand, Functional Reach Test):

- balance (Berg Balance Scale, ABC Scale, MiniBest Test, Tinetti Balance Scale, Four Square Step Test);

gait (walking speed, step length, stride length, cadence, 10m Walk Test, 6min Walk Test);

- falls (Fall calendar, Falls Efficacy Scale);

activities of daily living (Barthel Index, UPDRS II, B'DS, Schwab and England);

- quality of life (PDQ-39, SF-36, PDQL, Nottingham's Scale);

- disease severity (UPDRS, UPDRS III, UPDRS I).

Books, theses and conference abstracts were not included in this systematic review.

We excluded studies that used specific trainings such as strength, resistance, stretching, balance and gait training with cues because they have been used as a type of physical therapy for a long time, with good quality of evidence of their benefits.

## Identification and selection of studies

A systematic search of the literature was conducted with retrieval of published articles indexed on health electronic databases from Medline, Embase, Cinahl, The Cochrane Library and Pedro. The search was limited to studies written in English, Spanish or Portuguese, because these languages were spoken by the authors. Each database had a different search strategy. Nevertheless, for all of them the key words

Publisher

is protected by

document

were: "Parkinson's disease, rehabilitation, non-conventional physical therapies, alternative therapies, complementary physical therapies, exercise therapy, socio environmental therapy". References for the identified studies were also hand searched by the first author.

After the initial search the titles and abstracts identified were screened by the first author. Full-texts were then evaluated and documented by two authors (PAR and CV). Disagreements were resolved through a consensus meeting. Figure 1 shows the details for the search process.

# Assessment of study characteristics

A standardized data extraction form containing kev information was constructed to identify and extract features of the included studies. This included the types of therapies and treatments, the aims of the study, the design, the number of participants, sex, mean age, inclusion criteria, exclusion criteria, the mean modified HY Score, the method of randomization, allocation concealment, blinding, number of patients randomized, number of drop outs, outcomes, assessment tools and period, type of each intervention, duration of the program (number of sessions), therapy duration (length of session), frequency (number of therapies per week), follow up, results of each outcome (mean and standard deviation), and any side effects that occurred during the trial. To be included, the studies needed to assess functional mobility, activities of daily living, gait, quality of life, balance or a combination of these.

Each of the studies was examined in relation to risk of bias by two reviewers (PAR, CV), according to a standardized form based on the Cochrane collaboration tool.<sup>30</sup> All items were judged to be either adequate (low risk of bias), inadequate (high risk of bias) or unclear (unclear). Methodological quality was assessed with two different tools. The PEDro scale was used to assess RCT and for NRCT and case series we used the Downs and Black check-list.31 Both scales are valid, reliable and have strong internal and external validity.31-33

#### Data synthesis

Publisher

proprietary information of the

Due to the heterogeneity of studies and different designs and variables used, descriptive analyses were conducted with the interventions and variables. A meta-analysis of RCTs was conducted when possible.

#### Results

Thirty-five studies met the inclusion criteria for this systematic review. There were 20 RCTs, two NRCT and 13 case series studies. All provided reasonably clear descriptions of the participants and interventions.

Thirteen studies carried out follow-up assessments<sup>23-25</sup>, 34-43.

#### Participants

The number of participants ranged from 6-145, with 1210 participants in total. All studies recorded the mean age, which had a mean of  $60.17\pm10.26$ years <sup>24</sup> to 72.77±7.87 years.<sup>44</sup> Two reported means without standard deviation (SD).40,45 One study did not described stage of disease progression.25 The mean duration of PD ranged from 2.4 years to 11.2 years. One study did not provide data about disease duration.46

# Therapy frequency

The frequency of therapy was defined as number of sessions per week. Three studies had one session per week,26,47,48 19 had two sessions per week 24, 34-36, 39-41, 44, 46, 49-58, eight provided therapy three times per week 23, 37, 38, 42, 43, 45, 49, 59 and six had therapy five times per week.27, 60-64 One study reported different numbers of sessions across the trial.<sup>49</sup> ranging from two occasions of service per week to three occasion of service per week.

#### Therapy intensity

The intensity of therapy was reported in some investigations. Typically, intensity was reported in relation to the amount of weight lifted during progressive resistance strength training. Others quantified intensity in relationship to the speed of movements during therapy. Six studies provided data about therapy intensity. 37, 38, 42, 43, 47, 64

Article. It is not permitted to make additional copies

This document is protected by international copyright laws. No additional reproduction is authorized. It is permitted for personal use to download and save only one file and print only one copy of this.



Figure 1.-Search Strategy Based on PRISMA Flow Diagram.

# Therapy duration

The duration of each type of therapy was defined as the length of each session during the rehabilitation program. Six studies provided 90 minutes of therapy,<sup>24, 26, 48, 61-63</sup> 16 studies provided 60 minutes, 27, 34-36, 39, 40, 45, 49-53, 55-58 one provided 55 minutes,<sup>44</sup> one 50 minutes,<sup>59</sup> six provided 45 minutes, 37, 38, 41, 43, 47, 64 one study delivered 40 minute sessions<sup>54</sup>, two implemented 30 minute sessions <sup>23, 42</sup> and one 20 minutes.<sup>46</sup> One study had session durations longer than 90 minutes.<sup>25</sup>

# *Type of therapy*

Many of the alternative therapy studies were about dance therapy and hydrotherapy. The others were about tai chi, virtual reality therapy, mental practice, aerobic exercises, robotic gait training, boxing, whole body vibration and Nordic walking training. Table I lists the types of interventions used as well as studies design and measurement tools.

# Feasibility and safety

studies had drop-outs dur-Sixteen no ing the sessions or over the follow up period. 26, 27, 37, 38, 40, 43-46, 49, 52, 54, 57, 62-64 Safety was determined by the number and severity of adverse effects during intervention. Twelve studies reported no adverse effects during therapy sessions. 23, 24, 27, 36, 38, 39, 43, 45, 46, 48, 50, 62 One study reported drop outs with participants reporting that "the intervention causes too much effort and motor actions were too confronting".34 One study reported one fall during a therapy session.<sup>26</sup> The other studies did not mention adverse effects.

# Methodological quality

Fourteen RCTs studies scored six to eight indicating good methodological quality, 23, 26, 27, 34, 36, 38, 39, 43, 49, 53, 57, 59, 61, 64 five of the studies scored four to five indicating fair quality 41, 42, 53, 55, 56, 58 and one scored three indicating relatively low quality <sup>25</sup> according to PEDro Scale.

One NRCT scored 17 indicating fair methodology quality.44 One study scored 20 indicating good quality.<sup>50</sup> Most of the case series scored

16 to 19 indicating fair methodology qualitv.24, 37, 40, 45-48, 51, 52, 61, 63 One scored less than 15 indicating poor quality 54 according to Downs and Black check-list.

# Measurement tools

Table I shows the measurement tools used in each study. Mobility was the primary variable of interest for this systematic review and was reported in 19 studies using different measurement tools (Timed up and Go, five times sit to stand, Functional Reach Test). Gait was assessed in 24 studies, while balance was measured in 18 studies and falls just in two. Activities of daily living, quality of life and disease severity were measured in nine, 14 and 24 studies, respectively.

## Therapy effects

TAI CHI (N.=2 RCT/1 case series)

Studies that analyzed tai chi showed improvements for functional mobility, gait and disease severity.36, 62 One RCT concluded that tai chi was not better than QiGong, with no significant differences between groups.<sup>49</sup> However this trial had a very small sample size (21 participants) compared to Li 2012 (195 participants).

