

Dystonia Rating Scales: Critique and Recommendations

Alberto Albanese, MD,^{1,2*} Francesca Del Sorbo, MD,² Cynthia Comella, MD,³ H. A. Jinnah, PhD,^{4,5,6} Jonathan W. Mink, MD, PhD,⁷ Bart Post, MD, PhD,⁸ Marie Vidailhet, MD,⁹ Jens Volkmann, MD, PhD,¹⁰ Thomas T. Warner, FRCP,¹¹ Albert F.G. Leentjens, MD, PhD,¹² Pablo Martinez-Martin, MD,¹³ Glenn T. Stebbins, PhD,¹⁴ Christopher G. Goetz, MD,¹⁴ and Anette Schrag, PhD¹⁵

¹*Istituto di Neurologia, Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milano, Italy*

²*Neurologia I, Istituto Neurologico Carlo Besta, Milano, Italy*

³*Department of Neurological Sciences, Rush Medical College, Chicago, Illinois, USA*

⁴*Department of Neurology, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia, USA*

⁵*Department of Human Genetics, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia, USA*

⁶*Department of Pediatrics, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia, USA*

⁷*Department of Neurology, University of Rochester Medical Center, Rochester, New York, USA*

⁸*Department of Neurology, Radboud University Nijmegen Medical Center, Nijmegen, The Netherlands*

⁹*Department of Neurology, Pitié-Salpêtrière Hospital, Paris, France*

¹⁰*Department of Neurology, University of Wurzburg, Wurzburg, Germany*

¹¹*Reta Lila Weston Institute of Neurological Studies, University College London (UCL) Institute of Neurology, London, United Kingdom*

¹²*Department of Psychiatry, Maastricht University Medical Center, Maastricht, the Netherlands*

¹³*Alzheimer Disease Research Unit and Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red sobre Enfermedades Neurodegenerativas (CIBERNED), Alzheimer Center Reina Sofía Foundation, Carlos III Institute of Health, Madrid, Spain*

¹⁴*Department of Neurological Sciences, Rush University Medical Center, Chicago, Illinois, USA*

¹⁵*Department of Clinical Neurosciences, Royal Free Hospital, University College London, London, UK*

ABSTRACT: Many rating scales have been applied to the evaluation of dystonia, but only few have been assessed for clinimetric properties. The Movement Disorders Society commissioned this task force to critique existing dystonia rating scales and place them in the clinical and clinimetric context. A systematic literature review was conducted to identify rating scales that have either been validated or used in dystonia. Thirty-six potential scales were identified. Eight were excluded because they did not meet review criteria, leaving 28 scales that were critiqued and rated by the task force. Seven scales were found to meet criteria to be “recommended”: the Blepharospasm Disability Index is recommended for rating blepharospasm; the Cervical Dystonia Impact Scale and the Toronto Western Spasmodic Torticollis Rating Scale for rating cervical dystonia; the Craniocervical Dystonia Questionnaire for blepharospasm and cervical dystonia; the Voice Handicap Index (VHI) and the Vocal Performance Questionnaire (VPQ) for

laryngeal dystonia; and the Fahn-Marsden Dystonia Rating Scale for rating generalized dystonia. Two “recommended” scales (VHI and VPQ) are generic scales validated on few patients with laryngeal dystonia, whereas the others are disease-specific scales. Twelve scales met criteria for “suggested” and 7 scales met criteria for “listed.” All the scales are individually reviewed in the online information. The task force recommends 5 specific dystonia scales and suggests to further validate 2 recommended generic voice-disorder scales in dystonia. Existing scales for oromandibular, arm, and task-specific dystonia should be refined and fully assessed. Scales should be developed for body regions for which no scales are available, such as lower limbs and trunk.
© 2013 *Movement Disorder Society*

Key Words: botulinum neurotoxins; blepharospasm; dystonias; torticollis; rating scales

Additional Supporting Information may be found in the online version of the article.

***Correspondence to:** Dr. Alberto Albanese, Neurologia I, IRCCS Istituto Neurologico Carlo Besta, Via G. Celoria, 11, 20133 Milano, Italy; alberto.albanese@unicatt.it

Relevant conflicts of interest/financial disclosures: Full financial disclosures and author roles may be found in the Acknowledgments section online.

Received: 10 May 2013; **Accepted:** 22 May 2013

Published online in Wiley Online Library (wileyonlinelibrary.com). DOI: 10.1002/mds.25579

Dystonia is one of the most common movement disorders, with an overall prevalence of 16.43 per 100,000 for primary dystonia.¹ This meta-analysis prevalence figure is likely to be an underestimate, as it is based on studies with recruitment of diagnosed cases only and it is clear that under-ascertainment and underdiagnosis is a significant problem.² The broad spectrum of clinical features that encompass dystonia syndromes ranges from severe generalized childhood dystonia, to adult-onset focal dystonias, to secondary dystonias and dystonias as a feature of complex neurological disorders. Dystonia can be localized to a single body region (focal) or has spread to contiguous (segmental) or to noncontiguous (multifocal) regions. In generalized dystonia the trunk and at least 2 other sites are involved,³ whereas hemidystonia affects the body and limbs on one side.

Dystonia is typically considered a movement disorder characterized by motor manifestations, primarily sustained or intermittent muscle contractions causing abnormal, often repetitive, movements, postures, or both.³ However, growing evidence indicates the importance of a non-motor component to dystonia, including abnormalities in sensory and perceptual functions, as well as neuropsychiatric, cognitive and sleep domains.⁴ Treatment possibilities have greatly expanded in recent years after discovering the efficacy of botulinum neurotoxins and functional surgery.^{5,6} Pretreatment evaluation aims at characterizing the severity and topography of motor symptoms and their impact on activities of daily living and provides a baseline reference for posttreatment evaluations. The quality and accuracy of the pretreatment assessment and the choice of assessment tools are crucial as they will affect all subsequent posttreatment comparisons. Precise tools to rate improvement or deterioration are important to assess the patient's disease state as well as outcome after treatment.

To facilitate research and clinical practices aimed at improving the assessment and treatment of dystonia syndromes, the Movement Disorders Society (MDS) convened a task force to evaluate the dystonia rating instruments that have been used in published studies. This review is part of a process to assess scales currently in use for evaluating clinical aspects of movement disorders.

Materials and Methods

Administrative Organization and Critique Process

The MDS Task Force on Rating Scales for Movement Disorders Steering Committee invited the chairman (AA) to form a task force to critique existing

dystonia rating scales and to place them in a clinical and clinimetric context. This task force consisted of 8 members from Europe and North America with diverse background and expertise, including neurologists, a neuropsychiatrist, and a clinical epidemiologist, who had worked extensively in the area of dystonia. This group followed the same procedure as the task forces that appraised other rating scales in movement disorders. Initial discussions among these task force members regarded the construct to be reviewed, in the case its concept was not universally accepted. Then the task force members selected the scales to be included in the review (see criteria in the next paragraph) and identified unresolved issues and limitations of the critiqued scales. A standardized form was drawn up to allow structured assessment of the scales with regard to their descriptive properties, availability, content, use, acceptability, clinimetric properties, and overall impression in patients with dystonia (see online Supporting Information).

