

Test-Retest Reliability of Handgrip Strength as an Outcome Measure in Patients With Symptoms of Shoulder Impingement Syndrome

Christos Savva, PhD,^a Paraskevas Mougias, BSc (PT),^a Christoforos Xadjimichael, BSc (PT),^a Christos Karagiannis, MSc (PT),^a and Michalis Efstathiou, MSc (PT)^b

ABSTRACT

Objective: The purpose of this study was to investigate the degree of test-retest reliability of grip strength measurement using a hand dynamometer in patients with shoulder impingement syndrome.

Methods: A total of 19 patients (10 women and 9 men; mean $\pm$ standard deviation age, 33.2 ± 12.9 years; range 18–59 years) with shoulder impingement syndrome were measured using a hand dynamometer by the same data collector in 2 different testing sessions with a 7-day interval. During each session, patients were encouraged to exert 3 maximal isometric contractions on the affected hand and the mean value of the 3 efforts (measured in kilogram-force [Kgf]) was used for data analysis. The intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC_{2,1}) as well as the standard error of measurement (SEM) and Bland-Altman plot were used to estimate the degree of test-retest reliability and the measurement error, respectively.

Results: Grip strength data analysis revealed an ICC_{2,1} score of 0.94, which, based on the Shrout classification, is considered as excellent test-retest reliability of grip strength measurement. The small values of SEMs reported in both sessions (SEM₁, 2.55 Kgf; SEM₂, 2.39 Kgf) and the small width of the 95% limits of agreement in the Bland-Altman plot (ranging from -7.39 Kgf to 7.03 Kgf) reflected the measurement precision and the narrow variation of the differences during the 2 testing sessions.

Conclusions: Results from this study identified excellent test-retest reliability of grip strength measurement in shoulder impingement syndrome, indicating its potential use as an outcome measure in clinical practice. (J Manipulative Physiol Ther 2018;41:252–257)

Key Indexing Terms: *Hand Strength; Muscle Strength Dynamometer; Shoulder Impingement Syndrome*

INTRODUCTION

Shoulder impingement syndrome (SIS) is a general term that describes decreased movement of the glenohumeral joint as a result of shoulder pain and muscle weakness.^{1–3} Shoulder pain is second only to low back pain in prevalence, affecting 16% to 21% of the general population.^{4–6} SIS is considered the main cause of shoulder pain, affecting 44% to 60% of all patients with shoulder

pain complaints, suggesting a frequent appearance of this syndrome in everyday clinical practice.^{7,8} SIS is responsible for work disability and physical limitations in daily life, and recent studies have reported that it has become a considerable socioeconomic burden.^{9–12}

Patients with SIS often report a clicking sensation along with pain during arm elevation or overhead activities.^{13,14} To prevent pain exacerbation, most patients avoid daily movements or activities of the affected upper limb.^{1,15,16} However, these activity limitations can cause muscle imbalances in the whole upper limb kinematic chain.^{3,17–19} Several studies have identified glenohumeral and scapulothoracic muscle imbalances caused by deficits in muscle flexibility and strength.^{20–22} Alterations in humeral and scapular position and motion have been linked to decreased muscle activity of serratus anterior, lower and middle trapezius, and the rotator cuff, coupled with tightness of the upper trapezius, pectorals, and levator scapula muscles.^{5,22–24} Based on kinetic chain principles, the upper extremity is a system of linked segments that work together to perform

^a Department of Health Science, Diogenous 6, Engomi, European University, Nicosia, Cyprus.

^b Department of Life and Health Science, 46 Makedonitissas Avenue, Engomi, University of Nicosia, Cyprus.

Corresponding author: Christos Savva, PhD, Argolidos 25 Panthea, Limassol, Cyprus. Tel.: +357-99666124. (e-mail: savva.christos@hotmail.com).

Paper submitted July 28, 2016; in revised form July 30, 2017; accepted September 8, 2017.

Copyright © 2018 by National University of Health Sciences. 0161-4754

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmpt.2017.09.005>

daily movements.²⁵⁻²⁷ As a result, muscles imbalances in patients with SIS could affect grip strength (GS). This notion is supported by studies that have reported a positive correlation between GS and shoulder muscle strength and flexibility.²⁸⁻³⁰

Clinicians often use dynamometers to assess the before and after treatment effect on GS in patients with SIS.^{28,29} Therefore, test-retest reliability of GS measurement (GSM) seems to be one of its most important measurement properties because as an outcome measure it is used by the same treatment provider across repeated trials.^{31,32}

Although GSM is widely used in clinical practice, to date no study has explored whether this outcome measure can yield consistent results of GS when applied across separate measures in patients with SIS. Therefore, the objective of this study was to investigate the degree of test-retest reliability of GSM using a dynamometer in patients with SIS.

