



PEARL

**Effect of different durations of using a standing frame on the rate of hip migration in children with moderate to severe cerebral palsy: a feasibility study for a randomised controlled trial**

Rapson, R.; King, T.; Morris, C.; Jeffery, R.; Mellhuish, J.; Stephens, C.; Marsden, J.

**Published in:**  
Physiotherapy

**DOI:**  
[10.1016/j.physio.2022.01.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physio.2022.01.001)

**Publication date:**  
2022

**Link:**  
[Link to publication in PEARL](#)

**Citation for published version (APA):**

Rapson, R., King, T., Morris, C., Jeffery, R., Mellhuish, J., Stephens, C., & Marsden, J. (2022). Effect of different durations of using a standing frame on the rate of hip migration in children with moderate to severe cerebral palsy: a feasibility study for a randomised controlled trial. *Physiotherapy*, 116(0), 42-49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physio.2022.01.001>

1 **Word count (2949)**

2 **Contribution of the Paper**

- 3 • It is safe and feasible to recruit to a study investigating supported standing in children  
4 with cerebral palsy. The findings of this study contribute to designing a future RCT.
- 5 • Daily standing time of an hour per day was acceptable to children, schools and  
6 families over a 12-month period.
- 7 • In children who used standing frames for 40-60 minutes per day, there was a trend  
8 towards a lower rate of hip migration than previously reported rates of spontaneous  
9 hip migration.

10 **Key words**

11 Standing frame; Hip dysplasia; Cerebral palsy; Children; Paediatric; Feasibility study

12 **BACKGROUND**

13 Cerebral palsy (CP) describes a group of non-progressive disorders of posture and  
14 movement (1) affecting 2.1 per 1000 children (2). Secondary musculoskeletal impairments  
15 such as muscle and joint contractures and bony deformity develop, particularly in those  
16 children with more impaired gross motor function(1).

17 The Gross Motor Function Classification System (GMFCS) (3) provides a common language  
18 to describe and predict motor development. GMFCS level III describes children use walking  
19 aids and may use wheelchairs for longer distances, and GMFCS level V describes children  
20 who require full support in wheelchairs for their mobility. This study focuses on children with  
21 GMFCS levels III -V, where standing frames are recommended as part of postural  
22 management strategies to help improve posture and function (4).

23 The timing and intensity (dosage) of therapies was rated as the highest research priority by  
24 health professionals and carers of disabled children (5), to enable them to make informed  
25 decisions when dedicating time and effort to therapeutic programmes. Standing in

26 educational settings may improve access to activities, but can detract from educational time  
27 (6) and leave the child feeling isolated (7). Children may stand when they believe that there  
28 are health benefits, despite sometimes experiencing pain or discomfort (8).

29 The reported benefits of using a standing frame are improving bone mineral density,  
30 managing spasticity, contractures and hip stability (9-11). Anecdotally, some  
31 physiotherapists prescribe standing frames to help reduce the risk of hip dislocation(12) but  
32 there is insufficient evidence to prove that supported standing programmes slow the rate of  
33 hip migration (13, 14). Recommendations for the frequency and duration of standing time  
34 vary between 30 to 60 minutes per day, usually 5 days per week. A feasibility study is  
35 needed to determine an acceptable dose of supported standing and comparator required for  
36 prior to a randomised controlled trial (RCT).

37 This study aims to explore the feasibility of conducting a RCT, doubling standing time at  
38 home and school over a 12 month period. Feasibility outcomes are reported according to the  
39 CONSORT extension for randomised pilot and feasibility trials (15, 16).

## 40 **METHOD**

41 A working group comprising patient representatives, academics, physiotherapists and  
42 orthopaedic surgeons developed the study design. The trial was registered on  
43 ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT02141802. NHS Health Research Committee, South  
44 West granted ethics approval (ref 13/SW/0228).

