Exercise interventions improve postural control in children with cerebral palsy: a systematic review
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Aim The aim of this study was to evaluate the efficacy and effectiveness of exercise interventions that may improve postural control in children with cerebral palsy (CP).

Method A systematic review was performed using American Academy of Cerebral Palsy and Developmental Medicine (AACPDM) and Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) methodology. Six databases were searched using the following keywords: (‘cerebral palsy’ OR ‘brain injury’); AND (‘postural’ OR ‘balance’ OR ‘postural balance’ [MeSH]); AND (‘intervention’ OR ‘therapy’ OR ‘exercise’ OR ‘treatment’). Articles were evaluated based on their level of evidence and conduct.

Results Searches yielded 45 studies reporting 13 exercise interventions with postural control outcomes for children with CP. Five interventions were supported by a moderate level of evidence: gross motor task training, hippotherapy, treadmill training with body weight support (no-BWS), trunk-targeted training, and reactive balance training. Six of the interventions had weak or conflicting evidence: functional electrical stimulation (FES), hippotherapy simulators, neurodevelopmental therapy (NDT), treadmill training with body weight support, virtual reality, and visual biofeedback. Progressive resistance exercise was an ineffective intervention, and upper limb interventions lacked high-level evidence.

Interpretation The use of exercise-based treatments to improve postural control in children with CP has increased significantly in the last decade. Improved study design provides more clarity regarding broad treatment efficacy. Research is required to establish links between postural control impairments, treatment options, and outcome measures. Low-burden, low-cost, child-engaging, and mainstream interventions also need to be explored.
mass within the base of support where gravity is the key vector. Stability tasks can be considered static, when the body is stationary (e.g. when sitting or standing on a stable surface), or dynamic, when the body is moving, either during self-initiated internal perturbations (e.g. walking), or in response to external perturbations initiated by other people or objects (e.g. being pushed, or maintaining a stance on a moving bus). Postural orientation is the ability to attain and maintain an optimal functional relationship between body segments, a task, and the environment (e.g. for writing, reaching, or looking).

The effect and intent of postural control interventions need to be evaluated with reference to a framework of core postural control elements. Although numerous theoretical frameworks exist, the contemporary Systems Control Theory is the most comprehensive for this purpose. This theory describes postural control as a complex interaction between seven components: (1) neuromuscular synergies; (2) internal representations; (3) adaptive mechanisms (including reactive postural adjustments); (4) anticipatory mechanisms (including anticipatory postural adjustments); (5) sensory strategies; (6) individual sensory systems; and (7) musculoskeletal components. Children with motor disorders can show deficits in one or more of these components. Similarly, interventions and outcomes can target one or more components.

A burst of postural control intervention research in the 1980s and 1990s, relating to children with CP, prompted the publication of three review articles. First of all, Campbell published a non-systematic review of interventions for children with CP. This review proposed preliminary support for the following postural control interventions: gait training with real-time auditory biofeedback or retrospective verbal feedback; neurodevelopmental therapy (NDT); therapeutic horseback riding; and inhibitory casting. A decade later, Westcott and Burtner presented a second, non-systematic review of children with motor disabilities (including CP) using the systems control approach. This review supported Campbell’s findings, and also supported some new interventions, including reactive balance training using platform perturbations and anticipatory balance training with computer feedback. There was insufficient or conflicting evidence regarding outcomes of interventions targeting musculoskeletal (strengthening), sensory (vestibular stimulation), and motor (electrical stimulation) processes. To improve the existing body of research, the authors recommended that further studies include (1) outcome measures for both postural control and motor function; (2) more task-specific training to improve functional outcomes; and (3) evaluation of mainstream recreational activities for their potential impact on postural control. In 2005, the first systematic review of postural control interventions for children with CP was published by Harris and Roxborough. The authors supported Campbell’s view that progress in study quality and methodological rigor is required to provide adequate clinical guidance.

The outcomes and recommendations of these reviews prompted the study of many new clinical and mainstream approaches to treating postural control dysfunction in children with CP. Key examples include hippotherapy, treadmill training, upper limb therapy, strength training, and virtual reality technologies. However, it has been almost 10 years since the last review of postural control interventions in children with CP; therefore, an updated systematic review, to evaluate the efficacy and effectiveness of traditional and contemporary exercise interventions, is needed. In this respect, efficacy is defined as the ability of an intervention to improve postural control under ideal conditions, such as in a laboratory, and effectiveness is defined as the ability of an intervention to provide benefits during usual conditions of clinical care. Therefore, the aim of this paper is to present a systematic review of exercise interventions reported for use in children with CP; to evaluate the efficacy and effectiveness of these interventions for postural control outcomes, according to international standards; and to recommend appropriate management of postural control dysfunction in children with CP.

**METHOD**

This systematic review was conducted according to principles of American Academy of Cerebral Palsy and Developmental Medicine (AAPCPDM) methodology for developing systematic reviews of treatment interventions, and Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines. The study did not require human participation; therefore, ethical approval was not required.

**Search strategy**

A systematic literature search of articles published between January 1980 and December 2013 was performed using the following electronic databases: PubMed, EMBASE, EBSCOhost (MEDLINE and CINAHL), the Cochrane Library, and PEDro. Search terms were designed to include the population of interest (‘cerebral palsy’ OR ‘brain injury’), and intervention type (‘postur*’ OR ‘balance’ OR ‘postural balance’ [MeSH]), AND (intervention OR ‘therapy’ OR ‘exercise’ OR ‘treatment’). Secondary searches included reference list checking of the included articles, electronic searches for included interventions by name and author, and citation tracking of all included articles. Two authors (RD and LJ or SL) examined the titles.

---

**What this paper adds**

- First systematic review of postural control exercise interventions for children with cerebral palsy.
- Exercise interventions that improve postural control have increased in the last decade.
- Improved study design has clarified efficacy of postural control exercise approaches.
- Five exercise interventions reached moderate evidence level, however, no interventions were rated strong.
and abstracts of the articles identified by these searches. Full-text articles were retrieved if they fulfilled inclusion criteria, or if further clarification regarding the fulfilment of inclusion criteria was required. If agreement on inclusion could not be reached following review by two of the authors, the third author (IJ or SL) was consulted.

