



Rehabilitation Interventions in Systemic Sclerosis: A Systematic Review and Future Directions

Susan L Murphy, Janet L Poole, Yen T Chen, Alain Lescoat, Dinesh Khanna

► To cite this version:

Susan L Murphy, Janet L Poole, Yen T Chen, Alain Lescoat, Dinesh Khanna. Rehabilitation Interventions in Systemic Sclerosis: A Systematic Review and Future Directions. *Arthritis Care and Research*, 2022, 74 (1), pp.59-69. 10.1002/acr.24737 . hal-03282605

HAL Id: hal-03282605

<https://hal.science/hal-03282605>

Submitted on 16 Jul 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

DR. SUSAN MURPHY (Orcid ID : 0000-0001-7924-0012)

DR. ALAIN LESCOAT (Orcid ID : 0000-0003-2081-8558)

DR. DINESH KHANNA (Orcid ID : 0000-0003-1412-4453)

Article type : Original Article

Rehabilitation Interventions in Systemic Sclerosis: A Systematic Review and Future Directions

Susan L. Murphy ScD OTR^{1,2,3}, Janet L. Poole, PhD OTR/L⁴, Yen T. Chen PhD^{1,3},

Alain Lescoat MD PhD^{3,5,6,7}, Dinesh Khanna MD, MS^{3,7}

¹ Department of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, University of Michigan, USA

² VA Ann Arbor Healthcare System, Geriatric Research Education and Clinical Center, GRECC, Ann Arbor, MI USA.

³ Michigan Scleroderma Program, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA

⁴ Department of Occupational Therapy, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico, USA

⁵ Department of Internal Medicine and Clinical Immunology, Rennes University Hospital, Rennes, France.

⁶ Univ Rennes, CHU Rennes, Inserm, EHESP, Irset (Institut de Recherche en Santé, Environnement et Travail) - UMR_S 1085, Rennes, France

⁷ Division of Rheumatology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the [Version of Record](#). Please cite this article as [doi: 10.1002/ACR.24737](https://doi.org/10.1002/ACR.24737)

Corresponding author: Susan L. Murphy ScD OTR/L, 24 Frank Lloyd Wright Drive, PO Box 344, Ann Arbor MI 48106; 734-936-2123; sumurphy@umich.edu (corresponding author)

Funding: Dr. Chen is supported by a postdoctoral fellowship award funded by the University of Michigan's Advanced Rehabilitation Research Training Program in Community Living and Participation from the National Institute of Disability, Independent Living, and Rehabilitation Research, Administration for Community Living (grant # 90ARCP0003); Dr. Lescoat was funded by the French network of the University Hospitals HUGO (Hôpitaux Universitaires du Grand Ouest) (AAP- GIRCI JCM2020) and a grant from Rennes University Hospital (CORECT Visiting Grant 2020). Dr. Khanna's work was supported by the NIH/National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases (K24-AR-063129).

Conflict of Interest: authors have no conflict of interest to disclose.

Word count: 3793

ABSTRACT

Objective. To systematically review evidence of rehabilitation interventions for improving outcomes in systemic sclerosis (SSc) and to evaluate evidence quality.

Methods. Several electronic databases were searched to identify studies in which rehabilitation professionals delivered, supervised, or participated in interventions for individuals with SSc. Randomized (RCTs) or non-randomized trials, one-arm trials, and prospective quasi-experimental studies with interventions were included if they had > 10 participants. Quality appraisal was done by two independent raters using the Physiotherapy Evidence Database (PEDro) Scale.

Results. Sixteen good or excellent quality studies (15 RCTs, 1 prospective quasi-experimental study) were included. Most rehabilitation interventions focused on hands/upper extremities, followed by multicomponent, orofacial, and directed self-management. Sample sizes varied between 20 – 267 participants (median = 38). In 50% of studies, participants in intervention groups significantly improved compared to controls. Most studies demonstrated within-group improvements in intervention groups. Interventions varied in content, delivery, length, and dose and outcome measures collected.

Conclusion. Existing evidence provides some support for rehabilitation in SSc, such as interventions that focus on hand and upper extremity outcomes or are multicomponent, although there is high study heterogeneity. The evidence base would benefit from interventions testing similar replicable components, use of common outcome measures, and incorporation of delivery modes that enable larger sample sizes. There are challenges in recruiting participants due to SSc's rarity and involving participants in rehabilitation studies that require active participation over time due to high disease burden. Intervention studies designed to reduce participation barriers may facilitate translation of effective interventions into practice.

SIGNIFICANCE AND INNOVATIONS

- This is the first systematic review of rehabilitation literature in SSc.
- Rehabilitation interventions demonstrate improvements in hand/upper extremity function, and health-related quality of life; however, the studies mainly involve small samples and vary in intervention content and dose.
- Multicomponent interventions and those that focus specifically on hands and upper extremities showed the most improvements in outcomes.
- Evidence-building in SSc will require attention to enhancing comparability across studies such as by testing similar interventions, using the same outcome measures, and reporting findings appropriately.

Systemic sclerosis (SSc; also called scleroderma) is a rare, chronic, and progressive autoimmune disease characterized by skin fibrosis, vasculopathy, and visceral damage (1). SSc is often classified into two subtypes (2): limited and diffuse cutaneous SSc, which provides a clinically useful profile of people who have different progression of skin thickening and survival rates (2). People with both limited or diffuse subtypes commonly experience Raynaud's phenomenon, pain, fatigue, decreased flexibility, reduced strength, and visceral involvement. People with diffuse cutaneous SSc are more likely to have significant skin disease burden with large joint contractures and to have severe disease involvement in internal organs with lung fibrosis and renal crisis, whereas limited cutaneous SSc is likely to be associated with pulmonary arterial hypertension. Organ involvement, which can be life threatening, is a focus of clinical care in SSc, while less attention is spent on resultant disability and quality of life issues such as hand involvement, appearance changes, and fatigue (3-5). Yet, these symptoms are of significant concern to people with SSc (5). Regardless of subtype, there is a high symptom burden and disability that has significant effects on work and participation in life roles (6, 7). There have been treatment advances, but no approved disease-modifying drugs for SSc. Without a cure, strategies that help individuals with SSc with chronic disease management are needed.