45 **Eligibility criteria-** Children aged 1-12 years with a diagnosis of CP, GMFCS level III-V (3),  
46 using a standing frame for at least 1.5 hours per week were eligible. Children were not  
47 eligible if they had soft tissue surgery within six months or bony surgery within twelve months  
48 before the start of the study or during the study.

49 **Recruitment and consent-** Participants were identified through local Child Development  
50 Centres, physiotherapists, paediatricians and orthopaedic clinics as well as by adverts to  
51 parents via family networks across the South West of UK.

52 Written informed consent was sought from the parent or guardian and assent was sought  
53 from the children, to participate in a 12-month feasibility RCT. Data were collected in the  
54 child's local physiotherapy department, home, school or nursery.

55 **Sample size-** A pragmatic sample size of n=30 was based on a previous study (11) and  
56 enabled us to assess feasibility.

57 **Intervention and control-** The children in the control group continued their usual standing  
58 time and those in the intervention group were asked to double their standing time, using their  
59 existing standing frames and orthoses provided by their physiotherapist. Children were  
60 encouraged to stand for a maximum of 60 minutes per day for the control group and 120  
61 minutes per day in the intervention group. The intervention took place at home, school or  
62 nursery and was tailored to meet the individual needs and circumstances of the child. The  
63 child's usual paediatric physiotherapist advised carers on functional ways to use the  
64 standing frame, such as for mealtimes, cooking, craft or play activities. In both groups,  
65 carers recorded children's standing time, activities while standing and obstacles to standing.

66 **Randomisation-** The child's mean baseline standing time was measured using a standing  
67 diary recorded for two weeks by the child's family and school. A computer-generated  
68 programme (MINIM- York University) was used to randomise the participants into two groups  
69 at a ratio of 1:1 using the minimisation algorithm:

70 Age (<6 years vs >6 years)

71 Functional ability (GMFCS level III and IV vs GMFCS level V)

72 Average baseline standing time/day (<30 minutes vs >30 minutes)

73 The chief investigator (CI) performed randomisation and allocation after baseline  
74 assessment

75 **Assessments and outcome measures-** The feasibility of conducting a RCT was assessed  
76 by collecting recruitment and attrition rates, baseline characteristics, the acceptability of

77 increasing standing dose, the blinding of the assessor, the percentage of outcome  
78 measurements achieved at each stage, and adverse events.

79 The potential primary clinical outcome measure was Reimers' hip migration percentage  
80 (HMP)(17). Routine hip surveillance radiographs at baseline, 12 and 24 months were used  
81 to avoid additional exposure to radiation. The start time of the treatment phase was  
82 scheduled to begin up to 4 weeks before or after a routine hip x-ray. During the analysis,  
83 radiographs taken up to 4 weeks before or after specified time points were accepted for  
84 analysis. The HMP was reported by two paediatric consultant orthopaedic surgeons to  
85 ensure that HMP was measured reliably and to a consistent standard (18).

86 Secondary clinical outcomes were measured at 0, 6 and 12 months by a research  
87 physiotherapist blinded to group allocation. These were: Gross Motor Function Measure Item  
88 set (GMFM-66-IS) (19), a battery of lower limb function measures described previously (20)  
89 that included the modified Tardieu scale (21) measuring spasticity and range of movement of  
90 gastrocnemius, hamstrings and hip flexors, ultrasound depth of rectus femoris, thigh girth  
91 and myotonometer measurement of gastrocnemius muscle tone. Parents and guardians  
92 were asked to complete the Caregivers Priorities and Child Health Index of Life with  
93 Disabilities (CPCHILD)(22) questionnaire and the Paediatric Pain Profile (PPP)(23).

94 **Analyses-** The feasibility objectives were analysed using descriptive statistics according to  
95 the group they were originally assigned (intention to treat analysis).

96 **RESULTS**

97 **Recruitment and retention**

98 Twenty-five children were recruited to the study between April 2014 and 2015, at a rate of  
99 three per month, reaching 25/30 (83%) of the recruitment target (Figure 1).