Each scale was reviewed by 1 task force member. The completed reviews were then assessed by 2 members and modified according to their suggestions. In the final appraisal of a scale, the task force used the terminology developed for the Appendix of Ancillary Scales to complement the MDS-sponsored revision of the Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale.⁷ This terminology was also used in recent reviews on rating scales of other MDS task forces.⁸ The final assessment was based on consensus among the task force members and the Steering Committee of the Task Force on Rating Scales for Movement Disorders. The following criteria were specifically distilled from the available evidence. Criterion 1: The scale has been applied to dystonia patients; criterion 2: the scale has been used by other groups outside the original developers; criterion 3: the scale has been clinimetrically studied and found to be valid, reliable, and sensitive to change. The official definitions for task force critiques are: "recommended," if the scale fulfills criteria 1, 2, and 3; "suggested," if the scale fulfills criterion 1, but only 1 of the other criteria applies; or "listed," if the scale fulfills criterion 1, but does not meet either of the other 2 criteria.

Scale Selection Process and Literature Search Strategy

We considered all scales and questionnaires that have either been designed or used to rate dystonia, and in addition scales and questionnaires that, based on literature review and expert evaluation, have potential utility in dystonia based on their content, their widespread use, and clinimetric evidence from studies in patients without dystonia. We did not consider scales and questionnaires specifically designed for secondary dystonias

or requiring measurement devices. We included in the main document scales and questionnaires that have been “recommended” for use in dystonia. All scales are listed in the online Supporting Information.

The Medline database on PubMed was systematically searched for relevant papers published up to June 2012 using the following query: (“Dystonia”[MH]) OR (“Dystonia Musculorum Deformans”[MH]) OR (“Dystonic Disorders”[MH])) AND (“scale”[ALL] OR “measure”[ALL] OR “Questionnaire”[ALL]). For each scale, a search was conducted for the terms (“spasmodic dysphonia”[ALL]) OR (“Dystonic Disorders”[MH]) OR (“Dystonia”[MH]) OR (“Blepharospasm”[MH]) AND the name of the scale. In addition, published articles known to the Task Force members were included in this review. Only published or in press peer-reviewed papers or published abstracts were evaluated.

Results

Thirty-six scales and questionnaires were identified. Based on inclusion criteria, 28 measures were considered (Table 1); these were classified as “specific” if developed specifically to rate dystonia, or as “generic” if applicable across different diseases, including dystonia. Among the generic scales, 1 was developed to measure coping in chronically ill populations and 6 were originally developed to quantify the degree of dysphonia and to objectively determine the efficacy of voice therapy in voice disorders. Eight scales were excluded, because evaluating secondary dystonia, requiring measurement devices, or having no potential use in dystonia. The scales are grouped based on the affected body region they intend to explore.

Blepharospasm Scales

Blepharospasm Disability Index

Description of the Scale. The Blepharospasm Disability Index (BSDI)⁹ was developed to improve the Blepharospasm Disability Scale (see online Supporting Information) with respect to ease of use. It is a disease-specific patient-rated disability scale that measures impairment of specific activities of daily living caused by blepharospasm. It consists of 6 items rating specified activities (vehicle driving, reading, watching television, shopping, walking, and doing everyday activities), scored as a 5-point Likert scale relating to the severity of impairment (0, no impairment; 4, no longer possible due to illness), as well as a “not applicable” option. The range of scores is 0 to 24, with higher scores indicating a greater disability. A BSDI mean item score can also be calculated by dividing the total BSDI score by the number of items answered. It is available only in English, although the scale has been used extensively in Europe and Israel.

Scale Application in Dystonia. The BSDI was designed specifically for patients with blepharospasm.

Use by Multiple Groups Outside the Original Developers. The BSDI has been used in several recent trials with botulinum neurotoxins (BoNT).^{10–12}

Clinimetric Properties. The BSDI showed high internal consistency and the retest reliability of the single items was adequate.⁹ The BSDI total score was found to correlate moderately with the Jankovic Rating Scale score.¹² The results of an observational study showed that BSDI was sensitive to change after BoNT treatment.⁹ Data from 2 large randomized trials designed to evaluate the effects of BoNT type A products for blepharospasm showed that the BSDI was sensitive to change but did not detect differences between 2 BoNT products.^{10,11}

Strengths and Weaknesses. The BSDI has been specifically designed to measure disability in blepharospasm due to dystonic movements that affect vision. The scale focuses on daily activities and is easy to use; the scoring system is also rather simple. The BSDI focuses on disability related to sight and does not specifically measure dystonic motor abnormalities; it should be combined with a more specific scale that rates the movement disorder. Concern has been raised regarding poor sensitivity of the scale to mild disability or small changes.¹³

Cervical Dystonia Scales

Cervical Dystonia Impact Scale

Description of the Scale. The Cervical Dystonia Impact Scale (CDIP-58) is a disease-specific patient-rated questionnaire that measures quality of life in patients with cervical dystonia.¹⁴ It was developed for use in clinical research, audit, and treatment trials. It is composed of 58 five-point items grouped into 8 sub-scales that measure symptoms (head and neck movements, pain and discomfort in neck and shoulders, sleep disturbance as a result of torticollis), activity limitations in upper limb activities and walking, and psychosocial features (annoyance, mood, psychosocial functioning). Eight summary scale scores are generated by summing items and are then transformed to a 0 to 100 score. This scale is available only in English.

Scale Application in Dystonia. The CDIP-58 has been specifically developed for patients with cervical dystonia.

Use by Multiple Groups Outside the Original Developers. The CDIP-58 has been used to measure the health impact of cervical dystonia and the impact of treatment in cervical dystonia.^{15–18}

