

## Management of Developmental Coordination Disorder

Written by Ivonne Montgomery, MRSc, OT; Stephanie Glegg, PhD Candidate, OT; Giovanna Boniface, MRSc Candidate, OT; & Jill G. Zwicker, PhD, OT, March 2018

### Introduction

This document contains a brief overview of evidence regarding assessment, diagnosis, intervention, and service delivery for children and youth with developmental coordination disorder (DCD).

### How was the literature review completed?

An electronic search was performed in November 2017 and February 2018 of the following databases: TRIP, Cochrane, OT Seeker, Rehabilitation Reference Centre, UpToDate, CINAHL, and MEDLINE (PubMed). Keywords used in the search included: developmental coordination disorder, DCD, child\*, intervention, systematic review, and therapy. Summaries (e.g., clinical practice guidelines) and evidence syntheses (e.g., systematic reviews) were gathered to summarize research findings. Publications with the highest levels of evidence that were published since the most recent clinical practice guideline, as well as relevant qualitative research, were also included in this summary.

The American Academy for Cerebral Palsy and Developmental Medicine (AACPD) Levels of Evidence<sup>1</sup> were assigned to relevant studies (see Table 1). The AMSTAR<sup>2</sup> scale was used to rate quality of included systematic reviews. The Appraisal of Guidelines for REsearch & Evaluation II (AGREE II) Instrument<sup>3</sup> was used to assess the quality of any guidelines (see Tables 1 and 2). The International Classification for Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF) was used to describe study outcomes.<sup>4</sup>

### What is Developmental Coordination Disorder (DCD)?

**DCD** is a chronic motor skill disorder seen in children and youth that significantly affects activities of daily living, school performance, and leisure activities.<sup>5,6</sup> The motor deficits must not be attributable to any other known medical or neurological condition (e.g., cerebral palsy or a neurodegenerative disorder).<sup>5</sup>

Although DCD can occur on its own, there is a high co-occurrence with other neurodevelopmental or neurobehavioural disorders, such as attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) and/or specific learning and/or language disabilities. DCD also co-occurs with autism spectrum disorder (ASD) and is more prevalent in children born preterm and/or low-birth weight.<sup>5,7</sup>

### What is the incidence of DCD?

DCD is a prevalent disorder, typically affecting 5% to 6% of school-aged children and youth (i.e., one to two children in every Canadian classroom).<sup>8</sup> Males are more often diagnosed with DCD than females, with the male: female ratio varying from 2:1 to 7:1.<sup>5</sup> However, population-based studies have found the ratio to be more similar between the sexes, leading to the possibility that girls may be under-diagnosed, perhaps because parents place less importance on poor motor coordination in girls.<sup>9,10</sup>

### What are the consequences of DCD?

As a long-standing chronic disorder, the consequences of the motor deficits associated with DCD typically affect not only body fitness, activities of daily living, and academic functioning, but also social relationships and participation.<sup>5,6,11-14</sup> Children with DCD also report psychological issues, including

## Management of Developmental Coordination Disorder

significantly higher levels of depression and anxiety.<sup>14</sup> Consequently, the quality of life of children and youth with DCD can be considerably compromised compared to typically developing peers.<sup>13,14</sup>

Despite being one of the most common disorders in childhood, DCD is often under-recognized, under-diagnosed, and under-treated by the health care community.<sup>5</sup>

### How is DCD assessed and diagnosed?

DCD is assessed and diagnosed by a health care professional, typically a medical doctor or pediatrician, who is qualified to examine the specific criteria (see below).<sup>5</sup> Ideally, this process involves a multidisciplinary team approach for the most comprehensive assessment.<sup>5,6</sup> Assessment should include a thorough medical and developmental history, as well as the use of questionnaires, clinical examination, and motor test(s), as well as a discussion with the child and key individuals in their lives regarding the impact of the child's motor functioning on daily living skills, school, leisure, and participation.<sup>5,6</sup>

DCD is defined in the DSM-5<sup>15</sup> by the following four criteria:<sup>5</sup>

- A. Acquisition and execution of coordinated motor skills are substantially below what would be expected given the child's age and opportunity for skill learning and use. Difficulties may be seen as clumsiness, inaccuracy, or slowness of performance of motor skills (e.g., catching a ball, using scissors, printing or handwriting, riding a bicycle, or participating in sports).
- B. The motor skills deficit significantly and persistently interferes with activities of daily living and impacts school productivity, vocational skills, leisure activities, and play.
- C. The onset of symptoms is in the early developmental period.
- D. The motor skills deficit is not better explained by intellectual disability, visual impairment, or a neurological or medical condition affecting movement.