WATER EXERCISES (N.=2NRCT. 2 CASE SERIES AND 2 RCT)

Some authors reported improvements in walking.44, 51 Others showed that water exercises were associated with improved quality of life and falls.<sup>27</sup> The other studies did not show significant changes between groups.

#### ROBOTIC GAIT TRAINING (N=4 RCT)

A small number of studies on robotic gait training demonstrated improvements in functional mobility,<sup>2</sup>, balance <sup>38</sup> and disease severity.<sup>64</sup> All of them evidenced significant results on gait.

Robotic gait training had more optimal outcomes than physiotherapy for gait, balance and movement disorders. There were no differences between treadmill walking training and robotic gait training for gait and disease severity (Figures 2-4).

Publisher.

proprietary information of the



		Measurement tools								
Intervention	Study	Mobility	ADL	Gait	JoQ	Balance	Falls	Disease severity		
Tai Chi	Li 2007 (case series) <sup>62</sup> Li 2012 (RCT) <sup>36</sup>	•		•			•	•		
Water Exercises	Amano 2013 (RC1) <sup>49</sup> Ayan 2012a (NRCT) <sup>50</sup> Ayan 2012b (case series) <sup>51</sup> Ayan 2014 (NRCT) <sup>44</sup> Vivas 2011 (RCT) <sup>41</sup> da Silva 2013 (case series) <sup>52</sup>	•	•		Z)			• •		
Robotic Gait Training	Volpe 2014 (RCT) <sup>27</sup> Carda 2012 (RCT) <sup>23</sup> Picelli 2012 (RCT) <sup>43</sup> Picelli 2013 (RCT) <sup>38</sup> Sale 2013 (RCT) <sup>64</sup>	:				•	•	•		
Dance	Volpe 2013 (RCT) <sup>26</sup> Hackney 2007 (RCT) <sup>57</sup> Hackney 2009a (RCT) <sup>55</sup> Hackney 2009b (RCT) <sup>56</sup> Hackney 2009c (case series) <sup>61</sup> Hackney 2010 (RCT) <sup>35</sup> Duncan 2012 (RCT) <sup>53</sup> Marchant 2010 (case series) <sup>63</sup>				•			•		
Virtual Reality	Shanahan 2014 (case series) <sup>48</sup> Goncalves 2014 (case series) <sup>54</sup> Pompeu 2012 (RCT) <sup>39</sup> Mirelman 2011 (case series) <sup>37</sup> Mhatre 2013 (case series) <sup>45</sup>		•	•	•	•		•		
Mental Practice	Braun 2011 (RCT) <sup>34</sup> Tamir 2007 (RCT) <sup>58</sup>		•	•	•	•		•		
Aerobic Training	Lauhoff 2013 (case series) <sup>47</sup> Burini 2006 (RCT) <sup>59</sup>	•	•	•	•	•		•		
Boxing Training	Combs 2010 (case series) <sup>24</sup>	٠	•	•	•	•		•		
Whole Body Vibration	Ebersbach 2008 (RCT) <sup>25</sup>	•		•		•		•		
Nordic and downhill walking training	van Eijkeren 2008 (case series) <sup>40</sup> Yang 2010 (RCT) <sup>42</sup>	•		•	•					

#### DANCE (N=6 RCT/2 CASE SERIES)

Several studies showed that dancing was associated with improvements in functional mobility,26,63 QoL, 48, 55 gait, 35, 56 balance 26, 35, 53, 56, 57, 61, 63 and disease severity. 26, 48, 53, 57, 61, 63

Dance is more effective than no intervention for gait, balance and disease severity. Whether dance is

more effective than physical therapy remains open question (Figures  $2-\overline{4}$ ).

VIRTUAL REALITY (N.=4 CASE SERIES/1 RCT)

A small number of studies demonstrated improvements in functional mobility,54 ADL,39, 54 gait, 37, 54 QoL, 37 balance 37, 39, 45, 46 and movement