**Inclusion and exclusion criteria**

Articles were included if (1) they were full articles, published in English, in peer-reviewed journals, after 1980; (2) study participants were children diagnosed with CP, and aged between 0 and 18 years; (3) they performed a land-based exercise intervention that required active participation by the child; and (4) they reported the efficacy or effectiveness of the intervention, for improving postural control, using at least one outcome measure of either postural stability (static or dynamic balance), or postural orientation (e.g. postural alignment). Articles were excluded if they were non-systematic reviews or opinion articles, or if they reported (1) passive interventions (e.g. orthotics, equipment such as seating, or support garments); (2) water-based interventions; (3) medical or surgical interventions; or (4) active exercise interventions without any reported outcome measures for postural control.

**Data extraction and quality appraisal**

Two authors gathered data from each article using the appropriate AACPDM ‘study data extraction summary form’; the forms used were relevant for either group or single-subject research study designs. The forms recorded information regarding participants, intervention(s), outcome measure(s) (for postural control or other motor outcomes), results, and potential adverse effects. The quality of each included article was assessed in two steps: (1) by assignment of the level of evidence (for all studies); and then (2) by evaluation of conduct (for studies with level I–III evidence only [as determined using guidelines for each study type recommended by the AACPDM]). Group research designs were assigned levels of evidence using the classification described by Sackett et al.37 (see Table SI, online supporting information), where level I studies are most able to demonstrate that the intervention was responsible for the reported outcome. Conduct of level I to III group studies was rated using a seven-item questionnaire, with studies scoring ‘yes’ on six or seven items rated as strong, on four or five items rated as moderate, and on three or less items rated as weak. Single-subject research design studies were assigned levels of evidence using the classification described by Logan et al.38 (see Table SI). Conduct of level I to III single-subject research design studies was rated using a 14-item questionnaire, with studies scoring ‘yes’ on between 11 and 14 items rated as strong, on 7 to 10 items rated as moderate, and on seven or less items rated as weak. Systematic review studies were rated using the classification of Sackett et al.37 Conduct of systematic reviews was evaluated using Oxam and Guyatt’s39 classification, which yields a score out of 10.

**RESULTS**

A total of 911 articles were identified, 890 from initial searches, and 21 from secondary searches. After duplicates were removed, the titles and abstracts of 558 articles were screened. Of these, 154 full-text articles met initial criteria and were retrieved for review, with 45 studies meeting final inclusion criteria. The flow of studies, and reasons for exclusion at each stage, is summarized in a PRISMA diagram (Fig. 1).

From the 45 included articles (evidence levels I–V), 13 intervention types were identified that purported to impact postural stability or postural orientation in children with CP: functional electrical stimulation (FES) (n=2); gross motor task training (n=4); hippotherapy (n=9); hippotherapy simulators (n=3); progressive resistance exercise (n=1); reactive balance training (n=3); treadmill training with no body weight support (no-BWS) (n=1); treadmill training with partial or full body weight support (P-BWS or F-BWS respectively; n=5); trunk-targeted training (n=2); upper limb interventions (n=2); visual biofeedback (n=1); and virtual reality (n=8). Within the included articles, NDT was used as a comparison treatment in seven (n=7, not adding to the study tally), and appeared in one other where it was used as the sole intervention (n=1). Finally, three systematic reviews were identified, including one discussing postural control interventions in general, and two specifically discussing hippotherapy.

Results were tabulated based on AACPDM guidelines. Articles that were rated as level I to III (n=22) met criteria for full evaluation, which is provided in Table I, including citation, design, evidence level and conduct rating, intervention type, participants, results, outcome measures, and coding (according to the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health [ICF]: Children & Youth Version), and postural control component according to Systems Control Theory). Tables SIIa,b (online supporting information) provide additional information regarding participant characteristics and intervention methodology for each study (level IV–V studies were also included in this table to comprehensively describe the scope of research available for each intervention type). Tables SIIIa,b,c (online supporting information) report the objective conduct item scores for level I to III studies with group, single-subject, and systematic review designs. Table SIV (online supporting information) documents reported adverse events.

In the following sections, each intervention type with available level I to III evidence is critiqued for (1) the overall strength of the evidence presented; (2) the efficacy and/or effectiveness for improving postural control when considering each component (‘body functions and structures’, ‘activity’, and ‘participation’) of the ICF; (3) links between outcomes across the ICF; and (4) adverse events, if reported. Intervention types are discussed in alphabetical order.

**Functional electrical stimulation**

Two studies,41,42 both evidence level II (Table I), applied FES to abdominal and lumbar muscles simultaneously, with
the aim of improving muscle strength and function. Both studies used the following FES parameters with a sequence of 10 seconds ‘on’ followed by 12 seconds ‘off’: intensity of 20 to 30mA; pulse width of 250µs; and frequency of 25 to 35Hz. Both studies used the same dosage of 10 to 18 hours (five or six 30min sessions/wk for 4–6wks), together with rehabilitation (stretching, strengthening, and mobility activities, and Bobath treatments of inpatients in rehabilitation hospitals) for children aged between 1 and 10 years with spastic diplegia (Gross Motor Function Classification System [GMFCS] Level not reported). FES, along with rehabilitation, improved postural alignment (BF&S) to a greater extent than rehabilitation alone (evidence level II, conduct weak; see Table SIIIa).41,42 No discomfort was reported by children receiving FES (see Table SIV).42

**Gross motor task training**
Gross motor task training involves repetition of simple functional gross motor exercises (e.g. sit-to-stand exercises, step-ups, walking and standing activities, and reaching to limits of stability). Of four studies, two were level II (Table I). Improvement was reported for the ‘activity’, but not the BF&S, component. Thirty hours (five 1h sessions/wk for 6wks) of sit-to-stand and step-up exercises improved standing balance (‘activity’ and dynamic postural stability during gait (‘activity’)) in children with CP aged between 5 and 12 years (evidence level II, conduct moderate; see Table SIIIa).43 A lower dose of 10 hours (two 1h sessions/wk for 5wks) of walking, standing, sit-to-stand, and object pick-up activities improved dynamic balance during gait (‘activity’) in 4- to 11-year-old children with CP (evidence level II, conduct moderate; see online Table SIIIa).44