To address the above criteria, the assessment should encompass activities of daily living (e.g., self-care, academic abilities, prevocational and vocational activities, leisure participation and play) and the views of the child, parents, teachers, and relevant others.<sup>5</sup> Cultural differences should be considered to ensure that the child has had appropriate opportunities to practice and acquire motor skills.<sup>5</sup>

### Can a dual diagnosis be given?

A dual diagnosis of DCD and other neurodevelopmental disabilities (e.g., ASD, learning disorders, ADHD) should be given if appropriate, and treated according to established clinical guidelines. Treatment of co-occurring conditions can improve outcomes.<sup>5</sup>

### What assessment measures should be used for Criterion A?

Motor abilities should be assessed using objective, reliable, validated, and norm-referenced tests and measures.<sup>5,6</sup> The following motor function assessment tools are recommended as the primary evaluation measures for the assessment of DCD:<sup>5</sup>

#### 1. Movement Assessment Battery for Children, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (MABC-2)<sup>16</sup>

The MABC-2 is a norm-referenced test for children 3 years 0 months to 16 years 11 months.<sup>16</sup> The measure contains 8 tasks in each of the 3 age ranges (3-6 years, 7-10 years, 11-16 years). Tasks relate to 3 specific areas: manual dexterity, ball skills, and balance (static and dynamic). Total standard scores are calculated and then converted into percentiles to determine how a child's motor coordination compares to typically developing children of the same age. A cut-off score at or below the 16<sup>th</sup> percentile is recommended for children 6 years and older. However, if a child scores below the 5<sup>th</sup> percentile in one domain (e.g., fine motor, balance) but scores above the 16<sup>th</sup> percentile in other domains, a DCD diagnosis could be made if other diagnostic criteria are met.<sup>5</sup> For children under the age of 6 years, a cut-off score at or below the 5<sup>th</sup> percentile on the total motor score is recommended.<sup>5</sup>

## Management of Developmental Coordination Disorder

The MABC-2 has demonstrated good to excellent inter-rater and test-retest reliability ( $r=0.72-0.95$ ),<sup>17</sup> good specificity, and fair to good construct validity and concurrent validity with the Bruininks-Oseretsky Test of Motor Proficiency (1<sup>st</sup> edition: BOTMP and 2<sup>nd</sup> edition: BOT-2).<sup>5</sup> Sensitivity compared to the BOTMP is fair to good, with higher sensitivity demonstrated when using the 15<sup>th</sup> percentile cut-off.<sup>5</sup> Overall, the level of evidence on the quality and suitability of the MABC-2 for the diagnosis of DCD is moderate to good.<sup>5,17</sup>

### 2. Bruininks-Oseretsky Test of Motor Proficiency, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition (BOT-2)<sup>18</sup>

The BOT-2 is a norm-referenced motor function test for individuals aged 4 to 21 years, which assesses running ability, agility, balance, bilateral coordination, upper limb speed and dexterity, and visual motor control.<sup>18</sup> The BOT-2 has good to excellent test-retest and inter-rater reliability correlations ( $r=0.80$ ),<sup>17</sup> with good specificity, construct validity, and concurrent validity with the MABC-2. Sensitivity is reported to be lower than that of the MABC-2, although this information is based on weak evidence.<sup>5</sup> In general, the quality and suitability of the BOT-2 is rated moderate for this population.

Clinicians are advised that if any uncertainty exists in interpretation, administration of the alternate standardized motor test may be warranted.

### **What assessment measures should be used for Criteria B, C and D?**

A validated parent or teacher questionnaire should be used to support criterion B.<sup>5</sup> The parent-report Developmental Coordination Disorder Questionnaire (DCDQ)<sup>19</sup> is reported to be the best evaluated and validated questionnaire; use of the MABC-2 checklist<sup>16</sup> is also recommended.<sup>5</sup> Questionnaires and checklists should not, however, be used for population-based screening because of low sensitivity.<sup>5</sup> A history of motor learning challenges should be evident from early in life; parent interview and/or tools such as the Listening for DCD Checklist<sup>20</sup> or clinical interview guidelines<sup>21</sup> may be used to assist in determining Criteria B & C. Standardized testing for criterion D (e.g., IQ testing) is not required if a normal history of school functioning and academic achievements is reported and no uncertainty exists regarding the child's cognitive functioning level.<sup>5</sup>