Rehabilitation is an important tool to help individuals manage SSc and potentially slow its disabling effects; however, there are difficulties in translating evidence-based rehabilitation strategies into practice. Less than one in four people with SSc across several countries reported using rehabilitation services (physical or occupational therapy) (8) and there are low referral rates to rehabilitation (9). Additionally, most rehabilitation professionals do not have clinical experience with SSc due to its rarity, and there is little clinical guidance available for rehabilitation professionals when encountering these patients. There have been articles that have discussed the effectiveness of rehabilitation treatments in SSc; however, the literature has not been systematically reviewed for interventions specifically performed or supervised by rehabilitation professionals. Since 2001, and the updated definition of diffuse and limited cutaneous subtypes (10), there have only been two narrative reviews that examined rehabilitation treatments either limited to musculoskeletal impairments (11) or to describing local and generalized rehabilitation treatments (12); and neither review examined evidence based on study quality. Systematic reviews done in SSc encompass some rehabilitation studies but also included other non-pharmacological treatments, such as nutrition and dental treatments (13), or

examined effects of exercise but included studies that were not done within or as part of rehabilitation (14). A systematic review of rehabilitation treatments is still needed to provide a current understanding of the quality of this literature and provide the foundation to future directions to build evidence in this area. The objective of this systematic review was to examine the evidence for rehabilitation interventions in SSc. Therefore, our primary research question was: What is the effectiveness for rehabilitation interventions for individuals with SSc on clinical outcomes? Our secondary question was: What is the overall quality of the body of evidence in SSc rehabilitation?

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Search Strategy

The following databases were selected for the literature search: Medline through OVID, SCOPUS, Embase, CINAHL, the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), OT Seeker, and PEDro. These databases were selected in conjunction with our university library informationist along with guidance from the rehabilitation literature (15). In addition to searching these databases, we examined publication reference lists and other reviews for studies that would potentially meet study criteria. The informationist performed a literature search in these databases from year 2001 and later. Reviewing the literature starting at 2001 was done because the diagnostic classifications of SSc (diffuse and limited cutaneous) were updated that year (10) and we wanted to ensure we were including comparable patient samples. Searches involved subject headings unique to each database but similar to the Medline medical subject headings. The complete search strategy with terms used can be found in the Supplementary Material. The protocol for this systematic review is published in an online registry (16) and was conducted in accordance with PRISMA guidelines.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Because our intent was to select publications that examined rehabilitation practices, intervention studies were eligible for inclusion if the interventions included a rehabilitation professional (physical/physio therapist, occupational therapist, ergotherapist, rehabilitation specialist, or speech pathologist) for their delivery or supervision. Interventions that were multidisciplinary and included rehabilitation were also considered within scope. Interventions were excluded if they were conducted

by related but different disciplines, like respiratory therapy, nursing, or dentistry, or if they were complementary and alternative treatments not conducted by rehabilitation, like acupuncture or spa treatments. Interventions performed for the primary purpose of examining effects on a biomarker or physiological outcome in a research environment and not a clinical treatment were also excluded. Publications needed to involve adult samples (> 18 years) who had a diagnosis of SSc (limited or diffuse according to 1988 classification and updated in 2001) (10). Studies also needed to include samples that had > 10 participants, which excluded studies with a very low sample size given the heterogeneity of SSc, similar to another review (13). Given the state of the evidence, we felt it was important to consider all intervention studies with designs in which participants were either randomized or not, including pre-post studies and prospective studies that involved interventions. We also included published abstracts for the purpose of identifying additional research studies based on that work. Because some team members were fluent in languages other than English, we also considered articles written in French or Chinese.

Article Selection

Citations generated from the search were imported into Covidence® systematic review software for title and abstract screening. A pair of reviewers independently screened all titles and abstracts to determine if the articles met inclusion criteria. Conflicts were resolved by a third reviewer. A full text review of each eligible article was then conducted by the same pair of reviewers. These reviewers independently coded each full-text for the inclusion criteria. Disagreements in the full-text evaluation were resolved through discussion, and misunderstandings were corrected to ensure consistency for the remainder of the article evaluation. After full-text evaluation, there were 33 articles to include in quality assessment and data extraction.

Assessment of Methodological Quality

Quality appraisal was used to answer the secondary research question. The PEDro scale was used to assess article quality (17). It was developed for rehabilitation literature quality appraisal and has been shown to be a more comprehensive measure for rehabilitation evidence than the commonly-used Jadad scale (18). The PEDro scale has a possible score of 10, in which one point is given for each quality metric that is met. Quality classification is: <4 = poor, 4-5 = fair, 6-8 = good, and 9-10 =

excellent (19). Two independent raters trained in use of the PEDro scale independently rated each included article for quality. Any article for evaluation that was written by members of the study team did not include that member as a rater. We calculated inter-rater agreement of methodological quality for 18% of the articles (i.e. 6 articles) using Cohen's Kappa. After all raters reached a high level of agreement of articles by quality category (.80 or above) (20), they completed evaluation of the remaining articles. Discrepancies on remaining articles were resolved through discussion.

Data extraction

We extracted data from articles that met a quality classification of > 6 on the PEDro scale (good to excellent quality) (19). Data extraction was verified for 20% of articles. Data was independently extracted by a rater pair and then checked for consistency by a third rater. Only one discrepancy was found and resolved. One co-author then extracted data from the remaining articles with data verification by a different co-author.