TABLE 1. Classification of the rating measures applied in studies of dystonia

Scales/questionnaire	Type ^b	Criteria ^a			Qualification
		1	2	3	
Blepharospasm					
Blepharospasm Disability Index (BSDI)	Specific	Yes	Yes	Yes	Recommended
Jankovic rating scale	Specific	Yes	Yes	No	Suggested
Blepharospasm Disability Scale	Specific	Yes	Yes	No	Suggested
Cervical dystonia					
Cervical Dystonia Impact Scale (CDIP-58)	Specific	Yes	Yes	Yes	Recommended
Functional Disability Questionnaire	Specific	Yes	Yes	No	Suggested
Toronto Western Spasmodic Torticollis Rating Scale (TWSTRS)	Specific	Yes	Yes	Yes	Recommended
Tsui scale	Specific	Yes	Yes	No	Suggested
Modified Tsui scale	Specific	Yes	No	No	Listed
Freiberg Questionnaire for Dystonia torticollis version	Specific	Yes	No	No	Listed
Disability questionnaire for patients with cervical dystonia	Specific	Yes	No	No	Listed
Body Concept Scale	Specific	Yes	No	Yes	Suggested
Ways of Coping Checklist	Generic	Yes	No	No	Listed
Blepharospasm/cervical dystonia					
Craniocervical Dystonia Questionnaire (CDQ-24)	Specific	Yes	Yes	Yes	Recommended
Oromandibular dystonia					
Oromandibular dystonia questionnaire	Specific	Yes	No	Yes	Suggested
Laryngeal dystonia					
Unified Spasmodic Dysphonia Rating Scale	Specific	Yes	Yes	No	Suggested
Voice Handicap Index (VHI)	Generic	Yes	Yes	Yes	Recommended
Voice Handicap Index 10	Generic	Yes	Yes	No	Suggested
Pediatric Voice Handicap Index	Generic	Uncertain	Yes	No	Listed
Pediatric Voice-Related Quality of Life	Generic	Uncertain	Yes	No	Listed
Voice-Related Quality of Life	Generic	Yes	Yes	No	Suggested
Vocal Performance Questionnaire (VPQ)	Generic	Yes	Yes	Yes	Recommended
Arm dystonia					
Arm Dystonia Disability Scale	Specific	Yes	Yes	No	Suggested
Task-specific dystonia					
Dystonia Evaluation Scale	Specific	Yes	No	No	Listed
Tubiana-Chamagne Score	Specific	Yes	Yes	No	Suggested
Writer's Cramp Rating Scale	Specific	Yes	Yes	No	Suggested
Generalized dystonia					
Global Dystonia rating Scale	Specific	Yes	Yes	No	Suggested
Fahn-Marsden Dystonia Rating Scale (FMDRS)	Specific	Yes	Yes	Yes	Recommended
Unified Dystonia Rating Scale	Specific	Yes	Yes	No	Suggested

^aCriteria are as follows: 1 used in dystonia patients; 2 used by researchers beyond original developers; 3 successful clinimetric testing.

^b"Specific" indicates a measure developed specifically for dystonia, "generic" indicates a measure applicable across different diseases, including dystonia.

Clinimetric Properties. New psychometric techniques (Rasch analyses) revealed that the CDIP-58 performs well and, in addition, traditional psychometric properties such as reliability (internal consistency, item-total correlation, test-retest) and validity (within-scale analyses and comparisons with external measures) have been supported.^{14,15,19} The CDIP-58 is good at detecting the impact of BoNT on all 8 health dimensions in patients with cervical dystonia.¹⁵

Strengths and Weaknesses. The CDIP-58 is a disease-specific validated questionnaire. It is more sensitive in detecting statistical and clinical changes than comparable subscales, although it has not been widely used as an outcome measure. The authors themselves¹⁵ suggest further studies examining the responsiveness of the CDIP-58 as well as refinement of the walking subscale.

Toronto Western Spasmodic Torticollis Rating Scale

Description of the Scale. The Toronto Western Spasmodic Torticollis Rating Scale (TWSTRS) was developed for assessment of cervical dystonia in clinical trials.²⁰ It is composed of 3 subscales that measure symptom severity, disability, and pain. The severity scale, clinician-rated, is composed of 11 items that assess head movements, duration of symptoms, effects of sensory tricks, shoulder elevation and anterior displacement, range of motion, and time in neutral position; the maximal score is 35. The disability scale, patient-rated, comprises 6 items, including daily activities, work, reading, and driving; the maximal score is 30. The pain scale, patient-rated, comprises 3 items including severity, duration, and disability due to pain; the maximal score is 20. Each subscale is scored

independently and a total TWSTRS score (from 0 to 85) is calculated. A training tape for clinicians is available for the severity scale.²¹ The only available version is in English.

Scale Application in Dystonia. The TWSTRS has been developed specifically for patients with cervical dystonia.

Use by Multiple Groups Outside the Original Developers. The TWSTRS scale is the most widely used rating scale for cervical dystonia. Individual subscales and the total TWSTRS score have been used as outcome measures in many treatment trials, evaluating BoNT therapy, pharmacotherapy, and surgery.²²⁻⁵⁸

Clinimetric Properties. The TWSTRS has been shown to have internal consistency and acceptable interrater agreement. Evidence for validity is shown by moderate within-scale correlations.²⁰ The TWSTRS scale also showed strong correlation with Tsui scale.⁵⁹ Responsiveness to change has been demonstrated.^{25,59}

Strengths and Weaknesses. The TWSTRS assesses the severity of cervical dystonia and includes disability and pain subscales. The TWSTRS includes a videotape protocol allowing its use to evaluate all patients in a standardized fashion.²¹ Despite its value in clinical trials, the TWSTRS scale might be too complex for routine clinical practice. Weaknesses consist of an unclear definition of midline for assessing range of motion, lack of a separate scoring category assessing dystonic tremor, and the specification of duration for the effect of sensory tricks.²¹

Blepharospasm/Cervical Dystonia Scale Craniocervical Dystonia Questionnaire

Description of the Scale. The Craniocervical Dystonia Questionnaire (CDQ-24) is a patient-rated health-related quality of life (HRQoL) measure for craniocervical dystonia, featuring cervical dystonia and blepharospasm. It was developed for use in clinical research.⁶⁰ CDQ-24 measures the impact of craniocervical dystonia on 5 HRQoL domains. It is composed of 24 items, forming 5 subscales: stigma, emotional well-being, pain, activities of daily living, and social/family life. Items are rated on a 5-point scale. Although only the original German version was validated, an exact translation into English, including back-translation, was performed.⁶⁰ The CDQ-24 has also been translated and validated in Serbian.⁶¹

Scale Application in Dystonia. The CDQ-24 has been specifically developed for patients with craniocervical dystonia, who had both cervical dystonia and blepharospasm.

Use by Multiple Groups Outside the Original Developers. The CDQ-24 has been used by multiple groups to measure the impact on quality of life of focal, segmental and even generalized dystonia,¹⁶ and also as a HRQoL measure to assess responsiveness to treatment-induced changes.^{60,62}

Clinimetric Properties. There were no relevant ceiling effects, but a considerable floor effect was observed in the social/family life domain.⁶⁰ The CDQ-24 also showed good reliability properties, internal consistency, and test-retest reliability. Validity was assessed by checking convergent and discriminant validity as well as the dimensional structure of CDQ-24; sensitivity to change was confirmed after BoNT treatment.⁶⁰

Strengths and Weaknesses. The CDQ-24 is a brief and easy instrument. It can be used to evaluate the impact of the disease on areas not covered by generic measures, such as the Short Form (36) Health Survey (SF-36), which are of considerable concern to patients with craniocervical dystonia. The CDQ-24 also evaluates pain, sleep, and depression due to dystonia.