### **Can DCD be diagnosed before the age of 5?**

Although DCD is usually evident early on in a child's life, the disorder is not typically diagnosed before age five.<sup>5</sup> However, if a preschooler (3 to 5 years of age) shows significant motor impairments (despite having had ample opportunities for learning and with other causes of motor delay have been ruled out), the diagnosis of DCD can be given, based on the findings from at least two longitudinal assessments (such as the repeated administration of the MABC-2) performed at sufficiently long intervals (at least 3 months apart).<sup>5</sup> More specifically, a cut-off of no more than the 5<sup>th</sup> percentile is used for this age group.<sup>5</sup>

### **Which interventions are effective for children with DCD?**

Children with DCD require treatment to remediate their motor challenges; strong (level II) evidence demonstrates physiotherapy and/or occupational therapy intervention are better than no treatment.<sup>5,22-24</sup> Best practice dictates that intervention should begin with collaborative individualized client- and family-led goal setting, focused on functional and meaningful activities and participation outcomes.<sup>5,23</sup> Recommended goal-setting and outcome measurement tools include the Canadian Occupational Performance Measure (COPM),<sup>5,25</sup> the Goal Attainment Scale (GAS),<sup>5,26</sup> the Perceived Efficacy and Goal Setting System (PEGS),<sup>27</sup> and the Pediatric Activity Card Sort (PACS).<sup>28</sup>

Activity- or task-oriented approaches, such as Cognitive Orientation to Occupational Performance (CO-OP) and Neuromotor Task Training (NTT), focus on meaningful activities of daily living to help promote transfer of training, and are supported by strong evidence (level I and II) for improving task performance and satisfaction. This evidence is drawn from clinical practice guidelines<sup>5</sup> and subsequent systematic

## Management of Developmental Coordination Disorder

reviews.<sup>23,31</sup> Effectiveness findings for overall motor skill outcomes are inconclusive.<sup>31</sup> Research syntheses report large effect sizes and strong treatment effects for task-oriented approaches.<sup>23,30,31</sup>

To be most effective, the therapy process should be child-centred and include key stakeholders, such as parents and teachers.<sup>5,23,30</sup> Inclusion of parents and teachers is needed to support task-specific practice, and to enable adequate practice time of home exercises/activities outside of professional treatment time.<sup>5</sup> Professional instruction to educate and to coach the parents as a means to support the generalization and application of skills into daily life is recommended.<sup>5,23</sup> Qualitative research suggests that incorporating the priorities of parents and children is crucial for optimising the outcomes of intervention.<sup>32</sup> Parents report valuing the education and support provided by professionals, as it helps to mitigate the apprehension that is often associated with raising a child with DCD.<sup>32</sup>

Compensatory and environmental supports, as well as the use of coping strategies, also need to be considered as part of intervention.<sup>5,13</sup> Occupational therapy should include the modification of tasks and expectations to match abilities, and the adaptation of materials and the environment of the child.<sup>5,6,23.</sup>

Clinical practice guidelines and subsequent systematic reviews and meta-analyses (strong evidence; level II) do not recommend process-oriented approaches (e.g., sensory integrative, perceptual and kinaesthetic training<sup>5,23</sup>), non-task specific interventions (e.g., use of the Wii Fit), and psychological approaches (e.g., self-concept training)<sup>29</sup> because of inconclusive, weak, or negligible effects on motor performance in this population. Some preliminary evidence exists for the effectiveness of motor imagery combined with task practice training<sup>29</sup> and for active video gaming as an adjunct to standard treatment.<sup>31</sup> Despite the overwhelming support for task-specific interventions, a recent narrative meta-review<sup>24</sup> and evidence synthesis<sup>33</sup> convey weak to moderate confidence in previous systematic review findings. Clinicians are therefore encouraged to measure, monitor, and track motor skill outcomes, as well as activity- and participation-level outcomes that reflect families' goals.<sup>5,34</sup>

### Treatment frequency and duration

Optimal treatment frequency and duration have not been determined conclusively because of the non-uniformity of variables across studies.<sup>5,23</sup> However, the majority of effective treatment interventions lasted longer than 10 weeks.<sup>23</sup> Reported treatment frequency ranged from every school day (including home exercises) to weekly, with once per week being most common.<sup>23</sup> Training programs with more frequent practicing schedules (e.g., 3-5 times/week) demonstrated the most significant effects on motor performance.<sup>30,35</sup>