Evidence Synthesis

Studies were summarized by aspects of the intervention, such as intervention content, setting in which it was delivered (clinic, home, telehealth, or some combination), length, and dose. After a review of intervention content of included studies, interventions were categorized as: hand/upper extremities (UE), orofacial, multicomponent, or directed self-management. Hand/UE included any treatments for hand or UE symptom reduction or increased mobility (like thermal treatments, manual therapy, or exercises). Orofacial included an exercise intervention addressing mouth opening. Multicomponent rehabilitation interventions involved more than one treatment for specific body part such as hand or face but also more generalized whole-body treatments, such as aerobic or water-based exercises. Directed self-management included a rehabilitation-involved self-paced symptom self-management program.

Sample characteristics were summarized by age, sex, ethnicity/race, subtype of SSc, and disease duration. Other elements of the synthesis included study design, timing of outcomes collection, assessment measures used, and whether study authors designated a primary outcome. Due to variability in outcome assessments, outcome domains were created to summarize findings.

RESULTS

Search Results

The systematic literature search yielded 3478 publications in which titles and abstracts were screened by rater pairs. There was disagreement regarding eligibility among pairs in 2% of cases (79/3478), resolved by a third rater. The most common reason for exclusion was due to being an abstract with insufficient data on the involvement of a rehabilitation professional in the intervention (72% of those excluded). Ninety full texts were evaluated and 33 were selected for quality appraisal (Figure 1).

There were 16 articles included in this review.

Characteristics of Studies

The characteristics and main findings of each study are shown in Table 1. Of the 16 articles, 15 were randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and one used a prospective quasi-experimental study design (49). The sample sizes ranged from 20 – 267 people (median sample size = 38). Thirty-eight percent of articles (6/16) came from Italy (three of which were by the same author), three were from the US, and remaining articles came from other countries. Most studies involved a high proportion of females to males (the lowest percentage of females was 47%, 15/16 studies ranged from 65 – 100% females). In the US, Yuen et al (21) had the highest proportion of minorities (52% of African Americans, followed by Murphy et al (22) with 22%). The average age of participants across studies ranged from 50 to 65 years. Only three studies involved patients early in their disease process [average of 1-3 years since diagnosis (22, 23), or median of 4 years since diagnosis (24)]. The average disease duration of participants in the remainder of articles was > 6 years. With regard to disease subtype, 19% of articles did not specify. In terms of primary outcome, 6/16 articles (38%) did not specify a primary outcome.

Quality

Of potentially eligible articles reviewed, only 48% were considered of good quality or better on the PEDRO scale and were included. Of these 16 articles, the average PEDro score was 7.0 (SD = 0.97). Articles rated by each quality metric is located in the Supplemental Material. Only one article was rated as excellent (25). The number of included articles by quality criteria on the PEDro scale are shown in Figure 2. The aspect of quality that was met by the fewest studies was blinding. Over half of articles (56%) used blinded outcome assessors, only two had participants that were blinded, and no articles had therapists who were blinded.

Intervention Delivery and Content

Of the interventions which we classified by categories—hand/UE, orofacial, multicomponent, and directed self-management (Table 1)—hand/UE was the focus for over half of studies (9/16), followed by multicomponent interventions (5/16). All multicomponent interventions included treatments targeted to hands/UE, but also other aspects such as orofacial exercises, general aerobic or resistance exercise, or supervision or check-in calls from therapists. There was one intervention that focused only on orofacial exercises (21) and another that involved a rehabilitation-directed self-management program that had moderated online discussion boards with participants involving a rehabilitation professional (26). Intervention length ranged from 2 weeks to 12 months. Delivery mode was most often done in clinic either with a home component, such as an exercise program (n=4), without a home component (n=4), or with a telehealth component, which was an app-delivered exercise program with education (n=1) (22). The remaining 7 studies were designed as home interventions with two having a telehealth component (26, 27).

Investigators in almost all studies regardless of intervention content, evaluated quality of life (Table 2). The most commonly used measures were the Health Assessment Questionnaire (HAQ and HAQ-Disability Index) (n= 9) and SF-36 (n=11), which are reliable and valid outcomes in persons with SSc. Furthermore, since the majority of the studies were categorized as hand/UE or multicomponent, the other most frequent outcome measure was the HAMIS (n = 9), also validated for people with SSc. Other outcomes, grouped in domains, such as skin, pulmonary, cardiac, were used less frequently and were specific to intervention content (Table 2).

Table 2 shows findings for articles based on between-group differences in outcomes measured; more details are contained in the Supplementary Material. Most effects from SSc interventions were in hand/UE function and health-related quality of life domains, followed by orofacial. Interventions with the most effects had a hand exercise component or were multicomponent. In the hand/UE intervention category, findings varied as did interventions. The two studies that examined the effect of heat (warm water, paraffin) reported no significant difference between intervention and control groups (28, 29) as did two studies that have focused on hand exercises or massage with or without glove wearing (23, 27). The exceptions were studies that incorporated manual lymph drainage (48) or negative pressure

and stretching (22) reported significant between-group differences for some hand/UE outcomes. The only study that compared modality use (biofeedback, deep oscillation) to a control condition, did find a significant improvement in biofeedback compared to control, while the oscillation group revealed a trend in improvement (24). Furthermore, within hand/UE interventions, in the intervention group, significant improvements were reported in 7/9 (78%) of studies for the hand/UE function outcomes and in 5/7 (71%) of studies that had quality of life outcomes.

More positive group differences were reported in the multicomponent studies especially ones in which the interventions took place over a longer time period (31-33). In these studies, significant differences were reported between intervention and control groups for hand/UE function, orofacial, and quality of life (31-33). Specifically, 4/5 (80%) of studies in the multicomponent category reported within-group improvements in the intervention group in hand/UE function outcomes and quality of life outcomes. In the one orofacial intervention, there were significant improvements in oral aperture (face/mouth function) in the intervention group which were significantly different than the control group (21). The one directed self-management study did not report significant group differences (26). In general, many studies did report significant improvements in outcome measures within the intervention groups but the improvements were not significantly different from changes observed in the control groups.