**Hippotherapy**
Hippotherapy is the provision of sensory and motor input via the movements of a horse, with programmes designed by professionals with hippotherapy qualifications.53 From 11 studies, three level II or III studies, and two systematic
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
<th>Design, evidence level, and conduct rating</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Outcome measure</th>
<th>ICF (proposed code)</th>
<th>PC component measured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Functional electrical stimulation (FES)</strong> Park et al.(^{41})</td>
<td>Group, II, Weak</td>
<td>FES</td>
<td>CP (spastic diplegic); mean age=13y 6mo; n=26</td>
<td>Improved postural symmetry in sitting (Cobb and kyphotic angle, (p&lt;0.05)); no change in lumbosacral angle</td>
<td>Radiographic measures: Cobb, kyphotic, and lumbosacral angle GMFM: B (sitting)</td>
<td>B (b7101)</td>
<td>MSk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karabay et al.(^{42})</td>
<td>Group, II, Weak</td>
<td>FES</td>
<td>CP (spastic diplegic); 2–10y; n=33</td>
<td>Improved postural symmetry in sitting (Cobb, kyphotic, and sacral angle, (p&lt;0.001))</td>
<td>Radiographic measures: Cobb, kyphotic, and sacral angle GMFM: B (sitting)</td>
<td>B (b7101)</td>
<td>MSk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross motor task training</strong> Katz-Leurer et al.(^{43})</td>
<td>Group, II, Moderate</td>
<td>Gross motor task training</td>
<td>TBI and CP; GMFCS I–II; 5–13y; n=20</td>
<td>No change in strength</td>
<td>Muscle strength of lower limb (dynamometry) Walking speed over 10m Walking energy expenditure index Functional reach test Timed-up and go test</td>
<td>B (b7300)</td>
<td>MSk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem and Godwin.(^{44})</td>
<td>Group, II, Moderate</td>
<td>Gross motor task training</td>
<td>CP; GMFCS I–III; 4–11y; n=10</td>
<td>Improved gross motor function: standing ((p&lt;0.009)) and walking, running, and jumping ((p&lt;0.017))</td>
<td>GMFM-88: D (standing) and E (walking, running, and jumping) Timed-up and go test</td>
<td>A (d4105, d4106, d4452)</td>
<td>APA, IR, MSk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hippotherapy</strong> Kang et al.(^{45})</td>
<td>Group, II, Weak</td>
<td>Hippotherapy</td>
<td>CP (hemi- and diplegic ambulatory); 6–10y; n=45</td>
<td>Improved sitting balance ((p&lt;0.05))</td>
<td>Stabilometry (sitting): pathway and velocity of COP while sitting still for 30s with visual fixation</td>
<td>B (b755)</td>
<td>IR, sensory, MSk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamill et al.(^{46})</td>
<td>SSRD, III, Moderate</td>
<td>Hippotherapy</td>
<td>CP; GMFCS V; 27–54mo; sitting; n=3</td>
<td>No change in sitting postural control No change in gross motor function overall, or in sitting</td>
<td>Sitting Assessment Scale GMFM-88: B (sitting) and total score</td>
<td>A (d4153, d4300, d440) and B (b760)</td>
<td>APA, MSk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{41}\) Park et al. (2019) 
\(^{42}\) Karabay et al. (2020) 
\(^{43}\) Katz-Leurer et al. (2018) 
\(^{44}\) Salem and Godwin (2019) 
\(^{45}\) Kang et al. (2020) 
\(^{46}\) Hamill et al. (2019)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
<th>Design, evidence level, and conduct rating</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Outcome measure</th>
<th>ICF (proposed code)</th>
<th>PC component measured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kwon et al.¹⁷</td>
<td>Group, III, Moderate</td>
<td>Hippotherapy</td>
<td>CP; GMFCS I–II; 4–10y; n=32</td>
<td>Improved walking (stride length [p&lt;0.001] and walking speed [p&lt;0.002]; no change in cadence, single limb support, or pelvic and hip kinematics)</td>
<td>Temporal–spatial and kinematic gait parameters</td>
<td>B (b770, b710)</td>
<td>APA, MSk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved overall gross motor function (p&lt;0.003); improved walking, running, and jumping (p&lt;0.042)</td>
<td>GMFM-66/88: E and total score</td>
<td>A (d410–d429, d455)</td>
<td>APA, IR, MSk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved balance in standing (p&lt;0.004)</td>
<td>Paediatric Balance Scale</td>
<td>A (d410, d4104–d4106, d4153–d4154, d4200, d4452)</td>
<td>APA, IR, sensory, MSk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borges et al.⁴⁸</td>
<td>Group, II, Weak</td>
<td>Hippotherapy simulator</td>
<td>CP (spastic diplegia); GMFCS II–IV; 3–12y; n=40</td>
<td>Improved postural control in sitting (AP, p&lt;0.0001; ML, p&lt;0.0069)</td>
<td>Stabilometry: voluntary COP movement in sitting GMFCS</td>
<td>B (b760)</td>
<td>APA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herrero et al.⁴⁹</td>
<td>Group, II, Strong</td>
<td>Hippotherapy simulator</td>
<td>CP; GMFCS I–IV; 4–18y; n=38</td>
<td>No change in motor classification</td>
<td>No change in sitting postural control</td>
<td>A (d450–d469)</td>
<td>APA, IR, MSk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved sitting function (odds ratio=3.9; 95% CI=0.68–22.7); no change in overall gross motor function</td>
<td>Sitting Assessment Scale GMFM-66: B (sitting) and total score</td>
<td>A (d410–d429, d455)</td>
<td>APA, IR, MSk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDT</td>
<td>Park et al.⁴¹</td>
<td>NDT</td>
<td>CP (spastic diplegia); 8–18mo; n=26</td>
<td>Improved postural symmetry in sitting (Cobb angle only p&lt;0.05); no change in kyphotic and lumbosacral angle</td>
<td>Radiographic measures: Cobb, kyphotic, and lumbosacral angle</td>
<td>B (b7101)</td>
<td>MSk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved sitting function (p&lt;0.05)</td>
<td>GMFM: B (sitting)</td>
<td>A (d410–d429, d455)</td>
<td>APA, IR, MSk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem and Godwin⁴⁴</td>
<td>Group, II, Moderate</td>
<td>NDT</td>
<td>CP (quadriplegic and diplegic); GMFCS I–III; 4–11y; n=10</td>
<td>Improved gross motor function: standing and walking, running, and jumping (no p-value reported)</td>
<td>GMFM-88: D (standing) and E (walking, running, and jumping)</td>
<td>A (d410–d429, d455)</td>
<td>APA, IR, MSk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borges et al.⁴⁸</td>
<td>Group, II, Weak</td>
<td>NDT</td>
<td>CP (spastic diplegia); GMFCS II–V; 3–10y; n=40</td>
<td>Improved dynamic balance: walking (no p-value reported)</td>
<td>Timed-up and go test</td>
<td>A (d4103, d4104, d4500)</td>
<td>APA, MSk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karabay et al.⁴²</td>
<td>Group, II, Weak</td>
<td>NDT + conventional PT</td>
<td>CP (spastic diplegia); 2–10y; n=33</td>
<td>No change in motor classification</td>
<td>Stabilometry: voluntary COP movement in sitting GMFCS</td>
<td>A (d450–d469)</td>
<td>APA, IR, MSk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved postural symmetry: sitting (Cobb, kyphotic angle [p&lt;0.001] and sacral angle)</td>
<td>Radiographic measures: Cobb, kyphotic, and sacral angle</td>
<td>B (b7101)</td>
<td>MSk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved sitting (p&lt;0.001)</td>
<td>GMFM: B (sitting)</td>
<td>A (d410–d429, d455)</td>
<td>APA, IR, MSk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>Design, evidence level, and conduct rating</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Outcome measure</td>
<td>ICF (proposed code)</td>
<td>PC component measured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Shamy et al.(^{50})</td>
<td>Group, II, Moderate</td>
<td>NDT</td>
<td>CP (spastic diplegic); GMFCS I–II; 10–12y; (n=30)</td>
<td>Improved limits of stability ((p&lt;0.001))</td>
<td>Biodex, DSL level 12: movement of COP with visual feedback</td>
<td>B (b760)</td>
<td>APA, IR, sensory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved (reduced) falls risk ((p&lt;0.05))</td>
<td>Biodex: COP pathway in response to perturbation</td>
<td>A (d450)</td>
<td>RPA, NMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved functional standing balance ((p&lt;0.05))</td>
<td>Paediatric Balance Scale</td>
<td>A (d4103, d4104–d4106, d4153–d4154, d4200, d4452)</td>
<td>APA, IR, sensory, MSk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwon et al.(^{47})</td>
<td>Group, III, Moderate</td>
<td>NDT</td>
<td>CP (bilateral spastic); GMFCS I–II; 4–10y; (n=32)</td>
<td>Improved walking ((\text{cadence } p&lt;0.013; \text{walking speed } p&lt;0.002); \text{no change in stride length, single limb support, or pelvic and hip kinematics} )</td>
<td>Temporal–spatial and kinematic gait parameters</td>
<td>B (B770,B710)</td>
<td>APA, MSk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change in gross motor function</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change in standing balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive resistance exercises Bandholm et al.(^{51})</td>
<td>Group, II, Strong</td>
<td>Progression resistance training</td>
<td>CP; GMFCS I; 5–14y; (n=15)</td>
<td>Improved plantar flexion MVT only ((p&lt;0.035))</td>
<td>Ankle muscle strength: DF and PF dynamometer (MVT), and EMG (torque steadiness)</td>
<td>B (b7300)</td>
<td>MSk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change in gait pattern</td>
<td>3D gait kinematics and temporal–spatial parameters</td>
<td>B (b770, b710)</td>
<td>APA, IR, MSk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change in static balance (standing)</td>
<td>Stabilometry: standing COP sway</td>