100 <insert figure 1 here>

101

102 The two groups were of similar age, but there were more females in the control group (Table  
103 1). The intervention group stood for longer at baseline and had two participants GMFCS III.

104 <insert table 1 here>

105

106 **Intervention and feasibility outcomes**

107 Diaries were completed for a mean of 29.2 (SD 18.4) weeks in the control and 19.3 (SD  
108 10.5) weeks in the intervention group. Thirty-eight adverse events were recorded in the  
109 diaries, most frequent events were colds (n=28 control, n=7 intervention) or tiredness (n=0  
110 control, n=3 intervention) Three serious adverse events were recorded in the intervention  
111 group due to unplanned admissions to hospital with epilepsy (n=2) and respiratory illness  
112 (n=1) and were not attributed to standing.

113 The control group stood for a daily mean of 36.6 (SD 33.8) minutes (mon-sun) with a mean  
114 of 43.2 (SD 36.2) minutes during the weekdays (Mon-Fri). This was a 4% decrease in mean  
115 standing time compared to baseline, but with 13% increase during weekdays. The  
116 intervention group stood for a daily mean of 49.0 mins (SD 39.1) (mon-sun) and a mean of  
117 58.1 (SD 44.1) minutes during the weekdays. This represented an overall 2% increase in  
118 standing with 21% increase from baseline during weekdays.

119 Table 2 shows the number of outcomes recorded for each participant at each time point.  
120 Routine clinical hip surveillance radiographs were available in 37% of all possible data points  
121 and 25 % of the CPCHILD and 18% PPP questionnaires were returned by parents. Of the  
122 secondary clinical outcomes, 93% measures of leg function and 86% of GMFM were  
123 collected. The outcome assessor was accidentally un-blinded to group allocation on one  
124 occasion, and guessed four out of the remaining 18 allocations correctly.

125 <insert table 2 here>

126

### 127 **Results of the pilot RCT within the feasibility study**

128 Table 3 shows the differences in outcome measures at baseline and 12 months. The mean  
129 increase in hip migration (12 months – baseline) was larger in the control group (5% SD 17,  
130 n=5) than the intervention group (2% SD 3, n=3) in the eight children who had hip x-rays at  
131 12-months. Two in each group had x-rays at 24 months and the mean increase in HMP was  
132 4% in both groups. Improvements were seen in range of movement in the gastrocnemius in  
133 the control group, hamstrings in both groups, and hip flexors in the intervention group. The  
134 intervention group showed a reduction of spasticity in hamstrings and hip flexors at 12  
135 months. The ultrasound measure of depth of rectus femoris reduced in both groups over 12  
136 months. Mean GMFM -Item Set scores improved at 6 months from 16.5 (10-33) to 21 (5-54)  
137 in the control group and 26 (6-69) to 29 (7-62) in the intervention group.

138 <insert table 3>

### 139 **DISCUSSION**

140 This study has shown that it is safe and feasible to recruit to an RCT to investigate the effect  
141 of the daily duration of using a standing frame on hip migration in non-ambulant children with  
142 cerebral palsy.

143

144 **Recruitment and retention**

145 Families and children were willing to participate in this study. Initial recruitment was slow  
146 where physiotherapists perceived parents as already overburdened. However, contrary to  
147 clinicians' fears, parents often do want to be approached, even during difficult circumstances  
148 (24). An increased recruitment rate was achieved following advice from expert parents on  
149 the steering committee and training offered to therapy teams.

150 Schools and families were generally enthusiastic about participating. Administrative delays  
151 experienced while obtaining permission and insurance to carry out research activities in  
152 schools could be reduced by involving education partners in the design, planning and  
153 management of the study (25). A checklist has been produced to address these potential  
154 barriers in future community-based studies (25).