METHODS

Study Design

A prospective, observational, nonexperimental design was used to explore the test-retest reliability of GSM in patients with SIS.^{31,33} The GS of consecutive patients presenting to a rehabilitation clinic with SIS was evaluated by the same data collector. To prevent possible learning or fatigue effects, patients were assessed at 2 different periods with an interval of 7 days between each period.^{31,34}

A double-blind procedure was used to prevent research outcomes from being influenced by several biases that could affect interval validity. The data collector who measured the patients' GS was blinded to the purpose and nature of the study design to prevent potential recorder bias.³⁵ During GS trials, patients were blinded to their GS scores to address potential expectation bias.³⁶

Clinical Settings and Study Participants

Data collection was conducted between December 2015 and May 2016, in the outpatient physiotherapy department of Nicosia General Hospital. Consecutive patients diagnosed by orthopedic surgeons as having SIS, based on radiographs or magnetic resonance imaging, were referred to the outpatient physiotherapy department and were initially recruited. An independent physiotherapist not involved in assessment of the patients' GS screened all referred patients and determined eligibility for participation ($n = 25$). Participants were eligible if they reported (1) painful shoulder range of movement, (2) shoulder weakness, (3) clicking sensation in the shoulder, and (4) a positive result on Hawkins and Neer tests.^{37,38} Participants were excluded if they had a history of shoulder surgery on the symptomatic side; had shoulder pain caused by major shoulder trauma; had a history of frozen shoulder, traumatic

shoulder dislocation, or instability in the last 3 months; or had undergone physiotherapy treatment during the last 2 months.^{5,39} Participants were also excluded if they had been receiving any prescription or over-the-counter analgesia or anti-inflammatory medication within 2 weeks before the study.¹⁴

Of the 25 consecutive patients, 6 were excluded because they did not meet the inclusion criteria. A total of 19 patients (mean $\pm$ standard deviation [SD] age = 33.2 ± 12.9 years; range 18-59 years) met the inclusion criteria and were enrolled in the study. A difference in reliability of 0.9 and 0.7 at 80% power and a 5% level of significance using 2 ratings was set. Based on 2 testing sessions, an α value of .05, and a power of 0.80, a minimal sample size of 19 patients was identified. Specifically, 10 women (mean age $\pm$ SD, 35 ± 14.3 years) and 9 men (mean age $\pm$ SD, 32.2 ± 11.7 years) were included.^{40,41}

Ethical Considerations

On meeting the requirements for inclusion, participants gave written informed consent before participation. The study was approved by the Cyprus National Bioethics Committee.

Instrument

The hydraulic hand dynamometer (Saehan Corporation, Busan, South Korea) was designed after the Bechtol in 1954 was used to measure the patients' GS.⁴² The outcomes from this dynamometer are read in kilogram-force (Kgf) with 2-kg gradations.^{42,43} The hand dynamometer has been reported to have excellent test-retest reliability, with intraclass correlation coefficient ($ICC_{2,1}$) values varying between 0.81 and 0.98.^{44,45} The specific dynamometer was chosen for the present study because it produces similar and constant results of GS when applied by the same data collector across repeated GS trials and has been recommended by the American Society of Hand Therapists (ASHT).⁴⁶⁻⁴⁸

Procedure

Patients were assessed for GS on 2 different testing sessions with an interval of 7 days between sessions.^{31,34} Time of testing was standardized and patients were advised to attend in morning sessions between 8:00 and 12:00. Also, patients followed a standardized protocol for GS data collection as recommended by the ASHT.^{47,48}

Grip strength measurements were applied in the position recommended by the ASHT: sitting position with the feet flat on the floor, shoulder at 0° of flexion, abduction, and rotation; elbow flexed to 90°; forearm and wrist rested in a neutral position.^{43,49} In this standardized arm position, patients underwent a familiarization trial as they were instructed to hold the handle and squeeze the hand dynamometer set at the second handle space.⁵⁰ In addition,

patients were allowed to 2 to 3 gripping movements following a standardized verbal instruction from the data collector that was based on the ASHT protocol. The instructions were: "Please hold the handle like this and squeeze as hard as you can. Are you ready? Squeeze as hard as you can. Harder... harder... harder... relax." When patients became familiar with the task, they were instructed to perform three 5-second maximal gripping contractions.^{47,48,51} Every effort lasted 5 seconds and was followed by a 15-second rest period to avoid fatigue effects. During the rest period the data collector recorded the maximum GS of each effort.⁴⁸ The peak GS reading of the 3 trials was noted and averages were taken for the GS data analysis.