<td>B (b755)</td>
<td>IR, MSk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved spasticity of ankle PF in both groups ((p&lt;0.001))</td>
<td>Modified Ashworth Scale</td>
<td>B (7350)</td>
<td>MSk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change in gross motor performance</td>
<td>GMFM-66</td>
<td>A (d410–d429, d455)</td>
<td>APA, IR, MSk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reactive balance
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
<th>Design, evidence level, and conduct rating</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Outcome measure</th>
<th>ICF (proposed code)</th>
<th>PC component measured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El-Shamy et al.(^5^0)</td>
<td>Group, II, Moderate</td>
<td>Reactive balance training with Biodex balance system</td>
<td>CP (spastic diplegic); GMFCS I-II; 10-12y; (n=30)</td>
<td>Improved limits of stability ((p&lt;0.001))</td>
<td>Biodex, DSL level 12: movement of COP with visual feedback</td>
<td>B (b760)</td>
<td>APA, IR, sensory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Shamy et al.(^5^0)</td>
<td>Group, II, Moderate</td>
<td>Reactive balance training with Biodex balance system</td>
<td>CP (spastic diplegic); GMFCS I-II; 10-12y; (n=30)</td>
<td>Improved (reduced) falls risk ((p&lt;0.05))</td>
<td>Biodec COP pathway in response to perturbation calculation of falls risk</td>
<td>A (d450)</td>
<td>RPA, NMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Shamy et al.(^5^0)</td>
<td>Group, II, Moderate</td>
<td>Reactive balance training with Biodex balance system</td>
<td>CP (spastic diplegic); GMFCS I-II; 10-12y; (n=30)</td>
<td>Improved functional standing balance ((p&lt;0.05))</td>
<td>Paediatric Balance Scale</td>
<td>A (d4103, d4104–d4106, d4153–d4154, d4200, d4452)</td>
<td>APA, IR, sensory, MSk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shumway-Cook et al.(^5^2)</td>
<td>SSRD, II, Moderate</td>
<td>Massed practice: reactive balance training</td>
<td>CP; GMFCS I-II; 7-12y; (n=6)</td>
<td>Improved reactive balance in standing ((p&lt;0.05))</td>
<td>Stabilometry: COP time to stabilization and area in response to perturbation</td>
<td>B (b755)</td>
<td>RPA, NMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shumway-Cook et al.(^5^2)</td>
<td>SSRD, II, Moderate</td>
<td>Massed practice: reactive balance training</td>
<td>CP; GMFCS I-II; 7-12y; (n=6)</td>
<td>No change in function in standing</td>
<td>GMFM: D (standing)</td>
<td>A (d410–d429, d455)</td>
<td>APA, IR, MSk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic reviews</td>
<td>Systematic Review, II, 8/9</td>
<td>Seating, ankle foot orthotics, lycra garments, motor therapy and balance training protocols</td>
<td>12 studies; CP; 0–19y</td>
<td>Improved postural control (various) following motor therapy and balance training; conflicting results for NDT; improved reactive balance following reactive balance training, artificial hipphotherapy simulators, and rocker board training</td>
<td>Postural control in sitting, upper extremity movement control, standing balance, knee extension, pathological movement, head control, independent sitting balance, segmental level of control, dynamic stability in gait, function, goal performance, comfort, upper limb function, posture alignment, engagement with toys, caregiving, reactive balance, and motor function</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>Design, evidence level, and conduct rating</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Outcome measure</td>
<td>ICF (proposed code)</td>
<td>PC component measured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tseng et al.54</td>
<td>Systematic Review, II, 8/9</td>
<td>Equine-assisted activities and therapies (EAAT); hippotherapy and therapeutic horse riding only</td>
<td>14 studies; CP; 0–18y</td>
<td>Improved postural control (BPAS and SAS - see outcome measure description) following hippotherapy (involving children GMFCS I–IV); no change in all other measures</td>
<td>Betoti’s Postural Assessment Scale, Sitting Assessment Scale, surface EMG (hip adductor asymmetry), Modified Ashworth Scale, stride length, GMFM-66, and GMFM-88</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treadmill training Družbicki et al.55</td>
<td>Group, II, Weak</td>
<td>Treadmill training with Lukomat</td>
<td>CP; GMFCS II–III; 6–14y; n=18</td>
<td>Improved standing balance, predominantly in eyes closed condition (p&lt;0.05)</td>
<td>Stabilometry: COP deviations and pathway in standing, eyes open and closed Underfoot pressure distribution</td>
<td>B (b235, b755)</td>
<td>APA, IR, sensory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grecco et al.56</td>
<td>Group, II, Moderate</td>
<td>Treadmill training, no-BWS</td>
<td>CP; GMFCS I–II; 3–11y; n=15</td>
<td>Improved standing balance (p value not reported) Improved weight symmetry in standing Improved standing balance in eyes open and closed conditions for AP (p&lt;0.03), and eyes open for ML (p&lt;0.04) Improved functional balance in standing (p&lt;0.01)</td>
<td>Stabilometry: COP oscillation in standing, eyes open and closed Berg Balance Scale</td>
<td>B (b235, b755)</td>
<td>IR, sensory, MSk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
<th>Design, evidence level, and conduct rating</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Outcome measure</th>
<th>ICF (proposed code)</th>
<th>PC component measured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trunk-targeted training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unger et al.57</td>
<td>Group, II, Moderate</td>
<td>Trunk-targeted exercise with vibration</td>
<td>CP; GMFCS I–II; 6–13y; n=27</td>
<td>Improved postural alignment: AP angle sitting and standing, and shoulder-to-seat height in sitting (p&lt;0.05)</td>
<td>2D photographic posture analysis in standing</td>
<td>B (b7101)</td>
<td>MSk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved abdominal muscle thickness (RA, OE, OI, and TrA, p&lt;0.05)</td>
<td>Ultrasound imaging: resting abdominal muscle thickness</td>
<td>B (d7300)</td>
<td>MSk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved functional walking ability (p&lt;0.001)</td>
<td>Total sit-ups in one minute</td>
<td>B (d7300)</td>
<td>MSk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Virtual reality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramstrand and Lyngegard68</td>
<td>Group, II, Weak</td>
<td>Virtual reality: Nintendo Wii, Wii Fit, and Wii balance board</td>
<td>CP; GMFCS I–II; 8–17y; n=16</td>
<td>No change in standing balance</td>
<td>Stabilometry: mean velocity of COP during modified sensory organization test</td>
<td>B (b235, b755)</td>
<td>APA, IR, NMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change in reactive balance</td>
<td>Response to perturbation from platform: EMG on distal leg muscles</td>
<td>B (b755)</td>
<td>RPA, NMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change in directional control and synchronization of movement in standing</td>
<td>Rhythmic weight shift test</td>
<td>A (d4106)</td>
<td>APA, IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jelsma et al.59</td>
<td>SSRD, II, Strong</td>
<td>Virtual reality: Nintendo Wii, Wii Fit, and Wii balance board</td>
<td>CP; GMFCS I–II; 7–14y; n=14</td>
<td>No results reported</td>
<td>Goniometry lower limb</td>
<td>B (b7100)</td>
<td>MSk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved balance in standing (p&lt;0.043); no change in running</td>
<td>Bruininks—Oseretsky Test of Motor Proficiency: balance and running speed, and agility subsections</td>
<td>A (d4500, d4552)</td>
<td>APA, IR, RPA, sensory, MSk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deterioration in stair function</td>
<td>Timed-up and down stairs test</td>
<td>A (d4551)</td>
<td>APA, IR, MSk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brien and Sveistup65</td>
<td>SSRD, II, Strong</td>
<td>Virtual reality: 2D virtual world</td>
<td>CP; GMFCS I; 13–18y; n=4</td>
<td>Improved high level functional balance and mobility in everyday function (true change from mean of the baseline significant)</td>
<td>Community balance and mobility scale</td>
<td>A (d4500, d4552, d4553, d4106, d4101)</td>
<td>APA, IR, sensory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved functional walking capacity (MDC CI 80%, significant)</td>
<td>6-min walk test</td>
<td>A (d4501)</td>
<td>APA, IR, MSk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change in functional mobility</td>
<td>Timed-up and down stairs</td>
<td>A (d4551)</td>
<td>APA, IR, MSk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change in gross motor function</td>
<td>GMFM (total)</td>
<td>A (d410–d429, d455)</td>
<td>APA, IR, MSk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reviews, were identified (Table I). Sixteen hours of therapy (two 1h sessions/wk for 8wks) improved sitting balance (BF&S; evidence level II, conduct weak; see Table SIIIA)\(^45\) and standing balance (‘activity’; evidence level III, conduct moderate; see Table SIIIA)\(^47\) for ambulant, school-aged children (GMFCS I–II). In contrast, no improvement was seen for younger (2–5y), non-ambulant (GMFCS V) children receiving lower-dose (8h) hippotherapy (one 1h session/wk for 8wks) in sitting balance (BF&S and ‘activity’; evidence level III, conduct moderate; see Table IIIb).\(^46\)