### Group versus individual intervention

Small group intervention settings (4-6 children with one therapist and optional assistant) offer promise,<sup>31</sup> particularly those that involve parents;<sup>23,36</sup> however, this approach needs to be considered carefully for very young children and for those with severe DCD, both of whom may benefit more from individualized therapy.<sup>5</sup> Intervention should be tailored to the individual needs and interests of participants.<sup>29</sup>

Based on outcomes from the highest available level of evidence for each intervention approach for school-age children, grades of recommendation are offered in Table 1. Grades of recommendation are defined in Appendix II.<sup>37</sup> Evidence for early intervention for DCD is limited, but is summarized in the accompanying document, *Early Identification and Early Intervention for DCD* (<http://bit.ly/2D8IDEY>).

### **What is known about intervention for youth and young adults with DCD?**

The persistent nature of DCD needs to be addressed as children transition to adolescence and adulthood. New demands develop during this transition, which lead to subsequent struggles with activities, such as driving and academic tasks.<sup>13</sup> Mental health challenges, such as anxiety and depression, may emerge in early adolescence and continue into adulthood, leading to further reduced







## Management of Developmental Coordination Disorder

social participation.<sup>13,14</sup> Little evidence exists for interventions specifically targeted toward social participation for youth and young adults with DCD.<sup>13</sup> Current best practice recommendations include clinicians working with youth and young adults to address compensatory and coping strategies, to consider the impact of co-occurring conditions and secondary sequelae (and refer to other health care professionals, as necessary), to provide education, and to enhance functional abilities.<sup>13</sup> While improving motor skills is critical, the prevention and treatment of mental health difficulties should be a significant component of DCD intervention.<sup>38</sup>

### What is the best service delivery method?

Service delivery recommendations centre around organizing services to meet the comprehensive needs of children with DCD at all stages throughout childhood and adolescence.<sup>39</sup> Key elements of program delivery include: (1) working collaboratively with the child and family; (2) providing best practice treatment that focuses on function, participation, and prevention; (3) advocacy to increase awareness of DCD; (4) coordination among all professionals and community groups; (5) establishing clear care pathways; and (6) using a graduated or staged approach for assessment and intervention.<sup>39</sup> Stakeholders at all levels are encouraged to work together in designing, implementing, and evaluating interventions.<sup>39,40</sup> Two proposed models (Apollo and Partnering for Change) are described in the literature, and may hold promise for the provision of a continuum of services designed to build capacity,<sup>41,42</sup> for decreasing wait times, and for increasing the number of service recipients without sacrificing quality of care.<sup>41</sup>

**Table 1. Grades of Recommendation for Intervention with Children and Youth with DCD**

ICF Dimension	Outcome of interest	Intervention	Recommendation
Body Structure/Function	Gross motor skills	No intervention	 Proven Ineffective <sup>5,23,24,31</sup>
		Activity- or task-oriented approach (e.g., CO-OP, NTT) - individual or group* intervention	 Insufficient Evidence <sup>31</sup>
		Process-oriented approach (e.g., sensory integration, kinesthetic training)	 Conflicting Evidence <sup>5,23</sup>
		Gross motor functions, strength exercises, and weight-bearing	 Insufficient Evidence <sup>5</sup>
		Virtual reality/active video gaming as an adjunct to standard treatment	 Insufficient Evidence <sup>31</sup>
		Fine motor skills	Motor skills intervention
	Physical fitness (if targeted) (e.g., physical condition and strength)	Activity- or task-oriented training, (e.g., NTT and sport/play related skill training, and virtual reality)	 Proven Effective <sup>31</sup>

## Management of Developmental Coordination Disorder

ICF Dimension	Outcome of interest	Intervention	Recommendation		
Activity	Motor task performance	No intervention	 Proven Ineffective <sup>5,23,24,31</sup>		
		Activity- or task-oriented Approach (e.g., CO-OP, NTT) - individual or group* intervention	 Proven Effective <sup>5,23,31</sup>		
		Process-oriented approach (e.g., sensory integration, kinesthetic training)	 Insufficient Evidence <sup>5,23</sup>		
		Non-task-specific interventions (e.g., Wii Fit, Tai Kwon Do)	 Proven Ineffective <sup>29</sup>		
		Psychological approaches (e.g., self-concept training)	 Proven Ineffective <sup>29</sup>		
		Motor imagery training combined with task practice training	 Conflicting Evidence <sup>5,29</sup>		
		Active video gaming as an adjunct to standard treatment	 Insufficient Evidence <sup>31</sup>		
		Cognitive, emotional and other psychological factors (e.g., inhibition, self-esteem)	Not specified	 Insufficient Evidence <sup>30</sup>	
		Participation	Satisfaction with motor task performance	Not specified	 Insufficient Evidence <sup>30</sup>
				Participation in physical activity, sports, or active play.	Activity- or task-oriented approach (e.g., CO-OP, NTT) - individual or group* intervention