This

or Subgroup         Mean         SD         Total         Mean         SD         Total         Weight         IV, Fixed, 95% /r           Robotic vs physio         2013         410.2         55.15         20         329.95         54.78         20         6.7%         80.25 [46.18, 114.32           2012         366.06         78.54         18         280.11         18         10661         5.9%         85.95 [49.67, 122.23           tal (95% CI)         38         10681         12.5%         82.92 [58.08, 107.76]           or overall effect: Z = 6.54 (P < 0.00001)         38         10681         12.5%         82.92 [58.08, 107.76]           Sobotic vs treadmill         2013         410.2         55.15         20         400.15         61.65         20         5.9%         10.05 [-26.20, 46.30           2012         447.61         58.77         15         455.21         58.06         15         4.4%         -7.60 [-49.41, 34.21           tal (95% CI)         35         35         10.3%         2.47 [-24.91, 29.86]           Degeneity: Chi² = 0.39, df = 1 (P = 0.53); l² = 0%         0         22.00 [10.57, 33.43           tal (95% CI)         40         22         26         59.1%         22.00 [10.57, 33.43 </th <th></th> <th colspan="2">Experimental</th> <th colspan="2">Control</th> <th></th> <th colspan="2">Mean Differenc</th> <th colspan="3">Mean Difference</th>		Experimental		Control			Mean Differenc		Mean Difference			
Robotic vs physio         2013       410.2       55.15       20       329.95       54.78       20       6.7%       80.25       [46.18, 114.32]         2012       366.06       78.54       18       280.11       18       10661       5.9%       85.95       [49.67, 122.23]         tal (95% CI)       38       10681       12.5%       82.92       [58.08, 107.76]         orgeneity: Chi² = 0.05, df = 1 (P = 0.82); l² = 0%       roverall effect: Z = 6.54 (P < 0.00001)	Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI			IV, F
2013 410.2 55.15 20 329.95 54.78 20 6.7% 80.25 [46.18, 114.32 2012 366.06 78.54 18 280.11 18 10661 5.9% 85.95 [49.67, 122.23 tal (95% CI) 38 10681 12.5% 82.92 [58.08, 107.76] Degeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 0.05, df = 1 (P = 0.82); l <sup>2</sup> = 0% or overall effect: Z = 6.54 (P < 0.00001) Robotic vs treadmill 2013 410.2 55.15 20 400.15 61.65 20 5.9% 10.05 [-26.20, 46.30 2012 447.61 58.77 15 455.21 58.06 15 4.4% -7.60 [-49.41, 34.21 tal (95% CI) 35 35 10.3% 2.47 [-24.91, 29.86] Degeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 0.39, df = 1 (P = 0.53); l <sup>2</sup> = 0% or overall effect: Z = 0.18 (P = 0.86) Dance vs no intervention ey 2009a 423.6 25.3 14 360.9 33.3 17 18.1% 62.70 [42.06, 83.34 tal (95% CI) 40 43 77.2% 31.55 [21.55, 41.55] Degeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 11.43, df = 1 (P = 0.0007); l <sup>2</sup> = 91% or overall effect: Z = 6.18 (P < 0.00001) (95% CI) 113 10759 100.0% 34.98 [26.20, 43.77] Degeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 32.05, df = 5 (P < 0.00001); l <sup>2</sup> = 84% or overall effect: Z = 7.80 (P < 0.00001) r subgroup differences: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 20 18, df = 2 (P < 0.0001), l <sup>2</sup> = 90 1%	1.1.1 Robotic vs phy	sio										
2012 366.06 78.54 18 280.11 18 10661 5.9% 85.95 [49.67, 122.23 tal (95% CI) 38 10681 12.5% 82.92 [58.08, 107.76] pegeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 0.05, df = 1 (P = 0.82); l <sup>2</sup> = 0% or overall effect: Z = 6.54 (P < 0.00001) <b>Robotic vs treadmill</b> 2013 410.2 55.15 20 400.15 61.65 20 5.9% 10.05 [-26.20, 46.30 2012 447.61 58.77 15 455.21 58.06 15 4.4% -7.60 [-49.41, 34.21 tal (95% CI) 35 35 10.3% 2.47 [-24.91, 29.86] or overall effect: Z = 0.18 (P = 0.53); l <sup>2</sup> = 0% or overall effect: Z = 0.18 (P = 0.53); l <sup>2</sup> = 0% or overall effect: Z = 0.18 (P = 0.86) <b>Dance vs no intervention</b> ey 2009a 423.6 25.3 14 360.9 33.3 17 18.1% 62.70 [42.06, 83.34 tal (95% CI) 40 43 77.2% 31.55 [21.55, 41.55] or overall effect: Z = 6.18 (P < 0.0007); l <sup>2</sup> = 91% or overall effect: Z = 6.18 (P < 0.00001) (95% CI) 113 10759 100.0% 34.98 [26.20, 43.77] or overall effect: Z = 7.80 (P < 0.00001); l <sup>2</sup> = 84% or overall effect: Z = 7.80 (P < 0.00001) or subgroup differences: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 20.18, df = 2 (P < 0.0001), l <sup>2</sup> = 90.1%	Picelli 2013	410.2	55.15	20	329.95	54.78	20	6.7%	80.25 [46.18, 114.32]			
tal (95% CI)       38       10681       12.5%       82.92 [58.08, 107.76]         bigeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 0.05, df = 1 (P = 0.82); l <sup>2</sup> = 0%       or overall effect: Z = 6.54 (P < 0.00001)	Picelli 2012	366.06	78.54	18	280.11	18	10661	5.9%	85.95 [49.67, 122.23]			
bgeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.05$ , $df = 1$ (P = 0.82); $ ^2 = 0\%$ proverall effect: Z = 6.54 (P < 0.00001)	Subtotal (95% CI)			38			10681	12.5%	82.92 [58.08, 107.76]			
Proverall effect: Z = 6.54 (P < 0.00001)	Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =	0.05, df =	: 1 (P =	0.82); I	² = 0%							
Robotic vs treadmill         2013       410.2       55.15       20       400.15       61.65       20       5.9%       10.05       [-26.20, 46.30]         2012       447.61       58.77       15       455.21       58.06       15       4.4%       -7.60       [-49.41, 34.21]         tal (95% CI)       35       35       10.3%       2.47       [-24.91, 29.86]         or overall effect: Z = 0.18 (P = 0.53); I <sup>2</sup> = 0%       0%       0%       0%       0.33.3       17       18.1%       62.70       [42.06, 83.34]         or overall effect: Z = 0.18 (P = 0.86)       0       20       26       378       22       26       59.1%       22.00       [10.57, 33.43]         tal (95% CI)       40       43       77.2%       31.55       [21.55, 41.55]       0%         or overall effect: Z = 6.18 (P < 0.00001);	Test for overall effect:	Z = 6.54	(P < 0.0	0001)								
Robotic vs treadmill         2013       410.2       55.15       20       400.15       61.65       20       5.9%       10.05       [-26.20, 46.30         2012       447.61       58.77       15       455.21       58.06       15       4.4%       -7.60       [-49.41, 34.21         tal (95% CI)       35       35       10.3%       2.47       [-24.91, 29.86]         orgeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 0.39, df = 1 (P = 0.53); l <sup>2</sup> = 0%       0%       0%       0.33.3       17       18.1%       62.70       [42.06, 83.34]         or overall effect: Z = 0.18 (P = 0.86)       0       20       26       378       22       26       59.1%       22.00       [10.57, 33.43]         tal (95% CI)       40       43       77.2%       31.55       [21.55, 41.55]         orgeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 11.43, df = 1 (P = 0.0007); l <sup>2</sup> = 91%       31.55       [21.55, 41.55]       50         or overall effect: Z = 6.18 (P < 0.00001)												
2013 410.2 55.15 20 400.15 61.65 20 5.9% 10.05 [-26.20, 46.30 2012 447.61 58.77 15 455.21 58.06 15 4.4% -7.60 [-49.41, 34.21 tal (95% CI) 35 35 10.3% 2.47 [-24.91, 29.86] Degeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 0.39, df = 1 (P = 0.53); l <sup>2</sup> = 0% or overall effect: Z = 0.18 (P = 0.86) Dance vs no intervention ey 2009a 423.6 25.3 14 360.9 33.3 17 18.1% 62.70 [42.06, 83.34 in 2012 400 20 26 378 22 26 59.1% 22.00 [10.57, 33.43 tal (95% CI) 40 43 77.2% 31.55 [21.55, 41.55] Degeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 11.43, df = 1 (P = 0.0007); l <sup>2</sup> = 91% or overall effect: Z = 6.18 (P < 0.00001) (95% CI) 113 10759 100.0% 34.98 [26.20, 43.77] Degeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 32.05, df = 5 (P < 0.00001); l <sup>2</sup> = 84% or overall effect: Z = 7.80 (P < 0.00001) or subgroup differences: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 20.18, df = 2 (P < 0.0001), l <sup>2</sup> = 90.1%	1.1.2 Robotic vs trea	dmill										