Two systematic reviews, published in 2011 and 2013, concluded that children with less severe spastic CP were more likely to show improvements in postural control following hippotherapy compared with more severely affected children.\(^53,54\)

### Hippotherapy simulators

Hippotherapy simulators were developed to imitate the movement of a horse in an attempt to make hippotherapy accessible in a clinical setting.\(^49\) Four studies were identified, which included two level II studies and one systematic review (Table I). These showed that simulator training has a mixed ability to improve postural control at BF&S and ‘activity’ components. Simulator training for 2.5 hours (one 15min session/wk for 10wks) did not improve sitting balance (BF&S and ‘activity’) in a heterogeneous group of children with CP (GMFCS I–IV, predominantly non-ambulant GMFCS IV) (evidence level II, conduct strong; see Table SIIIA).\(^49\) A higher dose of 8 hours (two 40min sessions/wk for 6wks) improved sitting balance (BF&S) in another heterogeneous group of children with CP (GMFCS II–IV) (evidence level II, conduct weak; see Table SIIIA).\(^48\) A systematic review,\(^53\) which preceded these two studies, included predominantly sources of low-level evidence; although it included a meta-analysis of seven studies, which demonstrated statistically significant improvement in postural control, this result was confounded by the inclusion of simulator studies along side other studies of equine-assisted activities and therapies (hippotherapy \([n=3]\) and therapeutic horse riding \([n=3]\)).\(^53\)