155 This study had a high rate of attrition. In a previous study assessing the effects of increasing  
156 standing time over 9 months on bone mineral density, the investigators achieved 52% of the  
157 initial recruitment target and only one participant withdrew (11). Our intervention took place  
158 over 12 months, with 24-month follow up of the HMP, in order to reflect the timescale for  
159 changes in hip migration shown in previous studies (26, 27). Allocation after routine hip  
160 surveillance radiographs caused delays in starting the treatment phase and was the reason  
161 that four participants dropped out of the study before allocation. Surgery and botulinum toxin  
162 injections contributed to high rates of exclusion and loss to follow-up.

163 **Intervention**

164 Patient and public involvement during the design phase raised concerns over stopping usual  
165 standing practice for 12 months, and so the control was set at usual standing time. The  
166 intervention group were able to increase their standing time during the school week up to a  
167 mean of 58 minutes per day over the 12-month trial, however, the target daily standing time  
168 of 120 minutes was unrealistic. Adherence to standing during the week was good, while use



169 at home was variable due to the multiple pressures of family life. The mean standing time  
170 achieved is similar to a study that aimed at increasing standing time by 50% (11).

171 Goodwin et al (28) explored the acceptability to parents, physiotherapists and other  
172 stakeholders of a pilot RCT exploring the effect of standing frames. They concluded that a  
173 pilot of 6-12 weeks of standing 3 days per week for 30-60 minutes compared to no standing  
174 would be acceptable (29). It is unlikely that changes in hip development will be detectable  
175 over such a short period (11). Whilst comparison to no standing is more likely to highlight  
176 differences between groups, it is only likely to be acceptable to stake holders over a short  
177 period, such as the six-week school holidays. Therefore, a future RCT should compare an  
178 hour of standing 5 days per week to 30 minutes of standing 3 times per week for 12 months.  
179 This would enable comparison of two durations of standing at a ratio of 10:3, which should  
180 enable detection of differences between groups.

## 181 **Outcomes**

182 The blinding of the assessor to allocation was largely successful and could be used in a  
183 multi-site RCT. The primary clinical outcome was measured using routine hip surveillance x-  
184 rays, to ensure that children were not exposed to additional radiation or procedures.

185 However, guidelines were applied inconsistently resulting in routine hip surveillance proving  
186 inadequate for the primary outcome. Pelvic radiographs may need to be included as a  
187 research cost in a full RCT to ensure consistency and timeliness.

188 The parent reported questionnaires yielded important data about how the child's disability  
189 affected family life. Parents were asked to return the questionnaire by post. However, some  
190 parents found answering the same questionnaire emotionally challenging when it exposed a  
191 lack progress in the child's development. This, along with lack of administrative support, may  
192 have contributed to the poor return of these questionnaires. There was poorer completion of  
193 the paper diaries in the intervention group. This may reflect situations where both parents

194 and school completed paper diaries. Online diary and questionnaire collection, with  
195 automated reminders, would simplify and improve diary returns.

196

### 197 **The magnitude of change in the primary outcome measure**

198 A full set of primary outcome measures (HMP) was available at 0, 12 and 24 months for five  
199 participants, which can gives little indication of effect, and provides inadequate data for a  
200 power calculation. A power calculation should be made ahead of an RCT using the standard  
201 error of measurement of +/- 10% (30) and a clinically significant change of >10%(31) for  
202 Reimers' Hip migration percentage(17). Our results showed a small increase in HMP in both  
203 groups, but lower in the intervention group over 12 months. Both groups compare favourably  
204 with the median annual10% rate of spontaneous hip migration previously reported (17). Hip  
205 migration of >40% is an indication for surgical, rather than conservative intervention, to  
206 prevent dislocation. Therefore, HMP > 40 should be an additional exclusion criterion for a  
207 future RCT and would reduce the number of participants lost to surgery.

208 A large battery of potential secondary clinical outcome measures were explored. Potential  
209 indicators of muscle strength showed a decrease in depth of rectus femoris in both groups  
210 and an increase in the cross-sectional area in the intervention group. Studies have shown  
211 that muscle thickness increases in relation to weight in typically developing children of this  
212 age (32) and that the thickness of this muscle is significantly smaller in children with CP (33).  
213 Height and weight should therefore be recorded serially in a future RCT to account for  
214 growth. Hamstring range improved in both groups in line with previous work (10). The  
215 Myotonometer (an indicator of muscle tone) and thigh girth (an indicator of muscle strength)  
216 were not useful outcomes.