DISCUSSION

We systematically reviewed the literature in SSc to examine the effectiveness of rehabilitation interventions. From 33 studies identified, just under half (48%) met the quality standard for inclusion. Sixteen studies representing rehabilitation interventions focused on hand/UE or orofacial, were multicomponent, or involved rehabilitation-directed self-management were rated as good to excellent quality. Half of these studies showed between-group differences in which the intervention group had a statistically significant improvement compared to the control group on at least one outcome (21,22,24,25,31,32,33,48). Most studies in this review had relatively small sample sizes which may have resulted in lack of power to detect between-group interventions in studies with active comparator groups. However, the heterogeneity in studies and interventions make it difficult to synthesize the literature. These findings can be framed around two main challenges which have implications for

translation of research into practice: evidence-building of rehabilitation research and conducting rehabilitation studies in the SSc population.

The complexity and patient-centered nature of rehabilitation contribute to challenges of evidence-building and synthesizing results across rehabilitation trials. One problem is inconsistency in trial reporting, such as lack of pre-defined primary outcome measure, even among good quality studies.

There is a lack of consensus in reporting in rehabilitation RCTs in many areas such as participant characteristics (34); randomization procedures, statistical analyses and power (35); and intervention description (36). Tools under development such as checklists to extend the CONSORT statement for rehabilitation trial reporting (37) should help increase study quality and ability to synthesize findings. Many studies in this review had variable reporting of patient characteristics, intervention description, comparator/control groups, and lacked power analyses. Blinding was not done frequently and is challenging in a real-world environment with therapists, outcome assessors and participants. Despite challenges, some recommendations have been discussed to help ensure study rigor without being impossible such as blinding assessors and using active comparator groups where participants can be blinded to which intervention is hypothesized to be better (38).

Interventions tested in this review were difficult to synthesize even within a specific category. Hands and UE were most commonly addressed in interventions, but intervention content and dose were highly variable. Description of treatment rationale, goals and expected benefits and underlying theory of interventions are recommended for reporting (39) and consistent information across studies could help build evidence and reduce variability. In addition, thought about the mechanism of action is critical. While SSc rehabilitation treatments incorporate specific elements, such as thermal modalities, massage, and stretching, few studies discuss why these components are essential or investigate how they work. For example, to examine if negative pressure treatment affects skin thickness in SSc, Murphy and colleagues developed a protocol to use musculoskeletal ultrasound to examine changes in skin thickness after an occupational therapist-delivered treatment (40). Testing mechanism of action in rehabilitation treatments will help design and better target interventions in the future.

Most studies in this review required participants to come to clinics to receive all or some of the intervention. Even for interventions designed to be done at home, participants had to travel to receive

a device (wax or exercise machine) and/or instruction. Only one intervention was done completely via telehealth (26). Participation in interventions requiring in-person attendance may be prohibitive for those who do not live in urban areas, near scleroderma centers, or have transportation. Telehealth is an emerging mode of intervention delivery within rehabilitation. The recent global pandemic has led to massive changes in how healthcare and interventions are delivered. People have been forced to be more “tech savvy” and virtual interventions are becoming more accessible. The increased opportunity for virtual interventions helps to respond to the unmet need identified by people with SSc who want information delivered via the internet (41). Yet, virtual telehealth intervention delivery presents challenges to those with limited internet access, no video capabilities on their phones, and/or in areas with unstable connections. Further, telehealth is limited in its ability to provide hands-on treatment like massage or stretching by a rehabilitation professional which may reap greater benefits at least in the short-term or be preferred by patients.

A further complication is that the reviewed studies were conducted in many countries with different health care systems and reimbursement structures. These differences have implications for how interventions could be translated into clinical practice outside the study’s country of origin. Becetti and colleagues (8) reported that use of rehabilitation was higher in Canada and France compared to the United States and speculated that referral could be related to access to rehabilitation and health care costs. Other studies that surveyed providers reported referrals driven by costs (42) and a lack of understanding of the role of rehabilitation in management of SSc (43, 44).

In the US, African Americans have a higher prevalence of diffuse cutaneous SSc and more severe disease (45). However, the number of African Americans in research studies on SSc remains low. Although the three US studies reported on race and/or ethnic characteristics of samples, inclusion of diverse samples will be needed to better understand differences by race and ethnicity in the future.

For many studies in this review, outcome measures used have psychometric support for SSc. Stronger support exists for HAQ-DI, CHFT, and SF-36 than for the other outcomes (46). While these outcomes are largely self-reported and considered patient-centered, they do not measure what is important to patients or patients’ goals. Only the COPM or MACTAR used in two studies (25, 32) were truly patient-centered, and in one study, goals identified on the COPM guided the intervention (25).

Engaging patient stakeholders as members of research teams may also help initiate use of goal identification as outcomes and to guide interventions thus improving adherence.

Future Directions

The design of future SSc rehabilitation trials may benefit from lessons inherited from recent RCTs evaluating pharmacological treatments in SSc. Taking into account different subsets of the disease and impact of the natural history of SSc may help to include more homogeneous and comparable patient populations. Maddali Bongi and Del Rosso have recommended that rehabilitation treatments should be tailored to individuals based on phase of disease (47) because individuals with early disease tend to have a higher symptom burden. Another strategy is to focus on just one SSc cutaneous subtype, such as diffuse (22, 23). Specifying a clinically meaningful primary outcome measure that is tailored for a targeted disease subset [such as people in the edematous phase (48)], may help to improve statistical power of future RCTs. The coordination of centers of excellence with a multidisciplinary approach may also help expedite recruitment and ensure consistency of outcome measures. The use of web-based approaches for intervention delivery is a promising option to implement rehabilitation for daily SSc management as it may reduce some barriers to access, more readily allow for longer follow-up periods and facilitate treatment adherence. The long term impact of these techniques will also need to be demonstrated in RCTs as SSc remains a chronic disorder without available disease-modifying pharmacological agents and without demonstration of improved quality of life with current medications. Rehabilitation may thus play an important role to improve such patient reported outcomes with impact of more a holistic approach, including rehabilitation, on SSc patients' mental and social health as well as physical functioning.