CO-OP, Cognitive Orientation to Daily Occupational Performance; NTT, Neuromotor Task Training

\*Small group intervention recommended *with* parent involvement, for older children with milder DCD<sup>5</sup>

*Support for the research to conduct this review comes from the Michael Smith Foundation for Health Research REACH Award and Sunny Hill Health Centre for Children. Stephanie Glegg is supported by a CIHR Vanier Canada Graduate Scholarship, the Canadian Child Health Clinician Scientist Program, a UBC Public Scholars Award and Four-Year Fellowship, and the Sunny Hill Foundation. Dr. Jill Zwicker is a MSFHR Scholar and is funded by the Canadian Child Health Clinician Scientist Program, BC Children's Hospital Research Institute, Sunny Hill Foundation, and the Canadian Institutes of Health Research. The authors would like to acknowledge the help of Andrea Ryce, Librarian.*

# Management of Developmental Coordination Disorder

## Want to know more? Contact:

Ivonne Montgomery, Occupational Therapist

Therapy Department

Sunny Hill Health Centre for Children

imontgomery@cw.bc.ca

604-453-8300

A copy of this document is available at: [www.childdevelopment.ca](http://www.childdevelopment.ca)

## References

1. American Academy for Cerebral Palsy and Development Medicine Treatment Outcomes Committee. 2008. AACPD methodology to develop systematic reviews of treatment interventions (Revision 1.2) 2008 Version. [http://www.aacpdm.org/membership/members/committees/treatment\\_outcomes\\_methodology.pdf](http://www.aacpdm.org/membership/members/committees/treatment_outcomes_methodology.pdf).
2. Shea BJ, Hamel C, Well GA, Bouter LM, Kristiansson E, Grimshaw J, Henry D, Boera M. AMSTAR is a reliable and valid measurement tool to assess the methodological quality of systematic reviews. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2009;62:1013-1020.
3. Brouwers M, Kho ME, Browman GP, Burgers JS, Cluzeau F, Feder G, Fervers B, Graham ID, Grimshaw J, Hanna S, Littlejohns P, Makarski J, Zitzelsberger L for the AGREE Next Steps Consortium. AGREE II: Advancing guideline development, reporting and evaluation in healthcare. *Can Med Assoc J*. 2010. Available online July 5, 2010. doi:10.1503/cmaj.090449
4. World Health Organization. International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF). 2001. Geneva: Author.
5. Blank R, Smits-Engelsman B, Polatajko H, Wilson P. European Academy for Childhood Disability (EACD): recommendations on the definition, diagnosis, and intervention of developmental coordination disorder (long version). *Dev Med Child Neurol*. 2012;54:54-93.
6. Chung A, Callanen A. Clinical Review, Developmental Coordination Disorder: Occupational Therapy, CINAHL Information Systems, Rehabilitation Reference Center; 2016.
7. Edwards J, Berube M, Erlandson K, Haug S, Johnstone H, Meagher M, Sarkodee-Adoo S, Zwicker JG. Developmental coordination disorder in school-aged children born very preterm and/or at very low birth weight: a systematic review. *J Dev Beh Pediatr* 2011;32:678-87.
8. Karkling M, Paul A, Zwicker J. Occupational therapists' awareness of guidelines for assessment and diagnosis of developmental coordination disorder. *Can J Occup Ther*. 2017;84(3):148-157
9. Missiuna C, Cairney J, Pollock P, Russell D, Macdonald K, Cousins M, Veldhuizen S, Schmidt L. A staged approach for identifying children with developmental coordination disorder from the population. *Res Dev Disabil*. 2011;32(2):549-559.
10. Chen YW, Tseng MH, Hu FC, Cermak SA. Psychosocial adjustment and attention in children with developmental coordination disorder using different motor tests. *Res Dev Disabil*. 2009;30(6):1367-77.