2012 447.61 58.77 15 455.21 58.06 15 4.4% -7.60 [-49.41, 34.21 tal (95% CI) 35 35 10.3% 2.47 [-24.91, 29.86] or overall effect: Z = 0.18 (P = 0.53); $ ^2 = 0\%$ or overall effect: Z = 0.18 (P = 0.86) Dance vs no intervention evy 2009a 423.6 25.3 14 360.9 33.3 17 18.1% 62.70 [42.06, 83.34 an 2012 400 20 26 378 22 26 59.1% 22.00 [10.57, 33.43 tal (95% CI) 40 43 77.2% 31.55 [21.55, 41.55] or overall effect: Z = 6.18 (P < 0.00001); $ ^2 = 91\%$ or overall effect: Z = 6.18 (P < 0.00001); $ ^2 = 84\%$ or overall effect: Z = 7.80 (P < 0.00001); $ ^2 = 84\%$ or overall effect: Z = 7.80 (P < 0.00001) or subgroup differences: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 20.18, df = 2 (P < 0.0001), $ ^2 = 90.1\%$	Picelli 2013	410.2	55.15	20	400.15	61.65	20	5.9%	10.05 [-26.20, 46.30]			7
tal (95% CI)       35       35       10.3%       2.47 [-24.91, 29.86]         bigeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 0.39, df = 1 (P = 0.53); l <sup>2</sup> = 0%       0       0       0       0         bor overall effect: Z = 0.18 (P = 0.86)       0       0       0       0       0         Dance vs no intervention       0       20       26       378       22       26       59.1%       22.00 [10.57, 33.43]         tal (95% CI)       40       43       77.2%       31.55 [21.55, 41.55]         or overall effect: Z = 6.18 (P < 0.00001)	Carda 2012	447.61	58.77	15	455.21	58.06	15	4.4%	-7.60 [-49.41, 34.21]			
bgeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.39$ , df = 1 (P = 0.53); l <sup>2</sup> = 0%         br overall effect: Z = 0.18 (P = 0.86)         Dance vs no intervention         bey 2009a       423.6       25.3       14       360.9       33.3       17       18.1%       62.70 [42.06, 83.34         an 2012       400       20       26       378       22       26       59.1%       22.00 [10.57, 33.43         tal (95% CI)       40       43       77.2%       31.55 [21.55, 41.55]         or overall effect: Z = 6.18 (P < 0.00001)	Subtotal (95% Cl)			35			35	10.3%	2.47 [-24.91, 29.86]			
br overall effect: $Z = 0.18$ (P = 0.86)         Dance vs no intervention         evy 2009a       423.6       25.3       14       360.9       33.3       17       18.1%       62.70 [42.06, 83.34         In 2012       400       20       26       378       22       26       59.1%       22.00 [10.57, 33.43         tal (95% CI)       40       43       77.2%       31.55 [21.55, 41.55]         or overall effect: Z = 6.18 (P < 0.00001)	Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =	0.39, df =	: 1 (P =	0.53); I	² = 0%							
Dance vs no intervention         uey 2009a       423.6       25.3       14 $360.9$ $33.3$ 17 $18.1\%$ $62.70$ $[42.06, 83.34]$ un 2012       400       20 $26$ $378$ $22$ $26$ $59.1\%$ $22.00$ $[10.57, 33.43]$ tal (95% CI)       40       43 $77.2\%$ $31.55$ $[21.55, 41.55]$ or overall effect: Z = 6.18 (P < 0.00001)	Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.18	(P = 0.8	86)								
Dance vs no intervention         ey 2009a       423.6       25.3       14 $360.9$ $33.3$ 17 $18.1\%$ $62.70$ $[42.06, 83.34]$ un 2012       400       20 $26$ $378$ $22$ $26$ $59.1\%$ $22.00$ $[10.57, 33.43]$ tal (95% CI)       40       43 $77.2\%$ $31.55$ $[21.55, 41.55]$ or overall effect: Z = 6.18 (P < 0.00001)												
ey 2009a 423.6 25.3 14 360.9 33.3 17 18.1% 62.70 [42.06, 83.34 in 2012 400 20 26 378 22 26 59.1% 22.00 [10.57, 33.43 tal (95% CI) 40 43 77.2% 31.55 [21.55, 41.55] bgeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 11.43, df = 1 (P = 0.0007); l <sup>2</sup> = 91% or overall effect: Z = 6.18 (P < 0.00001) (95% CI) 113 10759 100.0% 34.98 [26.20, 43.77] bgeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 32.05, df = 5 (P < 0.00001); l <sup>2</sup> = 84% or overall effect: Z = 7.80 (P < 0.00001) or subgroup differences: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 20.18, df = 2 (P < 0.0001), l <sup>2</sup> = 90.1%	1.1.3 Dance vs no inf	terventio	n									$\sim$
In 2012 400 20 26 378 22 26 59.1% 22.00 [10.57, 33.43 tal (95% CI) 40 43 77.2% 31.55 [21.55, 41.55] or overall effect: Z = 6.18 (P < 0.00001) (95% CI) 113 10759 100.0% 34.98 [26.20, 43.77] or overall effect: Z = 7.80 (P < 0.00001); $l^2 = 84\%$ or overall effect: Z = 7.80 (P < 0.00001) or subgroup differences: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 20.18, df = 2 (P < 0.0001), $l^2 = 90.1\%$	Hackney 2009a	423.6	25.3	14	360.9	33.3	17	18.1%	62.70 [42.06, 83.34]		$\sim$ $^{\circ}$	$\sim N$
tal (95% CI) 40 43 77.2% 31.55 [21.55, 41.55] bigeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 11.43, df = 1 (P = $0.0007$ ); l <sup>2</sup> = 91% bor overall effect: Z = 6.18 (P < $0.00001$ ) (95% CI) 113 10759 100.0% 34.98 [26.20, 43.77] bigeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 32.05, df = 5 (P < $0.00001$ ); l <sup>2</sup> = 84% bor overall effect: Z = 7.80 (P < $0.00001$ ) or subgroup differences: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 20.18, df = 2 (P < $0.0001$ ), l <sup>2</sup> = 90.1%	Duncan 2012	400	20	26	378	22	26	59.1%	22.00 [10.57, 33.43]			$\sim$ / /
orgeneity: $Chi^2 = 11.43$ , $df = 1$ (P = 0.0007); $l^2 = 91\%$ or overall effect: Z = 6.18 (P < 0.00001)	Subtotal (95% CI)			40			43	77.2%	31.55 [21.55, 41.55]			
or overall effect: Z = 6.18 (P < 0.00001) (95% CI) 113 10759 100.0% 34.98 [26.20, 43.77] bgeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 32.05, df = 5 (P < 0.00001); l <sup>2</sup> = 84% or overall effect: Z = 7.80 (P < 0.00001) or subgroup differences: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 20.18, df = 2 (P < 0.0001), l <sup>2</sup> = 90.1%	Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =	11.43, df	= 1 (P =	= 0.000	7); l <sup>2</sup> = 9 <sup>4</sup>	1%						
(95% CI) 113 10759 100.0% 34.98 [26.20, 43.77] bigeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 32.05, df = 5 (P < $0.00001$ ); l <sup>2</sup> = 84% br overall effect: Z = 7.80 (P < $0.00001$ ) or subgroup differences: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 20.18, df = 2 (P < $0.0001$ ), l <sup>2</sup> = 90.1%	Test for overall effect:	Z = 6.18	(P < 0.0	0001)								
(95% CI) 113 10759 100.0% 34.98 [26.20, 43.77] ogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 32.05, df = 5 (P < 0.00001); l <sup>2</sup> = 84% or overall effect: Z = 7.80 (P < 0.00001) or subgroup differences: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 20.18, df = 2 (P < 0.0001), l <sup>2</sup> = 90.1%												
pgeneity: $Chi^2 = 32.05$ , df = 5 (P < 0.00001); l <sup>2</sup> = 84% pr overall effect: Z = 7.80 (P < 0.00001) pr subgroup differences: $Chi^2 = 20.18$ , df = 2 (P < 0.0001), l <sup>2</sup> = 90.1%	Total (95% CI)			113			10759	100.0%	34.98 [26.20, 43.77]			$\sim$
or overall effect: Z = 7.80 (P < 0.00001) or subgroup differences: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 20.18, df = 2 (P < 0.0001), l <sup>2</sup> = 90.1%	Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =	32.05, df	= 5 (P <	< 0.000	01); l² = 8	84%					-100	-100 -50
or subgroup differences: $Chi^2 = 20.18$ , $df = 2 (P < 0.0001)$ , $l^2 = 90.1\%$	Test for overall effect:	Z = 7.80	(P < 0.0	0001)				~		_	Fa	Favours [contr
	Test for subgroup diffe	erences: (	Chi <sup>2</sup> = 20	0.18, di	f = 2 (P <	0.0001	), l <sup>2</sup> = 90	0.1%			i a	i avours [conu