Limitations

The conclusions drawn are limited by studies that are somewhat heterogeneous and consist of small sample sizes which may be underpowered to detect effects, even in this group of studies considered to be of good to excellent quality. However, understanding weaknesses in study design and reporting can help to build the evidence by increasing potency of interventions and consideration of how to best tailor them. Importantly, interventions were of low risk to participants and had effects on both physical and quality of life outcomes, supporting the need for inclusion as part of clinical care.

Conclusion

Rehabilitation interventions have been recommended for people with SSc to address the musculoskeletal and systemic involvement leading to significant disability and reduction in meaningful activities (47). This comprehensive review of rehabilitation literature supports short-term efficacy of rehabilitation interventions and provides several future directions to further build the evidence and develop interventions that can reduce access barriers.

References

1. Bolster M, Silver R. Clinical features of systemic sclerosis. In: Hochberg MC SA, Smolen JS, Weinblatt ME, Weisman, MH, editors. *Rheumatology*. 5th ed. Philadelphia: Mosby, Elsevier; 2011. 1373–86.
2. Domsic RT, Medsger TA, Jr. Disease subsets in clinical practice. In: Varga J, Denton C, Wigley FM, Allanore Y, Kuwana M, Eds. *Scleroderma: From Pathogenesis to Comprehensive Management* 2nd Ed; 2017. 39-48.
3. Richards HL, Herrick AL, Griffin K, Gwilliam PDH, Loukes J, Fortune DG. Systemic sclerosis: patients' perceptions of their condition. *Arthritis Care Res*. 2003;49(5):689-96.
4. van Lankveld WGJM, Vonk MC, Teunissen H, van den Hoogen FHJ. Appearance self-esteem in systemic sclerosis - Subjective experience of skin deformity and its relationship with physician-assessed skin involvement, disease status and psychological variables. *Rheumatology*. 2007;46(5):872-6.
5. Sandusky SB, McGuire L, Smith MT, Wigley FM, Haythornthwaite JA. Fatigue: An overlooked determinant of physical function in scleroderma. *Rheumatology*. 2009;48(2):165-9.
6. Schnitzer M, Hudson M, Baron M, Steele R. Disability in systemic sclerosis-a longitudinal observational study. *J Rheumatol*. 2010;38:685-92.
7. Poole JL, Chandrasekaran A, Hildebrand K, Skipper B. Participation in life situations by persons with systemic sclerosis. *Disabil Rehabil*. 2015;37(10):842-5.
8. Becetti K, Kwakkenbos L, Carrier M-E, Gordon JK, Nguyen J, Mancuso CA, et al. Physical or occupational therapy utilization in systemic sclerosis: a scleroderma patient-centered intervention network cohort study. *Journal Rheumatol*. 2019;jrheum.181130.
9. Bassel M, Hudson M, Baron M, Taillefer SS, Mouthon L, Poiraudau S, et al. Physical and occupational therapy referral and use among systemic sclerosis patients with impaired hand function: Results from a Canadian national survey. *Clin Exp Rheumatol*. 2012;30(4):574-7.
10. LeRoy EC, Medsger TA, Jr. Criteria for the classification of early systemic sclerosis. *J Rheumatol*. 2001;28(7):1573-6.
11. Poole JL. Musculoskeletal rehabilitation in the person with scleroderma. *Curr Opin Rheumatol*. 2010;22(2):205-12.

12. Mugii N, Hamaguchi Y, Maddali-Bongi S. Clinical significance and usefulness of rehabilitation for systemic sclerosis. *J Scleroderma Relat Disord*. 2018;3(1):71-80.
13. Willems LM, Vriezekolk JE, Schouffoer AA, Poole JL, Stamm TA, Boström C, et al. Effectiveness of nonpharmacologic interventions in systemic sclerosis: a systematic review. *Arthritis Care Res*. 2015;67(10):1426-39.
14. Liem SIE, Vliet Vlieland TPM, Schoones JW, de Vries-Bouwstra JK. The effect and safety of exercise therapy in patients with systemic sclerosis: a systematic review. *Rheumatol Adv Pract*. 2019;3(2):rkz044.
15. Michaleff ZA, Costa LOP, Moseley AM, Maher CG, Elkins MR, Herbert RD, et al. CENTRAL, PEDro, PubMed, and EMBASE are the most comprehensive databases indexing randomized controlled trials of physical therapy interventions. *Phys Ther*. 2011;91(2):190-7.
16. Murphy S, Poole J, Chen Y, Lescoat A, Khanna D. Rehabilitation in systemic sclerosis: a systematic review protocol. *Open Science Framework (OSF)*; 2021.
17. Moseley AM, Herbert RD, Sherrington C, Maher CG. Evidence for physiotherapy practice: A survey of the Physiotherapy Evidence Database (PEDro). *Aust J Physiother*. 2002;48(1):43-9.
18. Bhogal SK, Teasell RW, Foley NC, Speechley MR. The PEDro scale provides a more comprehensive measure of methodological quality than the Jadad scale in stroke rehabilitation literature. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2005;58(7):668-73.
19. Foley NC, Teasell RW, Bhogal SK, Speechley MR. Stroke rehabilitation evidence-based review: methodology. *Top Stroke Rehabil*. 2003;10(1):1-7.
20. Altman DG. *Practical statistics for medical research*. London: Chapman and Hall; 1991.
21. Yuen HK, Marlow NM, Reed SG, Mahoney S, Summerlin LM, Leite R, et al. Effect of orofacial exercises on oral aperture in adults with systemic sclerosis. *Disabil Rehabil*. 2012;34(1):84-9.
22. Murphy SL BM, Huang S, Sabbagh M, Cutter G, Khanna D. Intensive and app-delivered occupational therapy to improve upper extremity function in early diffuse cutaneous systemic sclerosis: a pilot two-arm trial *Rheumatology (Oxford)*. 2021; keab339.