### 217 **Limitations to the study**

218 One limitation of this study was the small sample size, resulting in differences between  
219 groups at baseline. In an adequately powered RCT the minimisation criteria of age and  
220 GMFCS level should create equivalence between the groups.

221 Another limitation of this trial was the large attrition rate. Standing frames are part of a  
222 complex management plan for children with CP and therefore a RCT may not be able to  
223 control all factors (34). Hip adductor tenotomies, proximal femoral osetotomies and hip  
224 adductor botulinum toxin injections are common interventions known to affect the primary  
225 outcome measure of HMP and should remain exclusion criteria. However, botulinum toxin  
226 and soft tissue releases of other lower limb muscles e.g. hamstrings are common and may  
227 be indicated for comfort or functional benefit without influencing the primary outcome. In a  
228 future RCT these should not be exclusion criteria but should be noted as possible  
229 confounding factors. This may help reduce the rate of attrition.

230 Missing data was a limitation of this study, particularly for the primary outcome and diaries. A  
231 proportion of the HMP was not reported due to inadequate routine surveillance radiographs  
232 or inability to retrieve radiographs from hospital records. In a future RCT, it would be  
233 necessary to establish the inter- and intra-observer reliability of the raters in order to  
234 calculate the standard error of measurement (18).

235 An important limitation to this trial was the failure to establish distinctly different standing  
236 times in the two arms of the trial. This resulted in the control group being too similar to the  
237 intervention group. Recommendations are made to specify the dosage for a future study.

## 238 **Conclusions**

239 This study assessed the acceptability and adherence of a standing programme at home and  
240 school and feasibility of a RCT design. It explored barriers and facilitators to recruitment,  
241 documented the individualised standing programmes through diaries and assessed the use  
242 of a range of outcomes (35).

243 It is safe and feasible to conduct a RCT to assess the clinical effectiveness of comparing two  
244 duration times of standing on the rate of hip migration in children with CP. To facilitate a  
245 clear distinction in doses between the two groups, recommended dosages of one hour, five  
246 times per week would be compared to a control group standing for 30 minutes three times  
247 per week, over twelve months. Hip x-rays should be included as a research cost to improve  
248 the consistency and timing of the hip xray surveillance as a source of the primary outcome.

249

250 • Funding: This work was supported by the Chartered Society of Physiotherapy Charitable  
251 Trust through the Physiotherapy Research Foundation scheme.

252 •There are no conflicts of interest declared by the authors.

253

## 254 **Acknowledgments**

255 Thanks to the steering committee members, local PI's and all the parents and children who  
256 participated and made this study possible.

257

## 258 **References**

- 259 1. Rosenbaum P Fau - Paneth N, Paneth N Fau - Leviton A, Leviton A Fau - Goldstein M,  
260 Goldstein M Fau - Bax M, Bax M Fau - Damiano D, Damiano D Fau - Dan B, et al. A report: the  
261 definition and classification of cerebral palsy April 2006. *Dev Med Child Neurol Suppl.* 2007;109:8-14.
- 262 2. Oskoui M, Coutinho F, Dykeman J, Jetté N, Pringsheim T. An update on the prevalence of  
263 cerebral palsy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology.*  
264 2013;55(6):509-19.
- 265 3. Palisano RJ. GMFCS-E & R Gross Motor Function Classification System: Expanded and  
266 Revised: Canchild centre for childhood disability research; 2007.
- 267 4. Gericke T. Postural management for children with cerebral palsy: consensus statement.  
268 *Developmental medicine and child neurology.* 2006;48(4):244-.
- 269 5. Morris C, Simkiss D, Busk M, Morris M, Allard A, Denness J, et al. Setting research priorities  
270 to improve the health of children and young people with neurodisability: a British Academy of  
271 Childhood Disability-James Lind Alliance Research Priority Setting Partnership. *BMJ open.*  
272 2015;5(1):e006233.
- 273 6. Goodwin J, Lecouturier J, Smith J, Crombie S, Basu A, Parr JR, et al. Understanding frames: A  
274 qualitative exploration of standing frame use for young people with cerebral palsy in educational  
275 settings. *Child: care, health and development.* 2019;45(3):433-9.