Figure 2.—Forest plot - 6mWT (m).

disorders.<sup>37, 54</sup> However, virtual reality therapy compared with physical therapy did not show better improvements on balance (Figure 3).

MENTAL PRACTICE (N=2 RCT)

Two studies evaluated the benefits of mental practice.34, 58 Braun et al. showed that mental practice was not better than relaxation therapy for people with PD. Tamir et al. reported select benefits of imagery training associated with physical practice on functional mobility and disease severity (Figure 4).

Aerobic training (n=1 RCT/1 case series)

Two studies used cycle ergometer as aerobic training. One showed improvements in functional mobility, ADL, balance and disease severity.<sup>47</sup> The other demonstrated significant improvements in walking.59

BOXING TRAINING (N=1 CASE SERIES)

The author demonstrated that boxing therapy could improve functional mobility, ADL, gait and balance in some people with PD.<sup>24</sup>

WHOLE BODY VIBRATION (N.=1 RCT)

Just one small study analyzed the effects of whole body vibration in people with PD reporting modest improvements in the short term for mobility, gait, balance and disease severity<sup>25</sup>. This has not since been replicated.

NORDIC AND DOWNHILL WALKING TRAINING (N.=1 RCT/1 CASE SERIES)

One study used Nordic walking training as a treatment for PD participants and demonstrated significant benefits in functional mobility, gait and QoL.40

<u>0</u>

	Expe	rimen	tal	с	ontrol	Ме		Mean Difference		Mean Differen			
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI		IV, Fixe			
5.1.1 Dance vs no int	erventio	n											
Hackney 2009a Subtotal (95% CI)	52	0.8	14 <b>14</b>	47	2.5	17 <b>17</b>	24.5% <b>24.5%</b>	5.00 [3.74, 6.26] <b>5.00 [3.74, 6.26]</b>					
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable												
Test for overall effect:	Z = 7.78	(P < 0	0.00001	)									
5.1.2 Dance vs physi	0												
Hackney 2007	50.6	1	9	47.1	0.9	10	52.8%	3.50 [2.64, 4.36]					
Volpe 2013	46.08	6.75	12	38.92	9.97	12	0.8%	7.16 [0.35, 13.97]					
Subtotal (95% CI)			21			22	53.6%	3.56 [2.70, 4.41]					
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =	1.09, df =	= 1 (P	= 0.30)	; I <sup>2</sup> = 8%	0					7			
lest for overall effect:	∠ = 8.18	(P < 0	00001	)									
5.1.3 Virtual vs physi	0												
Pompeu 2012	54.4	2.2	16	53.1	3.4	16	9.9%	1.30 [-0.68, 3.28]					
Subtotal (95% CI)			16			16	9.9%	1.30 [-0.68, 3.28]					
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable												
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.28	(P = 0	).20)							$\alpha N$			
5.1.4 Robotic vs phys	sio								$\geq$	$\sim$ ) (			
Picelli 2013	53.4	3.3	20	47.35	5.28	20	5.2%	6.05 [3.32, 8.78]					
Subtotal (95% CI)			20			20	5.2%	6.05 [3.32, 8.78]	$\langle \rangle$				
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable												
Test for overall effect:	Z = 4.35	(P < 0	0.0001)							$\langle \langle \rangle \rangle$			
5.1.5 Hvdrotherapv v	s physic	<b>)</b>								V V V			
Vivas 2011	53.6	1.67	5	51.83	6.11	6	1.5%	1.77 [-3.33, 6.87]					
Volpe 2014	51.2	3.1	17	49.9	4.8	17	5.3%	1.30 [-1.42, 4.02]					
Subtotal (95% CI)	0	5.1	22			23	6.8%	1.40 [-0.99, 3.80]	$\mathbf{X}$	Y			
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =	0.03, df =	= 1 (P	= 0.87)	; I² = 0%	6	1							
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.15	(P = 0	).25)				$\langle \rangle \rangle$		$\sim$				
Total (95% CI)			93		$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}$	98	100.0%	3.67 [3.05, 4.30]	/				
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =	17.30. df	= 6 (F	P = 0.00	)8):  ² =	65%				<b>—</b>				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 11.5	4 (P <	0.0000	1)	5570	$\sim$		$  \rangle \rangle$	-50	-25			
Test for subgroup diffe	rences:	$Chi^2 =$	16.18	df = 4 (	P = 0.0	)03), l²	= 75.3%			Favours [control			
					5.		101070						

Figure 3.-Forest plot - BBS.

The other study analyzed the effect of downhill walking training, and showed significant improvements in walking.<sup>42</sup>

#### Discussion

This systematic review showed that a range of complementary physical therapies can assist with the rehabilitation of movement, balance, falls and functional ability in people living with Parkinson's. Overall, the literature on complementary therapies was of moderate strength from a methodological perspective. Nevertheless there was a consistent message that some physical therapies such as dancing, water exercises, virtual reality training and Nordic walking might enable some people with PD to move more easily and to enjoy greater health and wellbeing. These findings add to the existing body of evidence showing the beneficial effects of traditional physical therapies such as cueing, cognitive strategies, progressive resistance strength training, falls prevention education and gait training for people with PD.<sup>3, 10, 11, 15, 19, 20, 65, 66</sup>

The largest study on complementary physical therapy with a high level of evidence was from Li *et al.*, (2012) who studied tai chi. Consistent with other investigations <sup>62, 67-70</sup> Li *et al.* showed that tai

	Expe	eriment	al	C	ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
4.1.1 Dance vs no in	terventio	on or	~~				~~~~		_
Duncan 2012	31.7	2.4	26	45	1.9	26	28.2%	-13.30 [-14.48, -12.12]	
Hackney 2009a Subtotal (95% CI)	26	2.5	14 <b>40</b>	32.4	2.6	17 <b>43</b>	12.0% <b>40.2%</b>	-6.40 [-8.20, -4.60] -11.24 [-12.22, -10.25]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =	39.53, df	f = 1 (P	< 0.00	0001); l²	= 97%				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 22.3	6 (P < 0	0.0000	)1)					
4.1.2 Dance vs phys	io								
Hackney 2007	22.6	1.3	9	20.6	1.2	10	30.6%	2.00 [0.87, 3.13]	
Volpe 2013	17.42	3.8	12	21	3.07	12	5.1%	-3.58 [-6.34, -0.82]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			21			22	35.7%	1.20 [0.16, 2.25]	
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =	13.42, df	i=1 (P	= 0.00	002); l² =	= 93%				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.25	(P = 0.	02)						
4.1.3 Hydrotherapy	/s physic	<b>b</b>							
Vivas 2011	32.2	5.85	5	32.67	11.18	6	0.4%	-0.47 [-10.78, 9.84]	
Volpe 2014 Subtotal (95% CI)	33.6	8	17 <b>22</b>	30.8	13.8	17 <b>23</b>	0.7% <b>1.0%</b>	2.80 [-4.78, 10.38] 1.65 [-4.46, 7.76]	
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =	0.25, df =	= 1 (P =	0.62)	; I² = 0%	b				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.53	(P = 0.	60)						
4.1.4 Montal practice	we phys	io							
Tomir 2007	10.1	0 22	12	25.5	0.0	11	1 / 0/-	7 40 1 12 64 2 161	
Subtotal (95% CI)	10.1	9.22	12	20.0	0.9	11	1.4%	-7.40 [-12.64, -2.16]	
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable								
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.77	(P = 0.	006)						
4 1 5 Whole body vit	oration v	e nhvei	io						
Ebersbach 2008	17.6	4 5	10	16.9	5	11	24%	0 70 [-3 36 4 76]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	11.0	1.0	10	10.0	Ŭ	11	2.4%	0.70 [-3.36, 4.76]	$\bigtriangledown$ $\checkmark$ $\checkmark$
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable						$\langle \rangle \rangle$	$\mathcal{S}$	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.34	(P = 0.	74)			$\leq$	~ \ \		
4.1.6 Robotic vs trea	dmill					Ľ	$\sim$	$\langle \rangle$	7
Carda 2012	10.29	2.11	15	10.64	1.94	15	18.5%	-0.35 [-1.80, 1.10]	+
Sale 2013	40.45	7.88	10	40.25	8.21	10	0.8%	0.20 [-6.85, 7.25]	<del></del>
Subtotal (95% CI)			25	[ []		25	19.3%	-0.33 [-1.75, 1.09]	<b>♦</b>
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =	0.02, df =	= 1 (P =	0.88)	; l² = 0%	5				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.45	(P = 0.	65)				0	/	
Total (95% CI)		$\sim$	130		-	135	100.0%	-4.22 [-4.84, -3.60]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =	390.92, 0	df = 9 (F	<b>P</b> < 0.0	00001);	² = 98%	0			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 13.2	5 (P < 0	0.0000	)1)		$\mathbf{\nabla}$	1		-ou -25 U 25 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
Test for subgroup diff	erences:	Chi² = 3	337.70	), df = 5	(P < 0.0	0001),	l² = 98.5%	6	
		$\searrow$		(	$\sim$				
		<u> </u>				1			