11. Callanen A. Clinical Review, Developmental Coordination Disorder: Physical Therapy, CINAHL Information Systems, Rehabilitation Reference Center; 2017.
12. Magalhaes LC, Cardoso AA, Missiuna C. Activities and participation in children with developmental coordination disorder: a systematic review. *Res Dev Disabil*. 2011;32(4):1309-1316.
13. Gagnon-Roy M, Jasmin E, Camden C. Social participation of teenagers and young adults with developmental co-ordination disorder and strategies that could help them: results from a scoping review. *Child: Care Health Dev*. 2016;42(6):840-851.
14. Zwicker JG, Harris SR, Klassen AF. Quality of life domains affected in children with developmental coordination disorder: a systematic review. *Child: Care Health Dev*. 2013;39(4):562-580.
15. American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (5th ed.). Arlington, VA: APA 2013
16. Henderson SE, Sugden DA, Barnett AL. Movement Assessment Battery for Children, 2nd ed. London: Pearson. 2007.
17. Slater LM, Hillier SL, Civetta LR. The clinimetric properties of performance-based gross motor tests used for children with developmental coordination disorder: a systematic review. *Ped Phys Ther*. 2010;22:170-179.
18. Bruininks R, Bruininks B. Bruininks-Oseretsky Test of Motor Proficiency (2nd ed.) Minneapolis, MN: NCS Pearson. 2005.
19. Wilson BN, Crawford SG, Green D, Roberts G, Aylott A, & Kaplan B. (2009). Psychometric Properties of the Revised Developmental Coordination Disorder Questionnaire. *Phys Occup Ther Pediatr*. 2009;29(2):182-202.
20. Camden C, Rivard L, Pollock, Missiuna C. Listening for DCD Interview Guide. *CanChild*. 2013; Available from: <http://bit.ly/2Ca1qDw>
21. Missiuna C, Pollock N, Egan M, DeLaat D, Gaines R, Soucie H. Enabling occupation through facilitating the diagnosis of developmental coordination disorder. *Can J Occup Ther*. 2008;75(1):26-34.
22. Hillier S. Interventions for children with developmental coordination disorder: a systematic review. *Int J Allied Health Sci Prac*. 2007;5:1-10.
23. Smits-Engelsman BCM, Blank R, Van der Kaay A C, Mosterd-Van der Meijs R, Vlugt-Van den Brand E, Polatajko HJ, Wilson PH. Efficacy of interventions to improve motor performance in children with developmental coordination disorder: a combined systematic review and meta-analysis. *Dev Med Child Neurol*. 2013;55(3):229-237.
24. Miyahara M, Lagisz M, Nakagawa S, Henderson S E. A narrative meta-review of a series of systematic and meta-analytic reviews on the intervention outcome for children with developmental co-ordination disorder. *Child Care Health Dev*. 2017;43:733-742.
25. Law MA, Baptiste S, Carswell A, McColl MA, Polatajko H, Pollock N. Canadian Occupational Performance Measure. Ottawa: Canadian Association of Occupational Therapists, 2005.
26. Marson SM, Dran D. Goal Attainment Scaling. Available from [http://www.marson-and-associates.com/GAS/GAS\\_index.html](http://www.marson-and-associates.com/GAS/GAS_index.html) 2010.
27. Missiuna C, Pollock N, Law M. Perceived efficacy and goal setting system (PEGS). San Antonio, TX: Psychological Assessment, 2004
28. Mandich A, Polatajko HJ, Miller L, Baum C. Pediatric Activity Card Sort (PACS). Ottawa: Canadian Association of Occupational Therapists, 2004
29. Preston N, Magallón S, Hill I, Andrews E, Ahern S, Mon-Williams M. A systematic review of high quality randomized controlled trials investigating motor skill programmes for children with developmental coordination disorder. *Clin Rehabil*. 2017;31(7):857-870.
30. Yu JJ, Sit CHP, Burnett AF. Motor skill interventions in children with developmental coordination disorder: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Arch Phys Med Rehab*. 2018. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2017.12.009.