Laryngeal Dystonia Scales

Voice Handicap Index

Description of the Scale. The Voice Handicap Index (VHI) is a patient-rated scale addressing disability related to verbal communication. It was developed to determine the level of disability experienced by patients with different voice disorders.⁶³ The complete VHI has 30 items organized in 3 domains: a 10-item functional subscale, a 10-item emotional subscale, and a 10-item physical subscale. The rating is on a 5-point scale and the total score ranges from 0 to 120. VHI has been translated and clinimetrically tested in German, Mandarin Chinese, Spanish, Dutch, Arabic, Japanese, Hebrew, and Greek. The validity of the French translation has been confirmed, although the quality of translation needs further improvements.⁶⁴ The VHI has been also translated and adapted to Portuguese and Polish.

Scale Application in Dystonia. The VHI is not specific for dystonia-related voice problems; in the original development and validation study, 26% of the patients had neurogenic voice disorders, including vocal fold paralysis and laryngeal dystonia.⁶³

Use by Multiple Groups Outside the Original Developers. VHI has been used to measure outcomes after interventions for a broad range of laryngeal disorders, including cancer and mass lesions, vocal fold polyps and cysts, and laryngeal dystonia.⁶⁵⁻⁷⁵

Clinimetric Properties. In the development and validation study performed on a heterogeneous set of

disorders,⁶³ the VHI proved to have good internal consistency and good test-retest reliability for subscales and total scores. Construct validity was not fully evaluated. The VHI has been used in several studies to assess efficacy of treatments for laryngeal dystonia. However, considering that the VHI was validated on few patients with laryngeal dystonia compared to the total number of patients assessed, it still needs further validation for dystonia.

Strengths and Weaknesses. The VHI is a simple and efficient scale, but as a disability scale, it has no discriminant value and is not specific for dystonia. Therefore, the scale should be further validated specifically in spasmodic dysphonia. The VHI is similar to the Vocal Performance Questionnaire, and direct comparisons have been made showing similar clinimetric properties.

Vocal Performance Questionnaire

Description of the Scale. This scale was designed for use in an evaluation study of voice therapy in cases of nonorganic dysphonia.⁷⁶ The Vocal Performance Questionnaire (VPQ) is a questionnaire designed to allow patients to consider aspects of their own vocal performance and rate their severity. This 12-item questionnaire is designed using an answer format in which the patient selects the statement that best answers each question. The statements are graded in terms of severity of vocal performance. This scale is available only in English.

Scale Application in Dystonia. The VPQ has been used in dystonia in only 1 study,⁷⁷ which evaluated the reliability and validity of the scale in 181 patients with different voice disorders, including an undetermined number of patients with laryngeal dystonia.

Use by Multiple Groups Outside the Original Developers. The VPQ has been used to measure outcomes in interventions in several trials none of which were performed on patients with dystonia.^{78–81}

Clinimetric Properties. The VPQ was found to have good internal consistency in a study that included a large range of voice pathologies except for spasmodic dysphonia.⁸² In a study that included patients with laryngeal dystonia,⁷⁷ the VPQ had high levels of internal consistency and test-retest reliability. The VHI-10—the short form of VHI—and the VPQ were highly correlated in a study that did not include patients with laryngeal dystonia.⁸² Therefore, the VPQ still needs further validation in patients with dystonia.

Strengths and Weaknesses. The VPQ is a simple and efficient scale, but as a disability scale, it has no

discriminant value and is not specific for dystonia. Therefore, the scale should be further validated specifically in spasmodic dysphonia. The VPQ is similar to the VHI (see *Voice Handicap Index*). The value of having 2 scales for the same purpose is questionable and a sensible recommendation would be to merge them or pick 1 for future use.

Generalized Dystonia Scales

Fahn-Marsden Dystonia Rating Scale

Description of the Scale. The Fahn-Marsden Dystonia Rating Scale (FMDRS) is composed of 2 clinician-rated subscales: a movement subscale, based on patient examination, and a disability subscale, based on the patient's report of disability in activities of daily living. The movement subscale rates dystonia severity and provoking factors in 9 body areas, including eyes, mouth, speech and swallowing, neck, trunk, and both arms and legs. All items have a 5-point score. The provoking factor rates the relation of dystonia to action, from 0 (no dystonia at rest or with action) to 4 (dystonia at rest). The score obtained for eyes, mouth, and neck are each multiplied by 0.5, before being entered into the calculation of the total score, in order to down-weight them. The total movement FMDRS subscore is provided by the sum of the products of the provoking, severity, and weighting factors. The maximal total FMDRS score is 120. The disability subscale is composed of 7 items for activities of daily living, such as speech, writing, feeding, eating, hygiene, dressing, and walking. These are rated on a 5-point score (with the exception of walking, which is rated on a 7-point score), providing a maximum disability subscore of 30. Training for administration is recommended.

Scale Application in Dystonia. The FMDRS was originally established for the clinical assessment of primary torsion dystonia in adults.⁸³

Use by Multiple Groups Outside the Original Developers. The FMDRS has been used in numerous studies to determine the treatment effects of deep brain stimulation,^{23,34,46,84–109} including childhood-onset dystonia.^{110–114}

Clinimetric Properties. In the original validation study the reliability, interrater agreement, and concurrent validity of the FMDRS were demonstrated for the total score without reporting the level of agreement for ratings of the different body regions.⁸³ The FMDRS showed good internal consistency and good level of interrater reliability for the total scores.¹¹⁵ For separate items, interrater agreement was fair to good, being lowest for eyes, jaw, face, and larynx.¹¹⁵ The modifying ratings for the FMDRS (Provoking Factor)

showed consistently lower levels of agreement than motor severity ratings.¹¹⁵ The total scores for the FMDRS, the Unified Dystonia Rating Scale, and the Global Dystonia Rating Scale were highly correlated with each other.¹¹⁵ Responsiveness has been demonstrated in treatment studies.^{84,91,110}

Strengths and Weaknesses. Limitations in the FMDRS include a weighting factor that halves the contribution of dystonia in eyes, mouth, and neck to the total score. The FMDRS does not assess in detail the individual body areas, such as separate ratings for proximal and distal limbs; moreover, included in the FMDRS there is a subjective patient rating for speech and swallowing.

Discussion

We identified 7 scales that fulfilled the predefined criteria for “recommended” scales. One scale rates blepharospasm (BSDI), 2 rate cervical dystonia (CDIP-58, TWSTRS), 1 rates blepharospasm and cervical dystonia (CDQ-24), 2 rate laryngeal dystonia (VHI, VPQ), and 1 rates generalized dystonia (FMDRS). Two of these are generic scales (VHI and VPQ) that require further validation specifically in dystonia, while the remaining are disease-specific scales. The task force recommends the 5 specific dystonia scales and suggests that the 2 recommended generic voice-disorder scales be further validated in dystonia. Scales for oromandibular, arm, and task-specific dystonias require further assessment and there are no rating scales for some body areas, particularly the trunk and lower limbs. Eleven of the recommended scales provide objective evaluations, 15 provide measurement of disability or quality of life, and 2 are psychosocial scales.