Figure 4.—Forest plot - Disease severity (UPDRS III)

chi improved postural stability and movement function, while also improve gait in people with mildto-moderate PD. Gains were often maintained for 3 months, in agreement with other research on adults with PD aged over 70 years.67

Dancing was also shown to be of benefit for people with PD in a number of studies (Figures 2-4). Dancing is a complex motor skill involving elements such as postural stability, weight shifting, inter-limb coordination, single leg stance activities and trunk rotation. These elements have been the focus of some traditional exercise programs; although routine exercises are not always perceived to be interesting and enjoyable over long term. Volpe et al 26 reported that Irish dancing is an enjoyable adjunct to traditional therapy for PD with excellent adherence over long

Vol. 51 - No. 6

or

periods of time such as six months. Gerontological literature has also shown that some elderly people enjoy dance more than traditional exercises, with accompanying increased adherence.<sup>56, 71, 72</sup> Each of the dance genres analyzed in this systematic review showed benefits not only for body function and disease severity, but also for quality of life, corroborating the findings of research on social dancers.<sup>73, 74</sup>

Water exercises and hydrotherapy have also been used to treat other disorders and have shown promising results for both mobility and quality of life.<sup>75-77</sup> Emerging evidence suggests improvements in gait, quality of life, and falls after hydrotherapy in people with PD. Such benefits have been attributed to the beneficial effects of buoyancy and hydrostatic pressure that might reduce the risk of falls.<sup>78</sup> The aquatic environment might enhance balance, reduce freezing of gait and fear of falling and increase movement amplitude and speed.<sup>27, 79</sup> It may well enable people to perform complex skills in a different context, using frontal lobe mediated neural networks that subserve attention to bypass the defective basal ganglia pathways.<sup>80</sup>

Virtual reality therapy and exercise gaming have been proposed as an effective method to complement exercise therapy for some neurological patients.<sup>81, 82</sup> Due to added cognitive and motor stimulation in a motivating environment, this alternative therapy may enhance movements and afford a greater amount of practice. The exact mechanism by which virtual reality therapy is effective remains uncertain.<sup>37</sup>

Studies that analyzed robotic gait training as a complementary physical therapy suggested important improvements on motor performance of PD. However, none of these showed that robotic gait training is better than traditional treadmill walking training, which is less expensive and easier to handle. For the remaining alternative therapies reviewed, there was relatively low level evidence of their effects on people with PD. It remains open to question whether robotic gait training, mental practice, aerobic training, boxing training, whole body vibration or Nordic walking produce long term benefits in people with PD.

### Conclusions

The therapies described within this systematic review provide complementary treatment options

for people living with PD. There was emerging evidence that some of the therapies may be a suitable adjunct to conventional physical therapy (Figures 2-4). Despite this, more robust studies designed with higher methodological quality are needed. It is recommended that future research compare complementary physical therapies, ranging in both duration and frequency, in an effort to clarify the associated risks and benefits to people with this chronic and progressive disease.

# References

- Morris ME, Martin CL, Schenkman ML. Striding out with Parkinson disease: evidence-based physical therapy for gait disorders. Phys Ther 2010;90:280-8.
- 2. Pringsheim T, Jette N, Frolkis A, Steeves TD. The prevalence of Parkinson's disease: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Mov Disord 2014;29:1583-90.
- Keus SH, Bloem BR, Hendriks EJ, Bredero-Cohen AB, Munneke M. Evidence-based analysis of physical therapy in Parkinson's disease with recommendations for practice and research. Mov Disord 2007;22:451-60.
- Brauer SG, Morris ME. Can people with Parkinson's disease improve dual tasking when walking? Gait Posture 2010;31:229-33.
   Bloem BR, Hausdorff JM, Visser JE, Giladi N. Falls and freezing
- Bloem BR, Hausdorff JM, Visser JE, Giladi N. Falls and freezing of gait in Parkinson's disease: a review of two interconnected, episodic phenomena. Mov Disord 2004;19:871-84.
   Morris ME, Menz HB, McGinley JL, Watts JJ, Huxham FE, Mur-
- Morris ME, Menz HB, McGinley JL, Watts JJ, Huxham FE, Murphy AT, *et al.* A randomized controlled trial to reduce falls in people with Parkinson's disease. Neurorehabil Neural Repair 2015:1-9.
- 7. Soh S-E, Morris ME, McGinley JL. Determinants of health-related quality of life in Parkinson's disease: a systematic review. Parkinsonism Relat Disord 2011;17:1-9.
- 8. Morris ME. Movement disorders in people with Parkinson disease: a model for physical therapy. Phys Ther 2000;80:578-97.
- Keus SH, Munneke M, Nijkrake MJ, Kwakkel G, Bloem BR. Physical therapy in Parkinson's disease: evolution and future challenges. Mov Disord 2009;24:1-14.
- Rochester L, Hetherington V, Jones D, Nieuwboer A, Willems A-M, Kwakkel G, *et al.* The effect of external rhythmic cues (auditory and visual) on walking during a functional task in homes of people with Parkinson's disease. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2005;86:999-1006.
- Rocha PA, Porfírio GM, Ferraz HB, Trevisani VFM. Effects of external cues on gait parameters of Parkinson's disease patients: A systematic review. Clin Neurol Neurosurg 2014;124:127-34.
- Frazzitta G, Bertotti G, Riboldazzi G, Turla M, Uccellini D, Boveri N, *et al.* Effectiveness of intensive inpatient rehabilitation treatment on disease progression in parkinsonian patients: A randomized controlled trial with 1 year follow up. Neurorehabil Neural Repair 2012;26:144-50.
- Keus SHJ, Bloem BR, Verbaan D, de Jonge PA, Hofman M, van Hilten BJ, et al. Physiotherapy in Parkinson's disease: utilisation and patient satisfaction. J Neurol 2004;251:680-7.
- 14. Fox C, Ebersbach G, Ramig L, Sapir S. LSVT LOUD and LSVT BIG: Behavioral treatment programs for speech and body movement in Parkinson disease. Parkinson's Disease 2012:1-12.
- 15. Goodwin VA, Richards SH, Taylor RS, Taylor AH, Campbell JL. The effectiveness of exercise interventions for people with Par-