23. Vannajak K, Boonprakob Y, Eungpinichpong W, Ungpansattawong S, Nanagara R. The short-term effect of gloving in combination with Traditional Thai Massage, heat, and stretching exercise to improve hand mobility in scleroderma patients. *J Ayurveda Integr Med.* 2014;5(1):50-5.
24. Sporbeck B, Mathiske-Schmidt K, Jahr S, Huscher D, Becker M, Riemekasten G, et al. Effect of biofeedback and deep oscillation on Raynaud's phenomenon secondary to systemic sclerosis: results of a controlled prospective randomized clinical trial. *Rheumatol Int.* 2012;32(5):1469-73.
25. Stefanantoni K, Sciarra I, Iannace N, Vasile M, Caucci M, Sili Scavalli A, et al. Occupational therapy integrated with a self-administered stretching programme on systemic sclerosis patients with hand involvement. *Clin Exp Rheumatol.* 2016;34:157-61.
26. Khanna D, Serrano J, Berrocal VJ, Silver RM, Cuencas P, Newbill SL, et al. Randomized controlled trial to evaluate an internet-based self-management program in systemic sclerosis. *Arthritis Care Res.* 2019;71(3):435-47.
27. Piga M, Tradori I, Pani D, Barabino G, Dessì A, Raffo L, et al. Telemedicine applied to kinesiotherapy for hand dysfunction in patients with systemic sclerosis and rheumatoid arthritis: recovery of movement and telemonitoring technology. *J Rheumatol.* 2014;41(7):1324-33.
28. Gregory WJ, Wilkinson J, Herrick AL. A randomised controlled trial of wax baths as an additive therapy to hand exercises in patients with systemic sclerosis. *Physiotherapy.* 2019;105(3):370-7.
29. Kristensen LQ, Oestergaard LG, Bovbjerg K, Rolving N, Søndergaard K. Use of paraffin instead of lukewarm water prior to hand exercises had no additional effect on hand mobility in patients with systemic sclerosis: A randomized clinical trial. *Hand Ther.* 2019;24(1):13-21.
30. Maddali Bongi S, Rosso A, Galluccio F, Sigismondi F, Miniati I, Conforti ML, et al. Efficacy of connective tissue massage and Mc Mennell joint manipulation in the rehabilitative treatment of the hands in systemic sclerosis. *Clin Rheumatol.* 2009;28(10):1167-73.
31. Filippetti M, Cazzoletti L, Zamboni F, Ferrari P, Caimmi C, Smania N, et al. Effect of a tailored home-based exercise program in patients with systemic sclerosis: A randomized controlled trial. *Scand J Med Sci Sports.* 2020;30(9):1675-84.

32. Rannou F, Boutron I, Mouthon L, Sanchez K, Tiffreau V, Hachulla E, et al. Personalized physical therapy versus usual care for patients with systemic sclerosis: a randomized controlled trial. *Arthritis Care Res.* 2017;69(7):1050-9.
33. Schouffoer AA, Ninaber MK, Beaart-van de Voorde LJJ, van der Giesen FJ, de Jong Z, Stolk J, et al. Randomized comparison of a multidisciplinary team care program with usual care in patients with systemic sclerosis. *Arthritis Care Res.* 2011;63(6):909-17.
34. Meyer T, Tilly C. Reporting of patients' characteristics in rehabilitation trials: an analysis of publications of RCTs in major clinical rehabilitation journals. *Eur J Phys Rehabil Med.* 2020;56(6):829-35.
35. Amiri M, Kumbhare D. Randomized controlled trials in non-pharmacological rehabilitation research: a scoping review of the reporting of sample size calculation, randomization procedure, and statistical analyses. *Eur J Phys Rehabil Med.* 2020;56(6):790-8.
36. Whyte J, Dijkers MP, Van Stan JH, Hart T. Specifying what we study and implement in rehabilitation: comments on the reporting of clinical research. *Archives Phys Med Rehabil.* 2018;99(7):1433-5.
37. Negrini S, Armijo-Olivo S, Patrini M, Frontera WR, Heinemann AW, MacHalicek W, et al. The randomized controlled trials rehabilitation checklist: methodology of development of a reporting guideline specific to rehabilitation. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil.* 2020;99(3):210-5.
38. Page SJ, Persch AC. Recruitment, retention, and blinding in clinical trials. *Am J Occup Ther.* 2013;67(2):154-61.
39. Whyte J, Dijkers MP, Fasoli SE, Ferraro M, Katz LW, Norton S, et al. Recommendations for reporting on rehabilitation interventions. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil.* 2021;100(1):5-16.
40. Murphy SL, Krause D, Roll SC, Gandikota G, Barber M, Khanna D. Development of a musculoskeletal ultrasound protocol to examine upper extremity rehabilitation outcomes in systemic sclerosis. *J Diagn Med Sonogr.* 2021;37(1):13-23.
41. Schouffoer AA, Zirkzee EJM, Henquet SM, Caljouw MAA, Steup-Beekman GM, Van Laar JM, et al. Needs and preferences regarding health care delivery as perceived by patients with systemic sclerosis. *Clin Rheumatol.* 2011;30(6):815-24.

