

العلاج التأهيلي في مرضي خلل الاتزان الطرفي

رسالة

مقدمة كجزء متمم

للحصول علي درجة الدكتوراة في علم السمع

مقدمة من

الطبيبة/ هدايت السيد محمود الفولي

تحت إشراف

الأستاذ الدكتور / أحمد سامع حسني فريد

أستاذ الأذن و الأنف و الحنجرة

عميد كلية الطب

جامعة القاهرة

الأستاذ الدكتور / محمد طارق عبد العزيز مخنوم

أستاذ أمراض السمع و الصمم

كلية الطب جامعة القاهرة

كلية الطب
جامعة القاهرة
٢٠٠٧

Contents

	Page
<i>Introduction & Aim of The Work</i>	1
<i>Review of Literature</i>	
• Physiological background of balance	5
• Vestibular Compensation	15
• Causes of Peripheral Vestibular Disorders	19
• Effect of unilateral peripheral vestibular injury	31
• Assessment of vestibular system	33
• Vestibular rehabilitation	56
• Evidence that vestibular physical therapy facilitates recovery in people with vestibular hypofunction	72
<i>Materials and Methods</i>	77
<i>Results</i>	86
<i>Discussion</i>	112
<i>Conclusion</i>	122
<i>Recommendations</i>	123
<i>Summary</i>	124
<i>References</i>	126
<i>Arabic summary</i>	

List of figures

Figure No.	Title	Page
1	Balance (gaze & posture) control components	5
2	Inputs and outputs of the balance system	6
3	Crista (cupula and ampullary crest)	8
4	The effects of angular acceleration on the semicircular canals	9
5	Vestibular pathway & connections	11
6	Balance system during rest & turning head in a healthy subject (a,b), Balance system in acute unilateral lesion and compensated condition (c,d)	31
7	Electrode montage for electronystagmography (ENG) testing	43
8	Binocular camera recording for videonystagmography (VNG)	44
9	ENG/VNG testing	45
10	Rotatory chair	46
11	Posturography	50
12	Sensory Organization Test conditions	51
13	Gaze Stabilization Exercises	66
14	Balance & gait exercises	68
15	Gender distribution in the both groups	84
16	Pie chart showing gender distribution in the whole study group	84
17	Hearing status of patients in the study group	85
18	Hearing status of patients in the control group	85
19	Patients with and without BPPV among both groups	86
20	Caloric findings in both groups	87
21	Pie chart showing Canal paresis patients among both groups	87
22	Pie chart showing patients grouped according to hearing status and canal paresis	88
23	No. of patients in both groups among categories of DHI	91
24	Pre and Post-VRT scores in the study group	92
25	No. of patients with canal paresis with or without hearing loss in the study group	97
26	Initial & final evaluation of control group	102
27	No. of patients with canal paresis with or without hearing loss in the control group	103
28	Scatter diagram of equilibrium scores in both groups	108
29	Scatter diagram of vestibular ratio scores in both groups	108
30	Scatter diagram of DHI scores in both groups	109

List of tables

Table	Title	Page
1	Clues to distinguish between central and peripheral causes of vertigo	19
2	Differential Diagnosis of Vertigo	21
3	Summary of the vestibular rehabilitation protocols	81
4	Sample of the home-based VRT program	83
5	Age and gender distribution of both groups	84
6	Hearing status in both study and control groups	85
7	BPPV cases among both groups	86
8	Caloric finding in both groups	86
9	BPPV patients with or without canal paresis	88
10	SOT (Equilibrium Score) results in both groups	89
11	Sensory analysis (vestibular ratio) in both groups	89
12	Mean Equilibrium Scores in both groups	89
13	Mean Vestibular SOT scores in both groups	89
14	Patients with abnormal SOT with or without Canal paresis (CP)	90
15	Mean DHI scores in both groups	90
16	No. of patients in both groups among DHI categories	90
17	Mean SOT equilibrium score Pre-VRT & Post-VRT in the study group	91
18	Mean vestibular SOT score Pre-VRT & Post-VRT in the study group	92
19	Mean DHI score Pre-VRT & Post-VRT in the study group	92
20	Changes in the DHI scores in the study group after VRT	92
21	Study group patients grouped as regards presence of canal paresis/ abnormal SOT	93
22	Pre- & Post-VRT scores in the canal paresis group	93
23	Pre- & Post VRT scores in the abnormal SOT (without canal paresis) group	94
24	P values showing difference in pre & post-VRT assessment in canal paresis & non-canal paresis groups	94
25	Patients with BPPV in the study group	95
26	Pre and Post VRT scores in BPPV group	95
27	Pre and Post VRT scores in non-BPPV group	96
28	P values showing difference in pre & post-VRT assessment in BPPV & non-BPPV groups	96
29	Number of patients with canal paresis with or without hearing loss in the study group	97
30	Pre and Post VRT scores in the canal paresis with hearing loss group	97
31	Pre and Post VRT scores in the canal paresis without hearing loss group	98