- ment Disorders 2008;23:631-40. 16. Dibble LE, Addison O, Papa E. The effects of exercise on balance in persons with Parkinson's disease: a systematic review across the disability spectrum. J Neurol Phys Ther 2009;33:14-26
- 17. Tomlinson CL, Patel S, Meek C, Clarke CE, Stowe R, Shah L, et al. Physiotherapy versus placebo or no intervention in Parkinson's disease. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2012;8.
- 18. Deane K, Jones D, Playford E, Ben-Shlomo Y, Clarke C. Physiotherapy for patients with Parkinson's Disease: a comparison of techniques. The cochrane database of systematic reviews 2000(3):CD002817-CD002817
- 19. Gage H, Storey L. Rehabilitation for Parkinson's disease: a systematic review of available evidence. Clin Rehabil 2004;18:463-82
- 20. Tomlinson CL, Patel S, Meek C, Herd C, Clarke CE, Stowe R, et al. Physiotherapy intervention in Parkinson's disease: systematic review and meta-analysis. BMJ 2012;345:e5004.
- 21. Kwakkel G, De Goede C, Van Wegen E. Impact of physical therapy for Parkinson's disease: a critical review of the literature. Parkinsonism Relat Disord 2007;13:S478-S487
- 22. Kiepe M-S, Stöckigt B, Keil T. Effects of dance therapy and ballroom dances on physical and mental illnesses: A systematic review. The Arts in Psychotherapy 2012;39:404-11.
- 23. Carda S, Invernizzi M, Baricich A, Comi C, Croquelois A, Cisari C. Robotic gait training is not superior to conventional treadmill training in parkinson disease: A single-blind randomized controlled trial. Neurorehabil Neural Repair 2012;26:1027-34.
- 24. Combs SA, Diehl MD, Staples WH, Conn L, Davis K, Lewis N, et al. Boxing training for patients with Parkinson disease: a case series. Phys Ther 2010;91:132-42
- 25. Ebersbach G, Edler D, Kaufhold O, Wissel J. Whole body vibration versus conventional physiotherapy to improve balance and gait in Parkinson's disease. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2008;89:399-403.
- 26. Volpe D, Signorini M, Marchetto A, Lynch T, Morris ME. A comparison of Irish set dancing and exercises for people with Parkinson's disease: a phase II feasibility study. BMC Geriatr 2013:13:54
- 27. Volpe D, Giantin MG, Maestri R, Frazzitta G. Comparing the effects of hydrotherapy and land-based therapy on balance in patients with Parkinson's disease: a randomized controlled pilot study. Clin Rehabil 2014:1-8.
- 28 Shanahan J, Morris ME, Bhriain ON, Saunders J, Clifford AM. Dance for people with Parkinson disease: What is the evidence telling us? Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2015;96:141-53.
- Hoehn M, Yahr M. Parkinsonism: onset, progression, and mortality. Neurology 1967;17:427-442.
- 30. Higgings J, Green S. Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions version 5.0. 2. The Cochrane Collaboration ref type: Electronic Citation 2009.
- 31. Downs SH, Black N. The feasibility of creating a checklist for the assessment of the methodological quality both of randomised and non-randomised studies of health care interventions. J Epidemiol Community Health 1998;52:377-84
- 32. de Morton NA. The PEDro scale is a valid measure of the methodological quality of clinical trials: a demographic study. Aust J Physiother 2009;55:129-33.
- Maher CG, Sherrington C, Herbert RD, Moseley AM, Elkins M. 33. Reliability of the PEDro scale for rating quality of randomized controlled trials. Phys Ther 2003;83:713-21.
- Braun S, Beurskens A, Kleynen M, Schols J, Wade D. Rehabili-34. tation with mental practice has similar effects on mobility as rehabilitation with relaxation in people with Parkinson's disease: a multicentre randomised trial. J Physiother 2011;57:27-34
- 35. Hackney ME, Earhart GM. Effects of dance on gait and bal-

ance in Parkinson's disease: a comparison of partnered and nonpartnered dance movement. Neurorehabil Neural Repair 2010:24:384-92

- 36. Li F, Harmer P, Fitzgerald K, Eckstrom E, Stock R, Galver J, et *al.* Tai chi and postural stability in patients with Parkinson's disease. N Engl J Med 2012;366:511-9.
- 37 Mirelman A, Maidan I, Herman T, Deutsch JE, Giladi N, Hausdorff JM. Virtual reality for gait training: can it induce motor learning to enhance complex walking and reduce fall risk in patients with Parkinson's disease? J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci 2011;66:234-40.
- 38. Picelli A, Melotti C, Origano F, Neri R, Waldner A, Smania N. Robot-assisted gait training versus equal intensity treadmill training in patients with mild to moderate Parkinson's disease: A randomized controlled trial. Parkinsonism Relat Disord 2013:19:605-10.
- 39. Pompeu JE, Mendes FAdS, Silva KGd, Lobo AM, Oliveira TdP, ZOmignani AP, et al. Effect of Nintendo Wii™-based motor and cognitive training on activities of daily living in patients with Parkinson's disease: A randomised clinical trial. Physiotherapy 2012:98:196-204
- 40. van Eijkeren FJ, Reijmers RS, Kleinveld MJ, Minten A, Bruggen JP, Bloem BR. Nordic walking improves mobility in Parkinson's disease. Mov Disord 2008;23:2239-43.
- 41. Vivas J, Arias P, Cudeiro J. Aquatic therapy versus conventional land-based therapy for parkinson's disease: An open-label pilot
- Study. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2011;92:1202-10. Yang YR, Lee YY, Cheng SJ, Wang RY. Downhill walking train-ing in individuals with Parkinson's disease: a randomized con-42 trolled trial. Am J Phys Med Rehabil 2010;89:706-14.
- 43. Picelli A, Melotti C, Origano F, Neri R, Waldner A, Smania N. Robot-assisted gait training in patients with Parkinson disease: a randomized controlled trial. Neurorehabil Neural Repair 2012;26:353-61
- Ayan C, Cancela JM, Gutierrez-Santiago A, Prieto I. Effects of 44. two different exercise programs on gait parameters in individuals with Parkinson's disease: A pilot study. Gait Posture 2014:39:648-51.
- 45. Mhatre PV, Vilares I, Stibb SM, Albert MV, Pickering L, Marcinand gait in Parkinson disease. PM&R 2013;5:769-77.
- 46. Loureiro APC, Ribas CG, Zotz TGG, Chen R, Ribas F. Feasibility of virtual therapy in rehabilitation of Parkinson's disease patients: pilot study. Fisioter Mov 2012;25:659-66.
- Lauhoff P, Murphy N, Doherty C, Horgan NF. A controlled clini-47 cal trial investigating the effects of cycle ergometry training on exercise tolerance, balance and quality of life in patients with Parkinson's disease. Disabil Rehabil 2013;35:382-
- Shanahan J, Morris ME, Bhriain ON, Volpe D, Richardson 48 M, Clifford AM. Is Irish set dancing feasible for people with Parkinson's disease in Ireland? Complement Ther Clin Pract 2015;21:47-51.
- Amano S, Nocera JR, Vallabhajosula S, Juncos JL, Gregor RJ, Waddell DE, *et al.* The effect of tai chi exercise on gait initia-49 tion and gait performance in persons with Parkinson's disease. Parkinsonism Relat Disord 2013:19:955-60.
- 50. Ayan C, Cancela J. Feasibility of 2 different water-based exercise training programs in patients with Parkinson's disease: A pilot study. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2012;93:1709-4.
- 51. Avan C. Cancela I. Effects of aquatic exercise on persons with Parkinson's disease: A preliminary study. Science and Sports 2012:27:300-4
- 52. da Silva DM, Nunes MCO, Oliveira PJdAL, Coriolano MdGWdS, Berenguer FdA, Lins OG, et al. Effects of aquatic physiotherapy on life quality on subjects with Parkinson disease. Fisioter Pesqui 2013;20:17-23 [Article in Portoguese].
- 53. Duncan RP, Earhart GM. Randomized controlled trial of com-

not ŗ

This

Publisher

munity-based dancing to modify disease progression in Parkinson disease. Neurorehabil Neural Repair 2012;26:132-43.