42. Stöcker JK, Cup EHC, Vonk MC, van den Hoogen FHJ, Nijhuis-van der Sanden MWG, Bart Staal J, et al. What moves the rheumatologist? Unravelling decision making in the referral of systemic sclerosis patients to health professionals: A qualitative study. *Rheumatol Adv Pract*. 2018;2(2):1-7.
43. Johnson SR, Carette S, Dunne JV. Scleroderma: Health services utilization from patients' perspective. *J Rheumatol*. 2006;33(6):1123-7.
44. Toci AL, Madison Hyer J, Silver RM, Nietert PJ, Hant FN. Systemic sclerosis and perceptions of quality in primary care. *Am J Med Sci*. 2016;351(5):447-51.
45. Moore DF, Kramer E, Eltaraboulsi R, Steen VD. Increased morbidity and mortality of scleroderma in african americans compared to non-african americans. *Arthritis Care Res*. 2019;71(9):1154-63.
46. Mouthon L, Poole JL. Physical and occupational therapy. In: Varga J, Denton C, Wigley F, Kuwana M, Allanore Y, editors. *Scleroderma: From Pathogenesis to Comprehensive Management*. New York: Springer; 2017. p. 603-13.
47. Maddali-Bongi S, Del Rosso A. Systemic sclerosis: Rehabilitation as a tool to cope with disability. *Clin Exp Rheumatol*. 2016;34:162-9.
48. Maddali Bongi S, Del Rosso A, Passalacqua M, Miccio S, Cerinic MM. Manual lymph drainage improving upper extremity edema and hand function in patients with systemic sclerosis in edematous phase. *Arthritis Care Res*. 2011;63(8):1134-41.
49. Horvath J, Balint Z, Szep E, Deiszinger A, Minier T, Farkas N, et al. Efficacy of intensive hand physical therapy in patients with systemic sclerosis. *Clin Exp Rheumatol*. 2017.
50. Maddali Bongi S, Del Rosso A, Galluccio F, Tai G, Sigismondi F, Passalacqua M, et al. Efficacy of a tailored rehabilitation program for systemic sclerosis. *Clin Exp Rheumatol*. 2009;27(3 SUPPL. 54):S44-S50.

Table 1. Characteristics of Rehabilitation Studies Included in Evidence Synthesis (N = 16)

Author, Year, Country	Sample Total N (IG/CG)	Participant s	Intervention Length/ Dose*	Control/ Comparator Description	Delivery Mode	Intervention Content
Hand/UE						
Gregory 2019, UK(28)	36 (17/19)	Female = IG-76%, CG-63% % diffuse SSc = IG- 41%, CG- 42%	<i>9 weeks</i> Paraffin wax baths- no less than 4 times/ week; Hand stretch exercises- 3-10 times/day	Hand stretch exercise only	Home	Paraffin wax baths
Kristensen 2019, Denmark (29)	86 (43/43)	Female = IG-84%, CG-63% % diffuse SSc = IG- 60%, CG- 37%	<i>6 months</i> 30 minute sessions 2 times/day	Lukewarm water hand immersion prior to hand exercises	Home	Paraffin wax baths
Maddali- Bongi,	40	Female = IG-80%,	<i>9 weeks</i>	Home hand exercise	Clinic	Hand massage, joint

2009,
Italy(30)

(20/20)

CG-70%

Subtype:
N/S

Massage and
manipulation

program

/home

manipulation

-

1 hour session

2

times/week;

Home

exercise-

20 minutes

daily

Maddali
Bongi
2011,
Italy(48)

35
(20/15)

Female =
100%

Subtype:
N/S

5 weeks

Waitlist

Clinic

Manual lymph
drainage – UE
focus

1 hour

session/week

Murphy
2021,
US(22)

32
(16/16)

Female =
72%

% diffuse
SSc = 100%

18 weeks

OT sessions-

1 hour session

1 time/week

for 8 weeks;

App hand
exercises-

App hand
exercises only

Clinic/
telehealth

Thermal
treatments to
UE, negative
pressure
treatment, ROM,
Home hand
ROM exercises
tailored by OT

daily

Piga 2014, Italy(27)	20 (10/10)	Female = 100% % diffuse SSc = 40%	<i>12 weeks</i> maximum of 50 minutes 5 days/week	Home program of hand strength and mobility exercises using common objects	Telehealth	Hand exercises
Sporbeck 2012, Germany (24)	28† (10/8/ 10)	Female = Range/grp 80%-90% % diffuse SSc = range/grp 10-50%	<i>4 weeks</i> 3 times/week	Waitlist	Clinic	Biofeedback or deep oscillation to UE
Stephana ntoni 2016, Italy(25)	31 (15/16)	Female = IG-100%, CG-94% % diffuse SSc = IG- 47%, CG- 31%	<i>3 months</i> Home exercise- daily; Weekly check-in calls between	General hand exercise	Clinic/ home	Hand exercises tailored by OT

first and
second
assessments

**Vannajak
2014,
Thailand
(23)**

28
(14/14)

Female =
IG-64%,
CG-25%
% diffuse
SSc = 100%

2 weeks
Superficial
heat-20
minutes
daily;
TTM-30
minutes
daily;
Hand
stretches-
30 seconds
each hand
daily;
Wearing
gloves-6
hours daily

Same daily
home
program as
IG without
gloves

Home

Traditional Thai
massage to UE,
joint
manipulation,
home hand ROM
exercises,
insulation gloves

Orofacial

**Yuen
2012,
US(21)**

48
(26/22)

Female =
IG-81%,
CG-77%

6 months
6 minute
session

Usual dental
care

Home

Manual mouth-
stretching and
oral

% diffuse
SSc=44%

2x/day

augmentation
exercises with a
wooden stick

Multicomponent

Filippetti 2020, Italy(31)	44 (22/22)	Female = IG-80%, CG-79% % diffuse SSc = IG- 44%, CG- 25%	<i>6 months</i> 3 times/week	Usual care with general recommendat ion to increase physical activity	Home	Aerobic exercise (bike), UE resistance exercise, hand stretching, PT calls
Horvath 2017, Hungary (49)	53 (31/22)	Female = IG-93%, CG-91% % diffuse SSc = IG- 58%, CG- 50%	<i>3 weeks</i> 5 days/week for all therapies except for UE mud baths every other day and thermal baths daily	Mud baths, thermal baths, exercise for large joints, without treating hands	Clinic	Thermal treatments to UE, Hand stretching, massage to trunk/UE, stretching and exercise to lower extremities
Maddali- Bongi 2009,	20 (10/10)	Female =6 5%	<i>9 weeks</i> Hands-1hour	Educational advice and medical	Clinic	Connective tissue massage, Kabat's