## Management of Developmental Coordination Disorder

31. Smits-Engelsman B, Vinçon S, Blank R, Quadrado V H, Polatajko H, Wilson PH. Evaluating the evidence for motor-based interventions in developmental coordination disorder: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Res Dev Disabil*, 2018;74,72-102.
32. Morgan R, Long T. The effectiveness of occupational therapy for children with developmental coordination disorder: a review of the qualitative literature. *Br J Occup Ther*, 2012;75(1):10-18.
33. Sutton Hamilton S. UpToDate. Developmental coordination disorder: Management and outcome. 2017.
34. Novak I. New evidence in developmental coordination disorder (DCD). *Phys Occup Ther Ped*. 2013;33(2):170–173
35. Pless M, Carlsson M. Effects of motor skill intervention on developmental coordination disorder: a meta-analysis. *Adapted Phys Activity Q*. 2000;17:381–401.
36. Anderson L, Wilson J, Williams G. Cognitive Orientation to daily Occupational Performance (CO-OP) as group therapy for children living with motor coordination difficulties: an integrated literature review. *Aus Occup Ther J*. 2017;64:170–184.
37. Glegg S, Mayson TA, Barrie A. Traffic lighting overview: Identifying the evidence on intervention effectiveness. Updated April 26, 2012. Available at: <http://www.childdevelopment.ca/Evidencecentre/EvidenceBasedPractice.aspx>.
38. Caçola P. Physical and mental health of children with developmental coordination disorder. *Front Pub Health*. 2016;(4)1-6.
39. Camden C, Wilson B, Kirby A, Sugden D, Missiuna C. Best practice principles for management of children with developmental coordination disorder (DCD): results of a scoping review. *Child Care Health Dev*. 2015;41:147-59.
40. Pentland JM. Services for children with developmental co-ordination disorder. An evaluation against best practice principles. *Disabil Rehabil*. 2016;38(3):299–306.
41. Camden C, Leger F, Morel J, Missiuna C. A service delivery model for children with DCD based on principles of best practice. *Phys Occup Ther Ped*. 2015;35(4):412–425.
42. Missiuna CA, Pollock NA, Levac DE, Campbell WN, Whalen SD, Bennett SM, Hecimovich CA, Gaines BR, Cairney J, Russell DJ. Partnering for change: an innovative school-based occupational therapy service delivery model for children with developmental coordination disorder. *Can J Occup Ther*. 2012;79(1):41-50.



## Management of Developmental Coordination Disorder

**Table 2: AMSTAR Conduct Rating<sup>2</sup>**

Conduct Rating Questions	Articles								
	Zwicker <sup>14</sup>	Slater <sup>17</sup>	Pless <sup>35</sup>	Hillier <sup>22</sup>	Smits-Engelsman <sup>23</sup>	Miyahara <sup>24</sup>	Preston <sup>29</sup>	Yu <sup>30</sup>	Smits-Engelsman <sup>31</sup>
1. Was an a priori design provided?	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
2. Was there duplicate study selection and data extraction?	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
3. Was a comprehensive literature search performed?	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
4. Was the status of publication (i.e., grey literature) used as an inclusion criterion?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
5. Was a list of studies (included and excluded) provided?	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No
6. Were the characteristics of the included studies provided?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
7. Was the scientific quality of the included studies assessed and documented?	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
8. Was the scientific quality of the included studies used appropriate in formulating conclusions?	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
9. Were the methods used to combine the findings of studies appropriate?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
10. Was the likelihood of publication bias assessed?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
11. Was the conflict of interest included?	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Total Rating</b>	<b>8/11</b>	<b>7/11</b>	<b>3/11</b>	<b>5/11</b>	<b>6/11</b>	<b>6/11</b>	<b>8/11</b>	<b>10/11</b>	<b>8/11</b>
<b>AACPDM Level of Evidence (see Appendix 2)</b>	<b>II</b>	<b>II</b>	<b>II</b>	<b>II</b>	<b>II</b>	<b>II</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>I</b>

Note: AACPDM=American Academy for Cerebral Palsy and Developmental Medicine

### Quality Rating for AACPDM levels of evidence I through III<sup>1</sup>

High Quality           8 to 11  
 Moderate Quality      4 to 7  
 Low Quality            0 to 3