### Neurodevelopmental therapy

Because NDT has been an evolving concept since the 1940s, studies were included if they met any of the criteria reported in a previous AACPDM review of NDT.\(^62\) As a result, NDT was identified as a comparison treatment in seven studies, of which six were level II or III (Table I). An unspecified dose of NDT alone,\(^41\) or NDT (‘based on the Bobath technique’) combined with ‘conventional rehabilitation’ treatments (i.e. joint mobility, muscle strengthening, and mobility activities)\(^42\) improved postural alignment (BF&S, two of level II, conduct weak; see Table SIIIA) over 6 weeks in children with spastic diplegia, aged between 8 months and 10 years.\(^41,42\) An unknown dose of therapy ‘focused on improving walking and balance through facilitation and normalization of movement...
patterns’, delivered over 5 weeks, led to an average 1.80 second decrease in ‘timed-up and go’ test scores in children with quadriplegia and diplegia (GMFCS I–III), aged between 4 years and 11 years (‘activity’; level II, conduct moderate; see Table SIIId). However, the statistical significance of this decrease was not reported. Eight hours (two 40min sessions/wk for 6wks) of NDT focusing on trunk control improved postural control in sitting (BF&S) in children with spastic diplegia (GMFCS II–V), aged 3 to 10 years (level II, conduct weak, see Table SIIIa). The statistical significance of this change was not reported. NDT (composed of stretching, strengthening exercises, standing exercises, postural reactions exercises, reflex-inhibiting patterns, and gait training exercises) for 72 hours (three 120min sessions/wk for 12wks) improved limits of stability (BF&S) and standing balance (‘activity’), and reduced fall risk (‘activity’), in children with spastic diplegic CP, GMFCS I–II (evidence level II, conduct moderate; see online Table SIIId). In contrast, 8 hours (two 30min sessions/wk for 8wks) of NDT did not improve standing balance (‘activity’) in children with bilateral spastic CP (GMFCS I–II), aged 4 to 10 years (level III, conduct moderate; see Table SIIId).

Progressive resistance exercise
Progressive resistance exercise involves resisted motion or lifting tasks, with structured increases in training loads, to improve muscle strength. One study (evidence level II) was identified (Table I). Performing resisted ankle and knee exercises for a total of 6 hours (two 15min sessions/wk for 12wks), combined with rehabilitation (12h), did not improve standing balance (BF&S; as measured by stabilometry [sway path length], p>0.05) or gait kinematics (BF&S) in ambulant children with CP (GMFCS I), aged 5 to 14 years (level II, conduct strong; see online Table SIIId).

Reactive balance training
Reactive balance training involves repeated practice of balance recovery, when standing on a support surface that is perturbed without warning in a forward, backward, or lateral direction. Three studies were identified, of which two were level II (Table I). Training using a laboratory-based force platform for approximately 2 hours (one 20–25min session/d for 5d [100 perturbations/session]) improved standing balance (BF&S) in ambulant children with CP (GMFCS I–II) (level II, conduct moderate; see Table SIIId). Training using the Biodex balance system, for a higher dose of 18 hours (three 30min sessions/wk for 12wks), improved limits of stability (BF&S) and standing balance (‘activity’), and reduced fall risk (‘activity’), in children with spastic diplegic CP (GMFCS I–II) (evidence level II, conduct moderate; see Table SIIId). This protocol also included an unspecified duration of anticipatory balance training (voluntary movements of the center of mass to the limits of stability with visual feedback).

Treadmill training with no body weight support and treadmill training with partial or full body weight support
Treadmill training includes walking or running on a treadmill with F-BWS, P-BWS or no-BWS. Of six studies, two were level II (Table I). The first included training with no-BWS, and the second involved P-BWS or F-BWS with robotic assistance using the Lokomat. Treadmill training with no-BWS, for children with CP GMFCS I–II, improved BF&S and ‘activity’ components; training for 7 hours (two 30min sessions/wk for 7wks) improved standing balance (BF&S), which demonstrated improved overall balance (‘activity’) (level II, conduct moderate; see Table SIIId). Training with P-BWS or F-BWS and robotic assistance (Lokomat) for 15 hours (five 45min sessions/wk for 4wks), by ambulant and semi-ambulant children with spastic diplegia (GMFCS II–III), improved standing balance (BF&S), and foot loading symmetry with eyes open (BF&S; level II, conduct weak; see Table SIIId); no ‘activity’-level measures were evaluated. One study reported intermittent discomfort and ‘a few’ skin abrasions from robotic orthosis use; these issues were resolved by adjustment of the supports (see Table SIV).

Trunk-targeted training
Trunk-targeted training involves exercises aimed at improving trunk muscle strength and control. Two studies were identified, of which one was level II (Table I). In this study, trunk-strengthening exercises were performed whilst participants were positioned on a vibrating platform for between 1.5 and 2.5 hours over 4 weeks (two 5–10min sessions/wk for 2wks, followed by four or five 5–10min sessions/wk for a further 2wks). This protocol improved postural alignment (BF&S), increased resting abdominal muscle thickness (BF&S), and increased functional muscle strength (BF&S). All improvements were maintained after 4 weeks, except resting muscle thickness of the transversus abdominis and internal oblique, and performance on the 1-minute walk test (evidence level II, conduct moderate; see Table SIIId). The link between BF&S (transversus abdominis and internal oblique thickness) and ‘activity’ (1min walk test) was not evaluated.

Upper limb interventions
Two upper limb intervention studies were identified, each using a different approach: constraint-induced movement therapy or force use therapy (see Table SIIId). Both studies were classified as level IV (demonstrating low levels of evidence), and, therefore, did not meet criteria for further evaluation.