Each of these scales has been shown to have specific advantages and limitations in dystonia and all have been shown to have adequate clinimetric properties for the assessment of dystonia. However, these scales are useful mainly in assessing the motor aspects of dystonia, and only 2 of them (TWSTRS and FMDRS) assess some of the specific motor phenomena of dystonia, such as action specificity, gestes antagonistes, or temporal patterns. Non-motor symptoms such as sensory, sleep, and neuropsychiatric features related to dystonia are partially rated in the TWSTRS, CDIP-58, CDQ-24, and in some of the suggested or listed scales.

None of the reviewed scales is appropriate or sufficient to diagnose a specific dystonia type (eg, specific types of focal or generalized dystonia, paroxysmal, etc.), but these instruments can rate its severity and make comparison within different patient groups. Since most dystonia scales measure specific body regions, they should be applied to well-selected and

homogeneous patient groups. For example, the CDQ-24, a scale that measures the impact of craniocervical dystonia on quality of life, has been used in patients with segmental and generalized dystonia.¹⁶ However, this scale is specific to craniocervical dystonia; its use in patients with dystonia also involving other body regions may lead to misleading results.

Most of the scales used to rate dystonia were designed for adults and then applied to children. Evaluating children with dystonia is difficult, because a wider spectrum of abnormalities may be commonly associated with dystonia. Unlike adults, children frequently have secondary forms that can be confounded with other motor abnormalities, including weakness, spasticity, impaired selective motor control, bradykinesia, choreoathetosis, ataxia, and sensory impairments. Therefore, rating scales in children are designed to evaluate secondary dystonias, including a broad range of movement disorders different from dystonia (ie, the Barry-Albright Dystonia Scale, the Movement Disorder-Childhood Rating Scale) and are not reviewed here. Application of adult dystonia scales to children is further complicated by the impact of development on expressed motor patterns and skills. Thus, further validation of dystonia scales in children with primary dystonia and in those with secondary dystonias is needed.

Future directions will encompass the refinement of existing rating scales to include various specific motor as well as non-motor features of dystonia,³ and fuller clinimetric assessment for oromandibular, arm, and task-specific dystonias. There is also a need for the development of new tools for the dystonia types where no scales are available, such as lower limb and trunk dystonias. The selection of the most appropriate instrument for each particular dystonia type is advocated and the need for training physicians in recognizing the complex phenomenology of dystonia syndromes. Scales need to be evaluated in different populations such as in children versus adults, and primary versus secondary dystonias, and translations should be available. Finally, there is a need for uniform training by developing manuals and training tools for dystonia scales. ■

References

1. Steeves TD, Day L, Dykeman J, Jette N, Pringsheim T. The prevalence of primary dystonia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Mov Disord* 2012;27:1789–1796.
2. Albanese A, Asmus F, Bhatia KP, et al. EFNS guidelines on diagnosis and treatment of primary dystonias. *Eur J Neurol* 2011;18:5–18.
3. Albanese A, Bhatia KP, Bressman SB, et al. Phenomenology and classification of dystonia: a consensus update. *Mov Disord* 2013; 863–873.
4. Stamelou M, Edwards MJ, Hallett M, Bhatia KP. The non-motor syndrome of primary dystonia: clinical and pathophysiological implications. *Brain* 2012;135:1668–1681.