- 54. Goncalves GB, Leite MAA, Orsini M, Pereira JS. Effects of using the Nintendo Wii Fit Plus platform in the sensorimotor training of gait disorders in Parkinson's disease. Neurology International 2014;6:5048.
- 55. Hackney ME, Earhart GM. Health-related quality of life and alternative forms of exercise in Parkinson disease. Parkinsonism Relat Disord 2009;15:644-8.
- Hackney ME, Earhart GM. Effects of dance on movement control in Parkinson's disease: a comparison of Argentine tango and American ballroom. J Rehabil Med 2009;41:475-81.
- 57. Hackney ME, Kantorovich S, Levin R, Earhart GM. Effects of tango on functional mobility in Parkinson's disease: a preliminary study. J Neurol Phys Ther 2007;31:173-9.
- Tamir R, Dickstein R, Huberman M. Integration of motor imagery and physical practice in group treatment applied to subjects with Parkinson's disease. Neurorehabil Neural Repair 2007;21:68-75.
- Burini D, Farabollini B, Iacucci S, Rimatori C, Riccardi G, Capecci M, *et al.* A randomized controlled cross-over trial of aerobic training versus Qigong in advanced Parkinson's disease. Eura Medicophys 2006;42:231-8.
- Ebersbach G, Ebersbach A, Edler D, Kaufhold O, Kush M, Kupsch A, *et al.* Comparing exercise in Parkinson's disease—the Berlin BIG Study. Mov Disord 2010;25:1902-8.
- 61. Hackney ME, Éarhart GM. Short duration, intensive tango dancing for Parkinson disease: An uncontrolled pilot study. Complement Ther Med 2009;17:203-7.
- 62. Li F, Harmer P, Fisher KJ, Xu J, Fitzgerald K, Vongjaturapat N. Tai Chi-based exercise for older adults with Parkinson's disease: A pilot-program evaluation. J Aging Phys Act 2007;15:139-51.
- Marchant D, Sylvester JL, Earhart GM. Effects of a short duration, high dose contact improvisation dance workshop on Parkinson disease: A pilot study. Complement Ther Med 2010;18:184-90.
- 64. Sale P, De Pandis MF, Domenica LP, Sova I, Cimolin V, Ancilao A, *et al.* Robot-assisted walking training for individuals with Parkinson's disease: A pilot randomized controlled trial. BMC Neurol 2013;13:1-7.
- Crizzle AM, Newhouse IJ. Is physical exercise beneficial for persons with Parkinson's disease? Clin J Sport Med 2006;16:422-
- 66. Hirsch MA, Toole T, Maitland CG, Rider RA. The effects of balance training and high-intensity resistance training on persons with idiopathic Parkinson's disease. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2003;84:1109-7.
- Li F, Harmer P, Fisher KJ, McAuley E, Chaumeton N, Eckstrom E, et al. Tai Chi and fall reductions in older adults: a randomized controlled trial. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci 2005;60:187-94.
- Voukelatos A, Cumming RG, Lord SR, Rissel C. A randomized, controlled trial of tai chi for the prevention of falls: the Central Sydney tai chi trial. J Am Geriatr Soc 2007;55:1185-91.
   Wolf SL, Barnhart HX, Kutner NG, McNeely E, Coogler C, Xu
- 69. Wolf SL, Barnhart HX, Kutner NG, McNeely E, Coogler C, Xu T. Reducing frailty and falls in older persons: an investigation of Tai Chi and computerized balance training. Atlanta FICSIT Group. Frailty and Injuries: Cooperative Studies of Intervention Techniques. J Am Geriatr Soc 1996;44:489-97.
- Hackney ME, Earhart GM. Tai Chi improves balance and mobility in people with Parkinson disease. Gait Posture 2008;28:456-60.

- 71. Federici A, Bellagamba S, Rocchi MB. Does dance-based training improve balance in adult and young old subjects? A pilot randomized controlled trial. Aging Clin Exp Res 2005;17:385-9.
- Heiberger L, Maurer C, Amtage F, Mendez-Balbuena I, Schulter Monting J, Hepp-Reymond MC, *et al.* Impact of a weekly dance class on the functional mobility and on the quality of life of individuals with Parkinson's disease. Front Aging Neurosci 2011;3:14.
- 73. Verghese J. Cognitive and mobility profile of older social dancers. J Am Geriatr Soc 2006;54:1241-4.
- 74. Zhang J-G, Ishikawa-Takata K, Yamazaki H, Morita T, Ohta T. Postural stability and physical performance in social dancers. Gait Posture 2008;27:697-701.
- Katsura Y, Yoshikawa T, Ueda S-Y, Usui T, Sotobayashi D, Nakao H, *et al.* Effects of aquatic exercise training using water-resistance equipment in elderly. Eur J Appl Physiol 2010;108:957-64.
- 76. Arnold C, Busch A, Schachter C, Harrison E, Olszynski W. A randomized clinical trial of aquatic versus land exercise to improve balance, function, and quality of life in older women with osteoporosis. Physiother Can 2008;60:296-306.
- 77. Kesiktas N, Paker N, Erdogan N, Gülsen G, Bicki D, Yilmaz H. The use of hydrotherapy for the management of spasticity. Neurorehabil Neural Repair 2004;18:268-73.
- Franchimont P, Juchmes J, Lecomte J. Hydrotherapy-mechanisms and indications. Pharmacol Ther 1983;20:79-93.
   Baroni G, Ferrigno G, Rabuffetti M, Pedotti A, Massion J. Long-
- Baroni G, Ferrigno G, Rabuffetti M, Pedotti A, Massion J. Longterm adaptation of postural control in microgravity. Exp Brain Res 1999;128:410-6.
- Morris ME, Iansek R, Matyas TA, Summers JJ. Stride length regulation in Parkinson's disease normalization strategies and underlying mechanisms. Brain 1996;119:551-68.
- 81. Henderson A, Korner-Bitensky N, Levin M. Virtual reality in stroke rehabilitation: a systematic review of its effectiveness for upper limb motor recovery. Top Stroke Rehabil 2007;14:52-61.
- 82. Saposnik G, Levin M. Virtual reality in stroke rehabilitation a meta-analysis and implications for clinicians. Stroke 2011;42:1380-6.

Author roles: 1. Research project - Conception: P. Alves da Rocha, M. E. Morris Organization: P. Alves da Rocha, J. McClelland, M. E. Morris; Execution: P. Alves da Rocha. 2. Statistical Analysis - Design: P. Alves da Rocha, J. McClelland; Execution: P. Alves da Rocha; Review and Critique: J. McClelland, M. E. Morris. 3. Manuscript - Writing of the first draft: P. Alves da Rocha; Review and critique: J. McClelland, M. E. Morris.

Acknowledgments.—The authors thank Cameron Ventura and La Trobe University for the support, especially the Department of Physiotherapy, School of Allied Health. Also, the first author would like to thank CAPES Foundation, Ministry of Education of Brazil for the scholarship.

*Conflicts of interest.*— Priscila Alves da Rocha received scholarship from CAPES - Proc. nº BEX 9407/13-8 CAPES Foundation, Ministry of Education of Brazil, Brasília - DF 70040-020, Brazil, since May 2014.

Received on April 20, 2015.

Accepted for publication on June 30, 2015.

Epub ahead of print on July 3, 2015.

704