Data Analysis

The Statistical Package SPSS Version 17 (SPSS Inc, Chicago, Illinois) was used for analysis. Test-retest reliability of an outcome measure is recommended to be interpreted based on correlation coefficients and measurement error.⁵² The ICC_{2,1} is recommended in reliability studies with 1 data collector who examines the degree of agreement of GS scores between the 2 testing sessions.³³ The ICC_{2,1} was estimated for single measures using a 2-way random effect model of absolute agreement for the calculation of ICC.³³ To increase the level of certainty where the precise ICC_{2,1} value may lie, the 95% confidence interval for ICC_{2,1} was also calculated.⁵³ The obtained ICC_{2,1} value was interpreted using the Shrout classification.⁵⁴ Based on this classification, test-retest reliability is considered as good for an ICC_{2,1} of 0.61 to 0.80 and excellent for 0.81 and 1.00.⁵⁴ The standard error of measurement (SEM) and Bland-Altman plot were used along with the estimation of ICC_{2,1} to determine the measurement precision and provide information regarding the magnitude of measurement error.^{55,56}

RESULTS

Handgrip strength test results for 19 patients with SIS collected on 2 different occasions were analyzed (Table 1).

Grip strength data analysis revealed an ICC_{2,1} score of 0.94. Based on the Shrout classification, this score is considered as excellent test-retest reliability for GSM.⁵⁴ The given range of scores of the 95% confidence interval varied from 0.86 to 0.97, suggesting that there are 95 out of 100 chances the ICC_{2,1} precise value would fall between these 2 bounds. Regarding the estimation of measurement error, smaller SEM was identified in the second occasion (SEM₂, 2.39 Kgf) compared with the SEM value collected during the first occasion (SEM₁, 2.55 Kgf). In addition, Bland-Altman plot analysis indicated that the mean difference of the 2 measurements and the width of the 95% limits of agreements (mean difference $\pm$ 1.96 SD) was -0.18 Kgf and -7.39 to 7.03 Kgf, respectively (Fig 1). As

Table 1. Grip Strength Data Collected Across 2 Testing Sessions

Patient No.	First Testing Session, Kgf	Second Testing Session, Kgf
1	38.5	31.5
2	42.5	48.5
3	42	41
4	52	48.5
5	45	44.5
6	20.5	23.5
7	27	33
8	47.5	46.5
9	27.5	27.5
10	33	33
11	22.5	25
12	25.5	25
13	25.5	24.5
14	46	53
15	55	50
16	39.5	41.5
17	50	48
18	21.5	23
19	39	36

Kgf, kilogram-force.

shown in Figure 1, all GS data points lie within the 95% limits of agreement, indicating a normal distribution of the differences.

DISCUSSION

Often patients with SIS have weakness in GS, and GSM has been suggested to quantitatively determine GS deficits.^{28,29} However, to date no study has explored the test-retest reliability of GSM in this population. Therefore, the objective of this study was to investigate the test-retest reliability of GSM using the hand dynamometer.

Results from this study revealed an excellent test-retest reliability of GSM with an obtained ICC_{2,1} value of 0.94. The 95% confidence interval of the ICC_{2,1} increased the level of certainty that the test-retest reliability is considered excellent because its lower and upper bounds (0.86 and 0.97, respectively) were within the excellent range of scores




Fig 1. Bland-Altman plot. Y-axis represents the difference between grip strength scores (measured in kilogram force). X-axis represents the mean of the 2 measurements (measured in Kg). The central line represents the mean difference of the 2 measurements (mean difference, -0.18 Kg). The upper and lower dashed lines represent the width of the 95% limits of agreements (mean difference ± 1.96 standard deviations, -7.39 Kg to 7.03 Kg). Kg, kilogram force.

given by the Shrout classification.⁵⁴ This means that GSM is a reliable outcome measure providing similar and stable results when applied on repeated trials and therefore it is recommended for use in patients with SIS.³¹ The excellent test-retest reliability was related with low values of SEM and small width of the 95% limits of agreement in the Bland-Altman plot, reflecting the measurement precision and the narrow variation of the differences during the 2 testing sessions.^{55,56} Interpreting the patients' GS performance, in the second occasion most of them had a lower GS score compared with the first occasion, although this can be explained by the ongoing process of SIS and the patients' habit to avoid movements or activities of the involved upper limb, leading to further muscle weakness.^{5,20-24} In addition, it also highlights that the procedure of data collection was not biased by learning effects.³⁴

Test-retest reliability of GSM can be influenced by various factors such as participant testing position, number of grip trials, type of dynamometer, and time of day.^{32,57,58} A standard protocol that has been advocated by the ASHT^{47,52} was used.