5. Hallett M, Benecke R, Blitzer A, Comella CL. Treatment of focal dystonias with botulinum neurotoxin. *Toxicon* 2009;54:628–633.
6. Cloud LJ, Jinnah HA. Treatment strategies for dystonia. *Expert Opin Pharmacother* 2010;11:5–15.
7. Goetz CG, Tilley BC, Shaftman SR, et al. Movement Disorder Society-sponsored revision of the Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale (MDS-UPDRS): scale presentation and clinimetric testing results. *Mov Disord* 2008;23:2129–2170.
8. The Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale (UPDRS): status and recommendations. *Mov Disord* 2003;18:738–750.
9. Jankovic J, Kenney C, Grafe S, Goertelmeyer R, Comes G. Relationship between various clinical outcome assessments in patients with blepharospasm. *Mov Disord* 2009;24:407–413.
10. Roggenkamper P, Jost WH, Bihari K, Comes G, Grafe S. Efficacy and safety of a new botulinum toxin type A free of complexing proteins in the treatment of blepharospasm. *J Neural Transm* 2006;113:303–312.
11. Wabbels B, Reichel G, Fulford-Smith A, Wright N, Roggenkamper P. Double-blind, randomised, parallel group pilot study comparing two botulinum toxin type A products for the treatment of blepharospasm. *J Neural Transm* 2011;118:233–239.
12. Jankovic J, Comella C, Hanschmann A, Grafe S. Efficacy and safety of incobotulinumtoxinA (NT 201, Xeomin) in the treatment of blepharospasm—a randomized trial. *Mov Disord* 2011;26:1521–1528.
13. Wabbels B, Jost WH, Roggenkamper P. Difficulties with differentiating botulinum toxin treatment effects in essential blepharospasm. *J Neural Transm* 2011;118:925–943.
14. Cano SJ, Warner TT, Linacre JM, et al. Capturing the true burden of dystonia on patients: the Cervical Dystonia Impact Profile (CDIP-58). *Neurology* 2004;63:1629–1633.
15. Cano SJ, Hobart JC, Edwards M, et al. CDIP-58 can measure the impact of botulinum toxin treatment in cervical dystonia. *Neurology* 2006;67:2230–2232.
16. Zetterberg L, Aquilonius SM, Lindmark B. Impact of dystonia on quality of life and health in a Swedish population. *Acta Neurol Scand* 2009;119:376–382.
17. Jankovic J, Adler CH, Charles PD, et al. Rationale and design of a prospective study: Cervical Dystonia Patient Registry for Observation of OnaBotulinumtoxinA Efficacy (CD PROBE). *BMC Neurol* 2011;11:140.
18. Sethi KD, Rodriguez R, Olayinka B. Satisfaction with botulinum toxin treatment: a cross-sectional survey of patients with cervical dystonia. *J Med Econ* 2012;15:419–423.
19. Cano SJ, Warner TT, Thompson AJ, Bhatia KP, Fitzpatrick R, Hobart JC. The cervical dystonia impact profile (CDIP-58): can a Rasch developed patient reported outcome measure satisfy traditional psychometric criteria? *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2008;6:58.
20. Consky ES, Lang AE. Clinical assessments of patients with cervical dystonia. In: Jankovic J, Hallett M, editors. *Therapy with botulinum toxin*. New York, NY: Marcel Dekker; 1994:211–237.
21. Comella CL, Stebbins GT, Goetz CG, Chmura TA, Bressman SB, Lang AE. Teaching tape for the motor section of the Toronto Western Spasmodic Torticollis Scale. *Mov Disord* 1997;12:570–575.
22. Lalli S, Piacentini S, Franzini A, et al. Epidural premotor cortical stimulation in primary focal dystonia: clinical and 18F-fluoro deoxyglucose positron emission tomography open study. *Mov Disord* 2012;27:533–538.
23. Capelle HH, Blahak C, Schrader C, et al. Bilateral deep brain stimulation for cervical dystonia in patients with previous peripheral surgery. *Mov Disord* 2012;27:301–304.
24. Skogseid IM, Ramm-Petersen J, Volkmann J, Kerty E, Dietrichs E, Roste GK. Good long-term efficacy of pallidal stimulation in cervical dystonia: a prospective, observer-blinded study. *Eur J Neurol* 2012;19:610–615.
25. Comella CL, Jankovic J, Truong DD, Hanschmann A, Grafe S. Efficacy and safety of incobotulinumtoxinA (NT 201, XEOMIN(R)), botulinum neurotoxin type A, without accessory proteins in patients with cervical dystonia. *J Neurol Sci* 2011;308:103–109.
26. Ostrem JL, Racine CA, Glass GA, et al. Subthalamic nucleus deep brain stimulation in primary cervical dystonia. *Neurology* 2011;76:870–878.
27. Chinnapongse R, Pappert EJ, Evatt M, Freeman A, Birmingham W. An open-label, sequential dose-escalation, safety, and tolerability study of rimabotulinumtoxinb in subjects with cervical dystonia. *Int J Neurosci* 2010;120:703–710.
28. Cacciola F, Farah JO, Eldridge PR, Byrne P, Varma TK. Bilateral deep brain stimulation for cervical dystonia: long-term outcome in a series of 10 patients. *Neurosurgery* 2010;67:957–963.
29. Lew MF, Chinnapongse R, Zhang Y, Corliss M. RimabotulinumtoxinB effects on pain associated with cervical dystonia: results of placebo and comparator-controlled studies. *Int J Neurosci* 2010;120:298–300.
30. Truong D, Brodsky M, Lew M, et al. Long-term efficacy and safety of botulinum toxin type A (Dysport) in cervical dystonia. *Parkinsonism Relat Disord* 2010;16:316–323.
31. Quagliato EM, Carelli EF, Viana MA. A prospective, randomized, double-blind study comparing the efficacy and safety of type a botulinum toxins botox and prosigine in the treatment of cervical dystonia. *Clin Neuropharmacol* 2010;33:22–26.
32. Moro E, Piboolnurak P, Arenovich T, Hung SW, Poon YY, Lozano AM. Pallidal stimulation in cervical dystonia: clinical implications of acute changes in stimulation parameters. *Eur J Neurol* 2009;16:506–512.
33. Berman BD, Starr PA, Marks WJ, Ostrem JL. Induction of bradykinesia with pallidal deep brain stimulation in patients with cranial-cervical dystonia. *Stereotact Funct Neurosurg* 2009;87:37–44.
34. Pretto TE, Dalvi A, Kang UJ, Penn RD. A prospective blinded evaluation of deep brain stimulation for the treatment of secondary dystonia and primary torticollis syndromes. *J Neurosurg* 2008;109:405–409.
35. Pinsker MO, Volkmann J, Falk D, et al. Electrode implantation for deep brain stimulation in dystonia: a fast spin-echo inversion-recovery sequence technique for direct stereotactic targeting of the GPI. *Zentralbl Neurochir* 2008;69:71–75.
36. Pappert EJ, Germanson T. Botulinum toxin type B vs. type A in toxin-naive patients with cervical dystonia: Randomized, double-blind, noninferiority trial. *Mov Disord* 2008;23:510–517.
37. Kiss ZH, Doig-Beyaert K, Eliasziw M, Tsui J, Haffenden A, Suchowersky O. The Canadian multicentre study of deep brain stimulation for cervical dystonia. *Brain* 2007;130:2879–2886.
38. Skogseid IM, Malt UF, Roislien J, Kerty E. Determinants and status of quality of life after long-term botulinum toxin therapy for cervical dystonia. *Eur J Neurol* 2007;14:1129–1137.
39. Comella CL, Jankovic J, Shannon KM, et al. Comparison of botulinum toxin serotypes A and B for the treatment of cervical dystonia. *Neurology* 2005;65:1423–1429.
40. Ondo WG, Gollomp S, Galvez-Jimenez N. A pilot study of botulinum toxin A for headache in cervical dystonia. *Headache* 2005;45:1073–1077.
41. Factor SA, Molho ES, Evans S, Feustel PJ. Efficacy and safety of repeated doses of botulinum toxin type B in type A resistant and responsive cervical dystonia. *Mov Disord* 2005;20:1152–1160.
42. Bihari K. Safety, effectiveness, and duration of effect of BOTOX after switching from Dysport for blepharospasm, cervical dystonia, and hemifacial spasm dystonia, and hemifacial spasm. *Curr Med Res Opin* 2005;21:433–438.
43. Dressler D, Bigalke H. Botulinum toxin type B de novo therapy of cervical dystonia: frequency of antibody induced therapy failure. *J Neurol* 2005;252:904–907.
44. Truong D, Duane DD, Jankovic J, et al. Efficacy and safety of botulinum type A toxin (Dysport) in cervical dystonia: results of the first US randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study. *Mov Disord* 2005;20:783–791.
45. Kiss ZH, Doig K, Eliasziw M, Ranaway R, Suchowersky O. The Canadian multicenter trial of pallidal deep brain stimulation for cervical dystonia: preliminary results in three patients. *Neurosurg Focus* 2004;17:E5.
46. Eltahawy HA, Saint-Cyr J, Giladi N, Lang AE, Lozano AM. Primary dystonia is more responsive than secondary dystonia to pallidal interventions: outcome after pallidotomy or pallidal deep brain stimulation. *Neurosurgery* 2004;54:613–619.
47. Meyer CH. Outcome of selective peripheral denervation for cervical dystonia. *Stereotact Funct Neurosurg* 2001;77:44–47.