32	Pre and Post VRT scores in the non canal paresis non hearing loss group	98
33	Patients with and without hearing loss in the study group	99
34	Pre and Post VRT results of the group with normal hearing	99
35	Pre and Post VRT results of the group with hearing loss	100
36	P values showing difference in pre & post-VRT assessment in patients with & without hearing loss	100
37	Correlation between age and VRT outcome	101
38	Initial & final evaluation of the control group	101
39	Initial & final results of the canal paresis group	102
40	No. of patients with canal paresis with or without hearing loss in the control group	103
41	Initial & final results of the canal paresis with hearing loss group	103
42	Initial & final results of the non canal paresis group	104
43	P values showing difference in initial & final assessment in patients with canal paresis with hearing loss group & non canal paresis group	104
44	Patients grouped according to hearing status	105
45	Initial & final results of patients without hearing loss	105
46	Initial & final results of patients with hearing loss	105
47	P values showing difference in initial & final assessment in patients with & without hearing loss	106
48	Changes in BPPV patients of the control group	106
49	Initial & final evaluation in non-BPPV group	107
50	Initial & final evaluation in BPPV group	107

Abstract

Objective: To determine the outcome of vestibular rehabilitation protocols in subjects with peripheral vestibular disorders compared with abnormal control subjects. **Study Design:** Randomized study using repeated measure, matched control design. Subjects were solicited consecutively according to these criteria: vestibular disorder subjects who had abnormal results of computerized dynamic posturography (CDP) sensory organization tests (SOTs) 5 and 6 and/or canal paresis. Besides, unresolved BPPV. **Subjects:** Men and women over age 18 with chronic vestibular disorders and chief complaints of unsteadiness, imbalance, and/or motion intolerance. **Interventions:** Pre- and post-rehabilitation assessment included CDP, & DHI. Individualized rehabilitation plans were designed and implemented to address the subject's specific complaints and functional deficits. Supervised sessions were held at weekly intervals, and self-administered programs were devised for daily home use. **Main Outcome Measures:** CDP composite and vestibular ratio scores, self-assessment questionnaire results (DHI scores). **Results:** Subjects who underwent rehabilitation (Group A) showed statistically significant improvements in SOTs, overall composite score, and DHI scores, abnormal (Group B) control groups had statistically significant improvement as regards DHI scores only. **Conclusions:** Outcome measures of vestibular protocol physical therapy confirmed objective and subjective improvement in subjects with chronic peripheral vestibular disorders. These findings support results reported by other investigators.

Key Words: Vestibular rehabilitation—Peripheral vestibular disorders— Computerized dynamic posturography—Sensory organization testing—DHI.

Acknowledgment

I would like to express my greatest appreciation to Professor Dr. Ahmad Sameh Hosni Fareed for his support, help, continuous encouragement and precious time.

I would like also to express my gratitude to Professor Dr. Mohammad Tarek Ghanoum, for his supervision and valuable advice.

Finally, I would like to thank my family, friends, and colleagues for their help and support.



Aim of The Work

1. To determine the objective response to individualized vestibular rehabilitation therapy (VRT) protocols in subjects with peripheral vestibular disorders.
2. To determine the effectiveness in decreasing some symptoms, such as vertigo, and increasing performance of daily life skills after VRT.
3. To manage benign paroxysmal positional vertigo (BPPV) patients, who has been under successful canal repositioning procedures, and still complain of vertigo or unsteadiness.

Conclusions

1. Outcome measures of vestibular rehabilitation protocols confirmed objective and subjective improvement of balance and dizziness handicap in patients with peripheral vestibular disorders.
2. Based on an understanding of the vestibular system, the balance system, and normal functional capabilities, appropriate rehabilitative exercises can be designed for patients with chronic vestibular loss.
3. Vestibular rehabilitation improves symptoms, postural stability, and dizziness-related handicap in patients with chronic dizziness.
4. Successful vestibular rehabilitation therapy improves activities of daily living.
5. The results indicate that home-based exercises can significantly improve balance abilities in people with chronic vestibular dysfunction.
6. We believe that vestibular habituation retains a useful role in the treatment of BPPV.