## Management of Developmental Coordination Disorder

**Table 3: AGREE II Appraisal Instrument<sup>3</sup> for Blank<sup>5</sup> article**

Rating Questions	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Domain Score
1. The overall objective(s) of the guideline is (are) specifically described.	7	7	14
2. The health question(s) covered by the guideline is(are) specifically described.	6	6	12
3. The population (patients, public, etc.) to whom the guideline is meant to apply are specifically described.	5	7	12
<b>Scope and Purpose Domain Total Score</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>38 (89%)</b>
4. The guideline development group includes individuals from all the relevant professional groups.	5	4	9
5. The views and preferences of the target population (patients, public, etc.) have been sought.	4	6	10
6. The target users of the guideline are clearly defined.	6	5	11
<b>Stakeholder Involvement Domain Total Score</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>30 (67%)</b>
7. Systematic methods were used to search for evidence.	7	7	14
8. The criteria for selecting the evidence are clearly described.	6	6	12
9. The strengths and limitations of the body of evidence are clearly described.	7	7	14
10. The methods for formulating the recommendations are clearly described.	4	5	9
11. The health benefits, side effects and risks have been considered in formulating the recommendations.	3	4	7
12. There is an explicit link between the recommendations and the supporting evidence.	6	6	12
13. The guideline has been externally reviewed by experts prior to its publication.	4	3	7
14. A procedure for updating the guideline is provided.	1	1	2
<b>Rigour of Development Domain Total Score</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>77 (64%)</b>
15. The recommendations are specific and unambiguous.	6	6	12
16. The different options for management of the condition or health issue are clearly presented.	6	6	12
17. Key recommendations are easily identifiable.	7	7	14
<b>Clarity and Presentation Domain Total Score</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>38 (89%)</b>
18. The guideline describes facilitators and barriers to its application.	2	2	4
19. The guideline provides advice and/or tools on how the recommendations can be put into practice.	4	2	6
20. The potential resource implications of applying the recommendations have been considered.	3	3	6
21. The guideline presents monitoring and/or auditing criteria.	5	5	10
<b>Applicability Domain Total Score</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>26 (38%)</b>
22. The views of the funding body have not influenced the content of the guideline.	4	3	7
23. Competing interests of guideline development group members have been recorded and addressed.	1	1	2
<b>Editorial Independence Total Score<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>9 (21%)</b>
<b>Overall Guideline Assessment Quality<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	
<b>Overall Guideline Assessment Recommendation for Use<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	

**Domain scaled score (in brackets)=(Domain score – minimum possible score)/(maximum possible score – minimum possible score) x 100**

<sup>a</sup>AGREE Score: 1 to 7 (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree)

<sup>b</sup>Overall guideline assessment: 1 to 7 (1=lowest possible quality, 7=highest possible quality)

<sup>c</sup>I would recommend use of this guideline: Yes, Yes with modifications, No; Strongly recommend' or 'recommend' or 'would not recommend' or 'unsure'

## Management of Developmental Coordination Disorder

### Appendix I: AACPDM - Levels of Evidence for Group Intervention Studies (December 2008)<sup>1</sup>

Level of Evidence	Group Intervention Study Designs
I	Systematic review of randomized controlled trials (RCTs) Large RCTs (with narrow confidence intervals) (n>100)
II	Smaller RCTs (with wider confidence intervals) (n<100) Systematic reviews of cohort studies “Outcomes research” (very large ecologic studies)
III	Cohort studies (must have concurrent control group) Systematic reviews of case-control studies
IV	Case series Cohort study without concurrent control group (e.g., with historical control group) Case-control study
V	Expert opinion Case study or report Bench research Expert opinion based on theory or physiologic research Common sense/anecdotes

AACPDM, American Academy for Cerebral Palsy and Developmental Medicine; RCT, randomized controlled trial

### Appendix II: Traffic Lighting Classification Scale<sup>34</sup>

Colour Code	Criteria	State of the Evidence
	Group design Level I or II evidence of good* quality demonstrating negative outcomes (e.g., absence of change compared to no treatment)	<b>Proven Ineffective</b>
	Group design Level I or II evidence of poor <sup>∞</sup> quality regardless of outcome Group design Level III-V evidence of any quality regardless of outcome Single study research design Level I-V of any quality regardless of outcome Inconclusive results	<b>Insufficient Evidence</b>
	No evidence about the intervention's effectiveness	<b>No Evidence</b>
	Group design of either Level I or II evidence, where both studies of the same level of evidence show conflicting results	<b>Conflicting Evidence</b>
	Group design Level I or II evidence of good* quality, demonstrating statistically significant positive outcomes	<b>Proven Effective</b>

\*=Moderate or Strong quality (Group Design AACPDM Conduct Rating Scale<sup>1</sup> score 4-7 or AMSTAR<sup>2</sup> score 4-11)

<sup>∞</sup>=Weak quality (Group Design AACPDM Conduct Rating Scale<sup>1</sup> or AMSTAR<sup>2</sup> score of 1-3)