48. Naumann M, Yakovlev A, Durif F. A randomized, double-masked, crossover comparison of the efficacy and safety of botulinum toxin type A produced from the original bulk toxin source and current bulk toxin source for the treatment of cervical dystonia. *J Neurol* 2002;249:57–63.
49. Munchau A, Palmer JD, Dressler D, et al. Prospective study of selective peripheral denervation for botulinum-toxin resistant patients with cervical dystonia. *Brain* 2001;124:769–783.
50. Lucetti C, Nuti A, Gambaccini G, et al. Mexiletine in the treatment of torticollis and generalized dystonia. *Clin Neuropharmacol* 2000;23:186–189.
51. Brashear A, Lew MF, Dykstra DD, et al. Safety and efficacy of NeuroBloc (botulinum toxin type B) in type A-responsive cervical dystonia. *Neurology* 1999;53:1439–1446.
52. Brin MF, Lew MF, Adler CH, et al. Safety and efficacy of NeuroBloc (botulinum toxin type B) in type A-resistant cervical dystonia. *Neurology* 1999;53:1431–1438.
53. Krauss JK, Toups EG, Jankovic J, Grossman RG. Symptomatic and functional outcome of surgical treatment of cervical dystonia. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 1997;63:642–648.
54. Truong DD, Cullis PA, O'Brien CF, Koller M, Villegas TP, Wallace JD. BotB (botulinum toxin type B): evaluation of safety and tolerability in botulinum toxin type A-resistant cervical dystonia patients (preliminary study). *Mov Disord* 1997;12:772–775.
55. Lew MF, Adornato BT, Duane DD, et al. Botulinum toxin type B: a double-blind, placebo-controlled, safety and efficacy study in cervical dystonia. *Neurology* 1997;49:701–707.
56. Brans JW, Lindeboom R, Snoek JW, et al. Botulinum toxin versus trihexyphenidyl in cervical dystonia: a prospective, randomized, double-blind controlled trial. *Neurology* 1996;46:1066–1072.
57. Brans JW, Lindeboom R, Aramideh M, Speelman JD. Long-term effect of botulinum toxin on impairment and functional health in cervical dystonia. *Neurology* 1998;50:1461–1463.
58. Ranoux D, Gury C, Fondarai J, Mas JL, Zuber M. Respective potencies of Botox and Dysport: a double blind, randomised, crossover study in cervical dystonia. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2002;72:459–462.
59. Tarsy D. Comparison of clinical rating scales in treatment of cervical dystonia with botulinum toxin. *Mov Disord* 1997;12:100–102.
60. Muller J, Wissel J, Kemmler G, et al. Craniocervical dystonia questionnaire (CDQ-24): development and validation of a disease-specific quality of life instrument. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2004;75:749–753.
61. Tepaycevic DK, Svetel M, Pekmezovic T, Petrovic I, Kostic VS. Craniocervical Dystonia Questionnaire (CDQ-24): validation and cross-cultural adaptation in Serbian patients. *Coll Antropol* 2009;33:1185–1189.
62. Zetterberg L, Halvorsen K, Farnstrand C, Aquilonius SM, Lindmark B. Physiotherapy in cervical dystonia: six experimental single-case studies. *Physiother Theory Pract* 2008;24:275–290.
63. Jacobson BH, Johnson A, Grywalski C, et al. The Voice Handicap Index (VHI): development and validation. *Am J Speech Lang Pathol* 1997;6:66–70.
64. Woisard V, Bodin S, Puech M. [The Voice Handicap Index: impact of the translation in French on the validation]. Le "Voice Handicap Index": impact de la traduction française sur la validation. *Rev Laryngol Otol Rhinol (Bord)* 2004;125:307–312. [French].
65. Rosen CA, Murry T, Zinn A, Zullo T, Sonbolian M. Voice handicap index change following treatment of voice disorders. *J Voice* 2000;14:619–623.
66. Courey MS, Garrett CG, Billante CR, et al. Outcomes assessment following treatment of spasmodic dysphonia with botulinum toxin. *Ann Otol Rhinol Laryngol* 2000;109:819–822.
67. Spector BC, Netterville JL, Billante C, Clary J, Reinisch L, Smith TL. Quality-of-life assessment in patients with unilateral vocal cord paralysis. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 2001;125:176–182.
68. Benninger MS, Gardner G, Grywalski C. Outcomes of botulinum toxin treatment for patients with spasmodic dysphonia. *Arch Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 2001;127:1083–1085.
69. Lee L, Daughton S, Scheer S, et al. Use of acupuncture for the treatment of adductor spasmodic dysphonia: a preliminary investigation. *J Voice* 2003;17:411–424.
70. Chhetri DK, Mendelsohn AH, Blumin JH, Berke GS. Long-term follow-up results of selective laryngeal adductor denervation-reinnervation surgery for adductor spasmodic dysphonia. *Laryngoscope* 2006;116:635–642.
71. Tsuji DH, Chrispim FS, Imamura R, Sennes LU, Hachiya A. Impact in vocal quality in partial myectomy and neurectomy endoscopic of thyroarytenoid muscle in patients with adductor spasmodic dysphonia. *Braz J Otorhinolaryngol* 2006;72:261–266.
72. Hussain A, Shakeel M. Selective lateral laser thyroarytenoid myotomy for adductor spasmodic dysphonia. *J Laryngol Otol* 2010;124:886–891.
73. Tsuji DH, Takahashi MT, Imamura R, Hachiya A, Sennes LU. Endoscopic laser thyroarytenoid myoneurectomy in patients with adductor spasmodic dysphonia: a pilot study on long-term outcome on voice quality. *J Voice* 2012;26:666–612.
74. Novakovic D, Waters HH, D'Elia JB, Blitzer A. Botulinum toxin treatment of adductor spasmodic dysphonia: longitudinal functional outcomes. *Laryngoscope* 2011;121:606–612.
75. Morzaria S, Damrose EJ. A comparison of the VHI, VHI-10, and V-RQOL for measuring the effect of botox therapy in adductor spasmodic dysphonia. *J Voice* 2012;26:378–380.
76. Carding PN, Horsley IA, Docherty GJ. A study of the effectiveness of voice therapy in the treatment of 45 patients with nonorganic dysphonia. *J Voice* 1999;13:72–104.
77. Webb AL, Carding PN, Deary IJ, MacKenzie K, Steen IN, Wilson JA. Optimising outcome assessment of voice interventions. I: Reliability and validity of three self-reported scales. *J Laryngol Otol* 2007;121:763–767.
78. Steen IN, MacKenzie K, Carding PN, Webb A, Deary IJ, Wilson JA. Optimising outcome assessment of voice interventions. II: Sensitivity to change of self-reported and observer-rated measures. *J Laryngol Otol* 2008;122:46–51.
79. MacKenzie K, Millar A, Wilson JA, Sellars C, Deary IJ. Is voice therapy an effective treatment for dysphonia? A randomised controlled trial. *BMJ* 2001;323:658–661.
80. Rattenbury HJ, Carding PN, Finn P. Evaluating the effectiveness and efficiency of voice therapy using transnasal flexible laryngoscopy: a randomized controlled trial. *J Voice* 2004;18:522–533.
81. Meek P, Carding PN, Howard DH, Lennard TW. Voice change following thyroid and parathyroid surgery. *J Voice* 2008;22:765–772.
82. Deary IJ, Webb A, MacKenzie K, Wilson JA, Carding PN. Short, self-report voice symptom scales: psychometric characteristics of the voice handicap index-10 and the vocal performance questionnaire. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 2004;131:232–235.
83. Burke RE, Fahn S, Marsden CD, Bressman SB, Moskowitz C, Friedman J. Validity and reliability of a rating scale for the primary torsion dystonias. *Neurology* 1985;35:73–77.
84. Kim JP, Chang WS, Chang JW. The long-term surgical outcomes of secondary hemidystonia associated with post-traumatic brain injury. *Acta Neurochir (Wien)* 2012;154:823–830.
85. Cif L, Gonzalez-Martinez V, Vasques X, et al. Staged implantation of multiple electrodes in the internal globus pallidus in the treatment of primary generalized dystonia. *J Neurosurg* 2012;116:1144–1152.
86. Panov F, Tagliati M, Ozelius LJ, et al. Pallidal deep brain stimulation for DYT6 dystonia. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2012;83:182–187.
87. Sobstyl M, Zabek M, Dzierzecki S, Koziara H, Mossakowski Z. Chronic bilateral pallidal stimulation in patients with generalized primary dystonia - multi-contact cathodal stimulation is superior to bipolar stimulation mode. Preliminary results. *Neurol Neurochir Pol* 2011;45:252–259.
88. Schrader C, Capelle HH, Kinfe TM, et al. GPI-DBS may induce a hypokinetic gait disorder with freezing of gait in patients with dystonia. *Neurology* 2011;77:483–488.
89. Limotai N, Go C, Oyama G, et al. Mixed results for GPI-DBS in the treatment of cranio-facial and cranio-cervical dystonia symptoms. *J Neurol* 2011;258:2069–2074.
90. Valalik I, Jobbagy A, Bognar L, Csokay A. Effectiveness of unilateral pallidotomy for Meige syndrome confirmed by motion analysis. *Stereotact Funct Neurosurg* 2011;89:157–161.