- 276 7. Goodwin J, Lecouturier J, Crombie S, Smith J, Basu A, Colver A, et al. Understanding frames:  
277 A qualitative study of young people's experiences of using standing frames as part of postural  
278 management for cerebral palsy. *Child: care, health and development*. 2018;44(2):203-11.
- 279 8. Lyons E. An exploration of comfort and discomfort amongst children and young people with  
280 severe physical, learning and communication difficulties who depend on postural management  
281 equipment: Northumbria University; 2013.
- 282 9. Paleg GS, Smith BA, Glickman LB. Systematic review and evidence-based clinical  
283 recommendations for dosing of pediatric supported standing programs. *Pediatric physical therapy :  
284 the official publication of the Section on Pediatrics of the American Physical Therapy Association*.  
285 2013;25(3):232-47.
- 286 10. Gibson SK, Sprod JA, Maher CA. The use of standing frames for contracture management for  
287 nonmobile children with cerebral palsy. *International journal of rehabilitation research  
288 Internationale Zeitschrift fur Rehabilitationsforschung Revue internationale de recherches de  
289 readaptation*. 2009;32(4):316-23.
- 290 11. Caulton JM, Ward KA, Alsop CW, Dunn G, Adams JE, Mughal MZ. A randomised controlled  
291 trial of standing programme on bone mineral density in non-ambulant children with cerebral palsy.  
292 *Archives of disease in childhood*. 2004;89(2):131-5.
- 293 12. Hermanson M, Hägglund G, Riad J, Rodby-Bousquet E, Wagner P. Prediction of hip  
294 displacement in children with cerebral palsy. *The Bone & Joint Journal*. 2015;97-B(10):1441-4.
- 295 13. Pountney T, Mandy A, Green E, Gard P. Management of hip dislocation with postural  
296 management. *Child: care, health and development*. 2002;28(2):179-85.
- 297 14. Pountney TE, Mandy A, Green E, Gard PR. Hip subluxation and dislocation in cerebral palsy -  
298 a prospective study on the effectiveness of postural management programmes. *Physiotherapy  
299 research international : the journal for researchers and clinicians in physical therapy*.  
300 2009;14(2):116-27.
- 301 15. Group C. CONSORT 2010 checklist of information to include when reporting a randomized  
302 trial. *JAMA*. 2010;304(1):E1.
- 303 16. Eldridge SM, Chan CL, Campbell MJ, Bond CM, Hopewell S, Thabane L, et al. CONSORT 2010  
304 statement: extension to randomised pilot and feasibility trials. *bmj*. 2016;355:i5239.
- 305 17. Reimers J. The Stability of the Hip in Children: A Radiological Study of the Results of Muscle  
306 Surgery in Cerebral Palsy. *Acta Orthopaedica Scandinavica*. 1980;51(sup184):1-100.
- 307 18. Faraj S, Atherton W, Stott N. Inter-and intra-measurer error in the measurement of Reimers'  
308 hip migration percentage. *The Journal of bone and joint surgery British volume*. 2004;86(3):434-7.
- 309 19. Russell DJ, Avery LM, Walter SD, Hanna SE, Bartlett DJ, Rosenbaum PL, et al. Development  
310 and validation of item sets to improve efficiency of administration of the 66-item Gross Motor  
311 Function Measure in children with cerebral palsy. *Developmental medicine and child neurology*.  
312 2010;52(2):e48-54.
- 313 20. Rapson R, Marsden, J. Intra-rater reliability of clinical measures of leg function, in typically  
314 developing children aged 1-4 years. *Association of Paediatric Chartered Physiotherapists*.  
315 2016;16(1):14-22.
- 316 21. Boyd RN, Graham HK. Objective measurement of clinical findings in the use of botulinum  
317 toxin type A for the management of children with cerebral palsy. *European journal of neurology*.  
318 1999;6:s23-s35.
- 319 22. Narayanan UG, Fehlings D, Weir S, Knights S, Kiran S, Campbell K. Initial development and  
320 validation of the Caregiver Priorities and Child Health Index of Life with Disabilities (CPCHILD).  
321 *Developmental medicine and child neurology*. 2006;48(10):804-12.
- 322 23. Hunt A, Goldman A, Seers K, Crichton N, Mastroyannopoulou K, Moffat V, et al. Clinical  
323 validation of the paediatric pain profile. *Developmental medicine and child neurology*. 2004;46(1):9-  
324 18.