Discussion

Vestibular rehabilitation therapy is not new. It has long been recognized clinically as an effective method of managing peripheral vestibular disorders. In 1944, Cawthorne proposed a physiologic basis for head exercises for treatment of “giddiness” (vertigo). Vestibular rehabilitation therapy clearly and unequivocally improves both function and symptoms in patients with peripheral vestibular disorders (*Black et al., 2000*).

This randomized controlled study was conducted on 45 patients, in the period from October 2004 to October 2006. Their ages range from 21 to 69 years old, their mean age is 43.9 (SD 12.9). The whole study group was divided into two groups; group A (study group), which included patients suffering from vertigo, with canal weakness or abnormal SOT, or both. This group consists of 34 patients. The other group, group B (control group), included patients having same complaints, and findings as group A, but these patients weren't subjected to VRT, as with group A patients. This group included 11 patients.

Group A had 17 female, and 17 male patients, while group B had 6 female and 5 male patients.

The assessment of all patients was done initially before starting VRT, and were re-evaluated later after 3 months of VRT sessions (study group), or after 3 months duration in the control group.

Assessment included; objective measures which are; hearing status of the patients, search for spontaneous nystagmus, oculography, positional and positioning tests (searching for BPPV cases), caloric testing, SOT (composite, and vestibular ratio scores).

Though SOT testing is a popular measure in assessing patients with peripheral vestibular disorders, and assessing improvement related to VRT, still some authors might find it an invalidated measure in assessing the functional limitations in those patients. *O'Neil et al, (1998)*, assessed the validity of SOT, and they found that SOT lacks concurrent validity with functional and gait performance measures in patients who present with peripheral vestibular hypofunction and requested VRT for their postural instability. Accordingly, SOT by itself is not a useful measure to assess changes in balance and functional performance in patients with vestibulopathy.

We also included a subjective assessment in the form of DHI to better analyze the patients symptoms and disabilities related to these symptoms.

Group A patients had 15 patients with normal hearing status, 16 with unilateral SNHL, and 3 with bilateral SNHL. Group B patients had 5 patients with normal hearing levels, 5 with unilateral SNHL, and one patient with bilateral SNHL.

Both study groups had patients with BPPV, who had been under various treatments including canal repositioning procedures, but still complain of postural instability or unsteadiness. Our aim in including those patients was to find other strategy in treating persistent BPPV cases.

All patients in group A were subjected to VRT for 3 months, based on weekly supervised sessions, and home based exercises. The VRT program was designed for every patient according to his or her complaints. All patients were subjected to postural exercises, as it has been proven to improve the outcome of patients in performing better in daily activities, and even in vestibular testing. According to symptoms present, some patients were given gaze stabilization exercises, habituation exercises designed to facilitate central nervous system compensation by extinguishing pathologic responses to head motion, , and general conditioning activities. The

progress of exercises depends on the amount of improvement shown by each patient in the weekly visits. As the performance gets better the amount and quality of exercises are increased, but either the number or the quality of exercises are increased each time, this enables the patients to better understand and perform in the program.

Much of our findings results from an individualized VRT program for each subject. By tailoring the VRT approach to each patient's specific functional deficits and symptoms, and by making frequent adjustments based directly on their progress or lack of progress, we have observed positive responses in almost all our subjects.

The composite score in our study showed high statistically significant improvement ($P=0.001$) after completion of VRT, compared to results obtained pre-VRT. These results are matching with those obtained by **Badke et al. (2005)**, who found significant improvement in composite SOT scores. **Perez et al.(2006)** also confirm this finding that SOT scores improved in the 37 patient they conducted VRT on for 5 weeks interval. These findings were obtained by **Brown et al, (2001)**, **Black et al, (2000)**, **Blakley et al (1999)**, **Yardley et al, (1998)**, **Cass et al. (1996)** and **Shepard et al. (1993)** too, who documented that physical therapy results in an improvement in balance in patients with peripheral vestibular disorders. These studies suggested that after full compensation, results of posturography tests normalize and patients lose their abnormal vestibular pattern. **Cohen & Kimball (2004)** also studied effect of VRT on gait, balance, and ataxia, and found that SOT scores had improved significantly in addition to improved time to perform TUG.

On the other hand we found that the vestibular ratio improved, yet the improvement didn't reach a statistically significant value ($P=0.12$). Our findings, Among all patients in both groups, the post-VRT (or after 3 months in the control group), the vestibular ratio improved to an insignificant value, though the equilibrium scores did improve to a statistically significant figure, denoting that VRT improves