Virtual reality
Virtual reality involves balance training whilst playing computer games that create a virtual environment using artificial sensory information to simulate real-life experiences or activities. Virtual reality is used in rehabilitation to achieve therapy goals within a play environment. Out of eight studies, three were level II or III (Table I).
Conflicting results were obtained on the impact of virtual reality on the ICF BF&S and ‘activity’ components. Two studies involved the Nintendo Wii Fit. Five hours (four 25min sessions/wk for 3wks) of supervised Wii Fit training, in a physiotherapy clinic, playing games aimed at improving standing balance and weight shift, resulted in improved standing balance (‘activity’) for children with spastic hemiplegia, GMFCS I–II (level I, conduct strong; see Table SIIIb).59 However, stair climbing was unchanged or, in some cases, deteriorated. A higher dose of 12.5 hours (five 30min sessions/wk for 5wks) of unsupervised Wii Fit balance games at home did not improve standing balance (BF&S and ‘activity’) for ambulant children with hemiplegia or diplegia, GMFCS I–II (level II, conduct weak; see Table SIIIa).58 The third study involved a 2D virtual world game. Intensive training for 7.5 hours (ten 45min sessions over 1wk) improved functional balance (‘activity’) for adolescents with CP GMFCS I (level III, conduct strong; see Table SIIIb).60

**Visual biofeedback**

One study of visual biofeedback was identified, which had a level II evidence rating (Table I). It involved standing on a balance platform in a laboratory (no specifications provided) and keeping the centre of pressure, represented as a red dot on a computer screen, static, or shifting it to a target. Anticipatory training for 9 hours (three 30min sessions/wk for 6wks) improved static standing balance (BF&S) and dynamic standing balance (BF&S) in ambulant children with CP, GMFCS I (level II, conduct weak; see Table SIIIa).61 No ‘activity’-level measures were included.

**DISCUSSION**

This systematic review analysed 45 studies of children with CP, and presented information on the use of 13 different postural control interventions; 40 of these studies, and nine of these interventions, had not been included in a previous systematic review on postural control interventions, published in 2005. There is moderate evidence to support the use of five of these interventions: hippotherapy, treadmill training with no-BWS, trunk-targeted training, reactive balance training, and gross motor task training. There is only weak or conflicting evidence to support the use of six of these as effective postural control interventions: hippotherapy simulators, treadmill training with P-BWS or F-BWS (including robotic assistance), NDT, virtual reality, visual biofeedback, and FES. For the remaining two interventions, either there were no high-level protocols (level I–III) evaluating efficacy (upper limb interventions) or the evidence suggests that there is no improvement in postural control (progressive resistance exercise). With the possible exception of NDT, it was noted that all of the effective interventions were reported by studies involving ambulant children with CP (GMFCS I–III).

Of the five intervention types that gained moderate support, hippotherapy was the most commonly reported (five level I–III studies). Hippotherapy improved postural control in ambulant children with CP when provided for at least 16 hours. It appears to impact multiple postural control components, including anticipatory and reactive postural adjustments, and sensory and musculoskeletal systems. Effective elements of hippotherapy are proposed to include the horse’s movement, which has been suggested to challenge balance, improve posture and strength while incorporating sensory input,67 and simulate human gait and the vertical change in the centre of pressure;68 and the warmth and rhythm of the horse, which may promote relaxation, thereby reducing spasticity and increasing muscle length.53 Hippotherapy may also provide the opportunity for trunk muscle motor control training, similar to that achieved with therapy ball activities. The novelty of hippotherapy promotes extended engagement, and the opportunity for massed practice of reactive postural adjustments.10 Two previous systematic reviews support the current findings, including the conclusion that hippotherapy is more effective for ambulant children with CP (GMFCS I–II) than for children with more severe CP.53,54

Although moderate evidence supports the use of hippotherapy, the use of hippotherapy simulators cannot be supported by this systematic review because of conflicting outcomes between studies and the levels of the ICF components considered. The limitations of the two level II studies48,49 which explored the use of hippotherapy simulators, when compared with the studies of hippotherapy, included heterogeneity of participants (GMFCS I–IV); varied intervention dose (2.5–8h); and a lack of individualization in training protocols. Future research could address these limitations. The systematic review55 of hippotherapy simulator use provided little additional information because outcomes were pooled with both hippotherapy and therapeutic horse riding.

Treadmill training with no-BWS was the second most common approach, gaining moderate support, with one level II study.56 For ambulant children with CP, training for at least 7 hours improved musculoskeletal and sensory components, and anticipatory postural adjustments. The use of a specific protocol, guiding the gradual increase in treadmill speed for children who are walking independently (GMFCS I–II), appears to be critical to the success of this approach. In contrast, there was only weak evidence supporting the use of treadmill training with F-BWS or P-BWS for semi-ambulant children (GMFCS II–III), despite a higher dose of 15 hours (5wks×4 sessions×45min).55 This is not surprising given that the goal of treadmill training is to improve anticipatory and reactive postural adjustments, which are reduced when robotic support is present.69 A systematic review of P-BWS treadmill training, including robotic assistance, for children with CP, supports these findings, concluding that while treadmill training with P-BWS is effective for improving important gait elements, such as endurance, speed, and gait patterns,70 there is a need for further research, with standardized protocols, to determine if it is effective in improving postural control for children with lower-level mobility.
Function Measure (GMFM). However, when reactive improve self-initiated movement control (Gross Motor CP, with at least 2 hours of training, but it did not reactive postural adjustments in ambulant children with balance training alone as an intervention to improve challenge.

core tone, spasticity, and motor control issues remains a activation and strengthening in children with atypical mus-
tual components of this protocol. They proposed that vibration ‘activated weak and dormant muscles’, and reduced the need to use weights or high repetitions to strengthen abdominal muscles for postural control. A separate review of vibration therapy supports this concept, proposing that it perturbs the gravitational field to activate and strengthen muscles, stimulate peripheral sensory receptors, and evoke postural responses. In children with CP, vibration alone can improve gross motor function and bone density; further research is needed to establish the effects of vibration on postural control. Trunk muscle motor control training has been shown to improve anticipatory postural adjustments and gain in adult populations, and so appears to be a contender for further treatment development. A mechanism for achieving efficient trunk muscle activation and strengthening in children with atypical muscle tone, spasticity, and motor control issues remains a challenge.

There was moderate evidence to support the use of reactive balance training alone as an intervention to improve reactive postural adjustments in ambulant children with CP, with at least 2 hours of training, but it did not improve self-initiated movement control (Gross Motor Function Measure (GMFM)). However, when reactive balance training (Biodex system) was combined with anticipatory training (voluntary leaning towards the limits of stability), both reactive postural adjustments and self-initiated movement control did improve. A comparison of these two studies confirms the impact of specificity of training on postural control. Reactive balance training may improve recovery from external perturbations, such as a trip or movements when standing on a bus; if the goal of therapy is to improve control of self-initiated motor function, then anticipatory training may be more appropriate. More research is warranted to determine the extent to which reactive balance training alone influences other postural control elements, ICF components, and postural orientation, and not just stability.