Studies on asymptomatic populations have reported excellent test-retest reliability of GSM with an obtained $ICC_{2,1}$ measuring from 0.87 to 0.97, although data analysis in most of these studies was problematic because of the lack of measurement error estimation⁵⁹ or inappropriate correlation coefficient tests.^{44,48,60} Excellent levels of test-retest reliability ($ICC_{2,1} > 0.91$) have been also detected in

symptomatic populations with patients experiencing various musculoskeletal disorders, including cervical radiculopathy⁵¹ and thumb carpometacarpal osteoarthritis,⁴⁵ or in patients after carpal tunnel decompression and flexor tendon repair.³² However, this is the first study that highlights the excellent test-retest reliability of GSM in SIS, indicating its potential use as an outcome measure in clinical practice.

Limitations

Although reliability of GSM can be affected by several factors, including pain, dysfunction of shoulder movement, or chronicity of SIS's symptoms, these factors were not controlled. In addition, although SIS is an umbrella term that contains numerous pathologic conditions such as partial thickness rotator cuff tears, capsular laxity, and tightness, patients were not classified in accordance of the exact cause of SIS, type of impingement, location of shoulder pain, level of activity, or involved impingement structures.

CONCLUSION

Test-retest reliability of GSM used as an outcome measure in patients SIS was excellent, indicating its potential use in clinical practice. Further studies evaluating test-retest reliability of GSM in SIS according to the cause

and type of impingement, chronicity, and location or intensity of symptoms are now justified.

FUNDING SOURCES AND CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

No funding sources or conflicts of interest were reported for this study.

CONTRIBUTORSHIP INFORMATION

Concept development (provided idea for the research): C.S., P.M., C.X., C.K., M.E.

Design (planned the methods to generate the results): C.S., P.M., C.X., C.K., M.E.

Supervision (provided oversight, responsible for organization and implementation, writing of the manuscript): C.S., P.M., C.X., C.K., M.E.

Data collection/processing (responsible for experiments, patient management, organization, or reporting data): C.S., P.M., C.X., C.K., M.E.

Analysis/interpretation (responsible for statistical analysis, evaluation, and presentation of the results): C.S., P.M., C.X., C.K., M.E.

Literature search (performed the literature search): C.S., P.M., C.X., C.K., M.E.

Writing (responsible for writing a substantive part of the manuscript): C.S., P.M., C.X., C.K., M.E.

Critical review (revised manuscript for intellectual content, this does not relate to spelling and grammar checking): C.S., P.M., C.X., C.K., M.E.

Practical Application

- Grip strength measurement as an outcome measure in patients with SIS can yield similar and stable results of GS when applied across repeated trials, indicating its use in clinical practice.