Italy(50)

Subtype:
N/S

session

2
times/week;

Face-1hour
session

2
times/week;

Global-1hour
session/week

information
about SSc

technique,
kinesitherapy,
and a home
exercise program

Rannou
2017,
France
(32)

220‡
(112/
108)

Female =
IG-86%,
CG-80%
% diffuse
SSc = IG-
47%, CG-
50%

12 months

PT/OT-

3 weekly

3 hour
sessions

Splinting-

2 hours daily

Resting

splints-

nightly

home

exercise-
daily

Usual care
by physician
with no
restrictions
on PT

Clinic/
home

Multidisciplinary
intervention
(PT/OT) aerobic
and resistance
exercise, ROM
for mouth, face,
UE/LE and
splinting

Schouffer 2011, Netherlands(33)	53 (28/25)	Female = IG-68%, CG-84% % diffuse SSc = IG- 54%, CG- 60%	<i>12 weeks</i> Multi- disciplinary program- weekly; PT-weekly; Home exercise- 6 days/week	Usual care by physician with no restrictions on PT.	Clinic/ home	General exercise, hand/mouth exercises, education, PT supervised home exercise
--	---------------	--	--	---	-----------------	---

Directed self-management

Khanna 2019, US(26)	267 (134/ 133)	Female = IG-92%, CG-90% % diffuse SSc = IG- 43%, CG- 44%	<i>16 weeks</i> Self-paced with weekly moderated discussion board	Received a copy of popular scleroderma resource	Telehealth	Self-paced web- based self- management program with rehab-directed discussion board
------------------------------------	----------------------	--	--	---	------------	--

*Intervention length is italicized.

†All study designs were randomized controlled trials except Horvath et al. (49) which used a prospective quasi-experimental design

‡Three groups are biofeedback, deep oscillation, or waitlist control respectively; ‡N = 218 analyzed in study; IG = intervention group; CG = control group; N/S = not specified; HAQ-DI= Health Assessment Questionnaire Disability Index; DASH = Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder and Hand

questionnaire; VAS = visual analog scale; HAMIS = Hand Mobility in Scleroderma test; TTM = traditional Thai massage; FIHOA = Functional Index for Hand Osteoarthritis; PROMIS = Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System.

Table 2. Between-Group Differences by Outcome in Rehabilitation Studies in Systemic Sclerosis (N = 16)

Outcome	Number of Studies Out of 16 Evaluating the Outcome (N)	Studies with a Significant Difference between Intervention and Control Groups (p<0.05)
Skin		
MRSS, hand MRSS	2	
Hand/UE function		
HAMIS	9	33,48
Durouze Hand Index/Cochin Hand Function Test	6	32
QuickDASH or DASH	2	
FIHOA	1	
Kapandji index	1	32
Mobility - Hand opening, hand abduction, fist closing, fingertips to palmar crease, Total Active Motion, HAI	5	
Hand volume	2	48
VAS hand pain, interference	2	48
VAS hand edema, VAS interference edema	1	48
Pinch strength	3	22
Grip strength	6	31, 33
Biceps strength	1	31

Raynaud's Phenomenon

Raynaud's symptoms VAS	2	24
------------------------	---	----

Digital Ulcers

VAS Digital Ulcers	1	
--------------------	---	--

Orofacial

Oral aperture or mouth opening, MMO, microstomia, face involvement	4	21,32,33
--	---	----------

Cardiac

6MW	2	31,33
-----	---	-------

Vo2 Peak/max, Aerobic capacity	3	
--------------------------------	---	--

Pulmonary

VAS shortness of breath	1	
-------------------------	---	--

Gastrointestinal

VAS Gastrointestinal symptoms	1	
-------------------------------	---	--

Musculoskeletal

Quadriceps strength	1	31
---------------------	---	----

Global Health

Global health VAS or Questionnaire, General VAS	3	
---	---	--

VAS overall disease severity	1	
------------------------------	---	--

Health-Related Quality of life

PROMIS physical function	1	
--------------------------	---	--

PROMIS-29	1	
-----------	---	--

Patient Activation Measure	1	
----------------------------	---	--

Pain VAS	2	32
----------	---	----

PROMIS Self-Efficacy for Managing Symptoms	1	
Checklist Individual Strength	1	
HAQ-DI or HAQ, SHAQ	9	31,32,33,48
MACTAR	1	32
SF-36	11	31,48
VAS satisfaction with health	1	
COPM	1	25
EQ-5D, QALYs, SWAP	1	

† UE = upper extremity; HAMIS = Hand Mobility in Scleroderma; CHFT = Cochin Hand Function Test; MRSS = Modified Rodnan Skin Score; VAS = Visual analog scale; PROMIS = Patient Reported Outcome Measure Information System; SHAQ = Scleroderma Health Assessment Questionnaire; DASH = Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder and Hand questionnaire; RP = Raynaud's phenomenon; HAQ-DI = Health Assessment Questionnaire Disability Index; SF-36 = Short Form 36 health survey; FIHOA = Functional Index for Hand Osteoarthritis; HAI = Hand Anatomical Index; COPM = Canadian Occupational Performance Measure; HAQ = Health Assessment Questionnaire; MMO = maximum mouth opening; 6MW = six-minute walk; MACTAR = McMaster Toronto Arthritis Patient Preference Disability Questionnaire; EQ-5D =EuroQol-5 Dimension; QALYs=Quality Adjusted Life Years; SWAP=Brief Satisfaction with Appearance Scale

Figure 1. Flow Diagram Studies of Rehabilitation in Systemic Sclerosis





Figure 2. Articles rated by Quality Criteria on the PEDro Scale



Note. ITT = Intent to Treat

FIGURE LEGEND

Figure 1. Flow Diagram Studies of Rehabilitation in Systemic Sclerosis

Figure 2. Articles Rated by Quality Criteria on the PEDro Scale