91. Isaias IU, Volkman J, Kupsch A, et al. Factors predicting protracted improvement after pallidal DBS for primary dystonia: the role of age and disease duration. *J Neurol* 2011;258:1469–1476.
92. Reese R, Gruber D, Schoenecker T, et al. Long-term clinical outcome in Meige syndrome treated with internal pallidum deep brain stimulation. *Mov Disord* 2011;26:691–698.
93. Azoulay-Zyss J, Roze E, Welter ML, et al. Bilateral deep brain stimulation of the pallidum for myoclonus-dystonia due to epsilon-sarcoglycan mutations: a pilot study. *Arch Neurol* 2011;68:94–98.
94. Sako W, Morigaki R, Mizobuchi Y, et al. Bilateral pallidal deep brain stimulation in primary Meige syndrome. *Parkinsonism Relat Disord* 2011;17:12–125.
95. Gruber D, Kuhn AA, Schoenecker T, et al. Pallidal and thalamic deep brain stimulation in myoclonus-dystonia. *Mov Disord* 2010;25:1733–1743.
96. Vidailhet M, Yelnik J, Lagrange C, et al. Bilateral pallidal deep brain stimulation for the treatment of patients with dystonia-choreoathetosis cerebral palsy: a prospective pilot study. *Lancet Neurol* 2009;8:709–717.
97. Gruber D, Trottenberg T, Kivi A, et al. Long-term effects of pallidal deep brain stimulation in tardive dystonia. *Neurology* 2009;73:53–58.
98. Sensi M, Cavallo MA, Quatrone R, et al. Pallidal stimulation for segmental dystonia: long term follow up of 11 consecutive patients. *Mov Disord* 2009;24:1829–1835.
99. Vasques X, Cif L, Gonzalez V, Nicholson C, Coubes P. Factors predicting improvement in primary generalized dystonia treated by pallidal deep brain stimulation. *Mov Disord* 2009;24:846–853.
100. Sako W, Goto S, Shimazu H, et al. Bilateral deep brain stimulation of the globus pallidus internus in tardive dystonia. *Mov Disord* 2008;23:1929–1931.
101. Hamasaki T, Yamada K, Kuratsu J. Hemidystonia secondary to thalamic hemorrhage treated with GPi stimulation. *Mov Disord* 2008;23:1762–1766.
102. Sobstyl M, Zabek M, Koziara H, Dzierzecki S. Chronic bilateral pallidal stimulation in a patient with DYT-1 positive primary generalized dystonia. A long-term follow-up study. *Neurol Neurochir Pol* 2008;42:50–54.
103. Houeto JL, Yelnik J, Bardinet E, et al. Acute deep-brain stimulation of the internal and external globus pallidus in primary dystonia: functional mapping of the pallidum. *Arch Neurol* 2007;64:1281–1286.
104. Alterman RL, Miravite J, Weisz D, Shils JL, Bressman SB, Tagliati M. Sixty Hertz pallidal deep brain stimulation for primary torsion dystonia. *Neurology* 2007;69:681–688.
105. Kleiner-Fisman G, Liang GS, Moberg PJ, et al. Subthalamic nucleus deep brain stimulation for severe idiopathic dystonia: impact on severity, neuropsychological status, and quality of life. *J Neurosurg* 2007;107:29–36.
106. Ostrem JL, Marks WJ Jr, Volz MM, Heath SL, Starr PA. Pallidal deep brain stimulation in patients with cranial-cervical dystonia (Meige syndrome). *Mov Disord* 2007;22:1885–1891.
107. Kupsch A, Benecke R, Muller J, et al. Pallidal deep-brain stimulation in primary generalized or segmental dystonia. *N Engl J Med* 2006;355:1978–1990.
108. Coubes P, Cif L, El Fertit H, et al. Electrical stimulation of the globus pallidus internus in patients with primary generalized dystonia: long-term results. *J Neurosurg* 2004;101:189–194.
109. Katayama Y, Fukaya C, Kobayashi K, Oshima H, Yamamoto T. Chronic stimulation of the globus pallidus internus for control of primary generalized dystonia. *Acta Neurochir Suppl* 2003;87:125–128.
110. Air EL, Ostrem JL, Sanger TD, Starr PA. Deep brain stimulation in children: experience and technical pearls. *J Neurosurg Pediatr* 2011;8:566–574.
111. Haridas A, Tagliati M, Osborn I, et al. Pallidal deep brain stimulation for primary dystonia in children. *Neurosurgery* 2011;68:738–743.
112. Timmermann L, Pauls KA, Wieland K, et al. Dystonia in neurodegeneration with brain iron accumulation: outcome of bilateral pallidal stimulation. *Brain* 2010;133:701–712.
113. Borggraefe I, Mehrkens JH, Telegraviciska M, Berweck S, Botzel K, Heinen F. Bilateral pallidal stimulation in children and adolescents with primary generalized dystonia—report of six patients and literature-based analysis of predictive outcomes variables. *Brain Dev* 2010;32:223–228.
114. Borggraefe I, Boetzel K, Boehmer J, et al. Return to participation - significant improvement after bilateral pallidal stimulation in rapidly progressive DYT-1 dystonia. *Neuropediatrics* 2008;39:239–242.
115. Comella CL, Leurgans S, Wu J, Stebbins GT, Chmura T. Rating scales for dystonia: a multicenter assessment. *Mov Disord* 2003;18:303–312.