- 325 24. Shilling V, Williamson PR, Hickey H, Sowden E, Smyth RL, Young B. Processes in recruitment  
326 to randomised controlled trials of medicines for children (RECRUIT): a qualitative study. *Health*  
327 *Technol Assess.* 2011;15(15):1-116.
- 328 25. Beckers LWME, Rameckers EAA, Smeets RJEM, van der Burg JJW, Aarts PBM, Schnackers  
329 MLAP, et al. Barriers to recruitment of children with cerebral palsy in a trial of home-based training.  
330 *Contemporary clinical trials communications.* 2019;15:100371-.
- 331 26. Hankinson J, Morton RE. Use of a lying hip abduction system in children with bilateral  
332 cerebral palsy: a pilot study. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology.* 2002;44(3):177-80.
- 333 27. Martinsson C, Himmelmann K. Effect of weight-bearing in abduction and extension on hip  
334 stability in children with cerebral palsy. *Pediatric Physical Therapy.* 2011;23(2):150-7.
- 335 28. Goodwin J, Lecouturier J, Basu A, Colver A, Crombie S, Smith J, et al. Standing frames for  
336 children with cerebral palsy: a mixed-methods feasibility study. 2018.
- 337 29. Goodwin J, Colver A, Basu A, Crombie S, Howel D, Parr J, et al. Understanding frames: A UK  
338 survey of parents and professionals regarding the use of standing frames for children with cerebral  
339 palsy. *Child: care, health and development.* 2018;44(2):195-202.
- 340 30. Kim SM, Sim EG, Lim SG, Park ES. Reliability of Hip Migration Index in Children with Cerebral  
341 Palsy: The Classic and Modified Methods. *Annals of rehabilitation medicine.* 2012;36(1):33-8.
- 342 31. Miller F, Bagg MR. AGE AND MIGRATION PERCENTAGE AS RISK FACTORS TOR PROGRESSION  
343 IN SPASTIC HIP DISEASE. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology.* 1995;37(5):449-55.
- 344 32. Scholten RR, Pillen S, Verrips A, Zwarts MJ. Quantitative ultrasonography of skeletal muscles  
345 in children: Normal values. *Muscle & Nerve.* 2003;27(6):693-8.
- 346 33. Moreau NG, Teefey SA, Damiano DL. In vivo muscle architecture and size of the rectus  
347 femoris and vastus lateralis in children and adolescents with cerebral palsy. *Developmental Medicine*  
348 *& Child Neurology.* 2009;51(10):800-6.
- 349 34. Campbell M, Fitzpatrick R, Haines A, Kinmonth AL, Sandercock P, Spiegelhalter D, et al.  
350 Framework for design and evaluation of complex interventions to improve health. *BMJ.*  
351 2000;321(7262):694-6.
- 352 35. Craig P, Dieppe P, Macintyre S, Michie S, Nazareth I, Petticrew M. Developing and evaluating  
353 complex interventions: the new Medical Research Council guidance. *BMJ.* 2008;337:a1655.

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

363

364

365

366