The use of gross motor task training (two level II studies) was supported by moderate-level evidence to improve postural control in ambulant children with CP when provided for at least 10 hours. Gross motor task training affects most postural control elements because the development of efficient anticipatory and reactive postural adjustments occurs in parallel with the attainment of a gross motor skill, and variability in practice can then fine-tune control of that task. Both papers also highlight the concept of specificity of practice, which is important when designing programmes to address functional goals. This approach has high clinical utility because it requires no technical equipment, and can be delivered in most settings. Further research is required to determine the minimum required dose, as total training times ranged from 10 to 30 hours in the studies considered by this review.

Six intervention approaches showed weak or conflicting evidence. Hippotherapy simulators and treadmill training with P-BWS or F-BWS have been addressed in previous paragraphs. Overall, NDT was the most commonly evaluated intervention in this category (six level II–III studies), as it was frequently included as a comparison when testing potential new interventions. Unfortunately, although it appeared in six high-level studies, it is difficult to assign more than a weak evidence level to this intervention for several reasons. Primarily, studies often lacked a clear description of the specific framework or intervention content of the NDT component provided, or how fidelity was maintained across participants or therapists. Furthermore, it was combined with other therapies and so the effective postural control element was not possible to determine. At times, dose was delivered in unspecified or variable formats. In other cases, participants were heterogeneous in GMFCS or age. It would be useful to address these methodological limitations in future research so that the relative benefit of NDT for postural control in children with CP can be more clearly understood, particularly for children with more severe motor impairment, where it may be of particular benefit.

Virtual reality (three level I–III studies) is gaining popularity as a result of the increasing availability of relevant home- and laboratory-based technologies. Although it received weak support as a postural control intervention, it is proposed to influence anticipatory and sensory components through practice of voluntary movement, in conjunction with feedback through visual (screen) and/or tactile (haptic control) modalities. It is suggested to fulfil three important requisites for motor learning: (1) movement repetition; (2) active participation; and (3) performance feedback. Lack of rigorous research conduct makes it difficult to draw conclusions about the effects of virtual reality on postural control. One author recommends that virtual reality be used only as an adjunct to other therapies, and not as a replacement. A review of virtual reality use by children with CP, which included motor but not postural control outcomes, agrees that substantial benefits could be gained from using virtual reality; however, the current evidence is weak.

Visual biofeedback (one level I–III study) and FES (two level I–III studies) are the remaining two intervention types to show weak evidence. Both demonstrated broad efficacy in improving postural stability and orientation. Both approaches require more detailed reporting of participant groups and/or evaluation of higher participant numbers, as well as more detailed treatment protocols, to establish a sufficient level of guidance for evidence-based practice.
Two interventions showed no impact on postural control. Progressive resistance exercise (one level II study) showed no effect on children with CP. This finding is supported by studies with adult populations, which have suggested that, rather than strengthening, neuromuscular control training is required to improve postural control. This recommendation is consistent with the moderate support found for functional strength training during gross motor tasks, as discussed earlier. Finally, there were no high-level upper limb interventions suitable for reporting at this stage. Ballaz et al. contend that investigating postural control outcomes following constraint-induced movement therapy and force use therapy is important to assess the effect of reducing asymmetric upper limb function on balance (postural stability) and postural symmetry (orientation). More rigorous research is required before it is possible to recommend these approaches specifically as effective postural control interventions.

**Outcome measures**

This review highlights the importance of selecting appropriate outcome measures when assessing the potential impact of each intervention. Progress has been made, but broader evaluation is required to establish a thorough understanding of the effects of each intervention on (1) overall postural stability and orientation functions; (2) postural control elements according to the systems theory approach; and (3) ‘function’ (BF&S), ‘activity’, and ‘participation’ according to the ICF. The majority of studies reported in this review measured postural stability outcomes, especially the ability to ‘maintain’ or ‘restore’ balance; however, fewer studies have measured the ability to ‘achieve’ balance, or improve orientation of body segments relative to the task and environment. Furthermore, new measures may better quantify the impact on postural control elements; for example, the recently described Balance Evaluation Systems Test (BESTest) or the miniBESTest, which were developed to differentiate the six postural control elements of the systems control approach. Neither of these tests has been validated for use with children. Finally, our review shows that outcomes were generally measured at the ICF BF&S (impairment) or ‘activity’ (basic motor skill) levels, with no exploration of the impact on ‘participation’. There is great scope for future research to explore the potential carry-over from postural control interventions to ‘activity’ and ‘participation’ functions, which may be assessed by using, for example, the Canadian Occupational Performance Measure, Goal Attainment Scale, or the The Children’s Assessment of Participation and Enjoyment.

**Limitations and future direction for research**

It is possible that other exercise interventions may affect postural control to some degree. If an intervention study did not include a postural control outcome measure, it was excluded from this review and, therefore, some effective exercise interventions may not be represented here. This highlights the importance of including postural control measures in future studies of exercise interventions. This review also reports on many positive gains made in postural control intervention design and evaluation in the last decade. It highlights where further research is needed if intervention types are to achieve higher levels of evidence. In particular, a focus on improving treatment description and fidelity, establishing dosage and measuring both short- and long-term effects for subgroups in the CP population, is required. Finally, there is a need for further research into programmes that are innovative, provide multidimensional impact on components of postural control, and include functional exercise. Mainstream programmes, such as yoga, Pilates, and tai chi, which are popular with adults, are now being offered to children. The intent of these programmes is to improve posture and motor control; however, their efficacy for children with CP has yet to be investigated.

**CONCLUSION**

Exercise interventions documented to improve postural control for children with CP are increasing. This review has identified five potentially effective interventions, six that require more investigation, and two that are probably ineffective. Further research is required for children with different types and severities of CP to establish (1) responsive and reliable postural control outcome measures; (2) effective treatment selection and dose guidelines; and (3) possible efficacy of mainstream exercise interventions that have demonstrated effectiveness for improving postural control in adults with brain injury, such as Pilates, yoga, and tai chi.

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

We would like to thank the Research and Innovation Unit of the Cerebral Palsy League, Queensland Australia, who supported this study, including Jill Duff, Information and Resource Coordinator, and Robyn Smedley, Research and Evaluation Officer, for their assistance in accessing the full-text articles required for this review. The authors state that they had no interests that could be perceived as posing a conflict or bias.

**SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

The following additional material may be found online:

**Table S1:** Levels of evidence for group and single-subject design studies.

**Table SII:** (a) Summary of group studies – interventions and participants. (b) Summary of single-subject studies – interventions and participants.

**Table SIII:** (a) Conduct of group design studies. (b) Conduct of single-subject design studies. (c) Conduct of systematic review.

**Table SIV:** Reported adverse events.
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