REFERENCES

1. Dong W, Goost H, Lin XB, et al. Treatments for shoulder impingement syndrome: a PRISMA systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2015; 94(10):e510.
2. Braun C, Bularczyk M, Heintsch J, Hanchard NCA. Manual therapy and exercises for shoulder impingement revisited. *Phys Ther Rev*. 2013;18(4):263-284.
3. Page P. Shoulder muscle imbalance and subacromial impingement syndrome in overhead athletes. *Int J Sports Phys Ther*. 2011;6(1):51-58.
4. Senbursa G, Baltaci G, Atay A. Comparison of conservative treatment with and without manual physical therapy for patients with shoulder impingement syndrome: a prospective, randomized clinical trial. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc*. 2007;15(7):915-921.
5. Tate AR, McClure PW, Young IA, Salvatori R, Michener LA. Comprehensive impairment-based exercise and manual therapy intervention for patients with subacromial impingement syndrome: a case series. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*. 2010; 40(8):474-493.
6. Pope DP, Croft PR, Pritchard CM, Silman AJ. Prevalence of shoulder pain in the community: the influence of case definition. *Ann Rheum Dis*. 1997;56(5):308-312.
7. Umer M, Qadir I, Azam M. Subacromial impingement syndrome. *Orthop Rev (Pavia)*. 2012;4(2):e18.
8. van der Windt DA, Koes BW, de Jong BA, Bouter LM. Shoulder disorders in general practice: incidence, patient characteristics, and management. *Ann Rheum Dis*. 1995; 54(12):959-964.
9. Heredia-Rizo AM, López-Hervás A, Herrera-Monge P, Gutiérrez-Leonard A, Piña-Pozo F. Shoulder functionality after manual therapy in subjects with shoulder impingement syndrome: a case series. *J Bodyw Mov Ther*. 2013;17(2): 212-218.
10. Virta L, Joranger P, Brox JJ, Eriksson R. Costs of shoulder pain and resource use in primary health care: a cost-of-illness study in Sweden. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*. 2012;13:17.
11. Struyf F, De Hertogh W, Gulinck J, Nijs J. Evidence-based treatment methods for the management of shoulder impingement syndrome among Dutch-speaking physiotherapists: an online, web-based survey. *J Manip Physiol Ther*. 2012;35(9): 720-726.
12. Lewis JS. Rotator cuff tendinopathy/subacromial impingement syndrome: is it time for a new method of assessment? *Br J Sports Med*. 2009;43(4):259-264.
13. Manske RC, Grant-Nierman M, Lucas B. Shoulder posterior internal impingement in the overhead athlete. *Int J Sports Phys Ther*. 2013;8(2):194-204.
14. Kachingwe AF, Phillips B, Sletten E, Plunkett SW. Comparison of manual therapy techniques with therapeutic exercise in the treatment of shoulder impingement: a randomized controlled pilot clinical trial. *J Man Manip Ther*. 2008;16(4):238-247.
15. Struyf F, Nijs J, Mollekens S, et al. Scapular-focused treatment in patients with shoulder impingement syndrome: a randomized clinical trial. *Clin Rheumatol*. 2013;32(1): 73-85.
16. Bang MD, Deyle GD. Comparison of supervised exercise with and without manual physical therapy for patients with shoulder impingement syndrome. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*. 2000;30(3):126-137.
17. Phadke V, Makhija M, Singh H. The use of evidence-based practices for the management of shoulder impingement syndrome among Indian physical therapists: a cross-sectional survey. *Braz J Phys Ther*. 2015;19(6):473-481.
18. De Mey K, Danneels L, Cagnie B, Cools AM. Scapular muscle rehabilitation exercises in overhead athletes with impingement symptoms: effect of a 6-week training program on muscle recruitment and functional outcome. *Am J Sports Med*. 2012;40(8):1906-1915.
19. Lucado AM. Scapular muscle imbalance: implications for shoulder pain and pathology. *Phys Ther Rev*. 2011;16(5): 356-364.

20. Moeller CR, Bliven KC, Valier AR. Scapular muscle-activation ratios in patients with shoulder injuries during functional shoulder exercises. *J Athl Train*. 2014;49(3):345-355.
21. Worsley P, Warner M, Mottram S, et al. Motor control retraining exercises for shoulder impingement: effects on function, muscle activation, and biomechanics in young adults. *J Shoulder Elb Surg*. 2013;22(4):e11-e19.
22. Ludewig PM, Cook TM. Alterations in shoulder kinematics and associated muscle activity in people with symptoms of shoulder impingement. *Phys Ther*. 2000;80(3):276-291.
23. Roy JS, Moffet H, Hébert LJ, Lirette R. Effect of motor control and strengthening exercises on shoulder function in persons with impingement syndrome: a single-subject study design. *Man Ther*. 2009;14(2):180-188.
24. Kamkar A, Irrgang JJ, Whitney SL. Nonoperative management of secondary shoulder impingement syndrome. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*. 1993;17(5):212-224.
25. Alizadehkhayat O, Fisher AC, Kemp GJ, Vishwanathan K, Frostick SP. Assessment of functional recovery in tennis elbow. *J Electromyogr Kinesiol*. 2009;19(4):631-638.
26. Page P, Frank CC, Lardner R. *Assessment and Treatment of Muscle Imbalance: The Janda Approach*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics; 2010.
27. McMullen J, Uhl TL. A kinetic chain approach for shoulder rehabilitation. *J Athl Train*. 2000;35(3):329-337.
28. Kobesova A, Dzvonik J, Kolar P, Sardina A, Anel R. Effects of shoulder girdle dynamic stabilization exercise on hand muscle strength. *Isokinet Exerc Sci*. 2015;23(1):21-32.
29. Horsley I, Herrington L, Hoyle R, Prescott E, Bellamy N. Do changes in hand grip strength correlate with shoulder rotator cuff function? *Should Elb*. 2016;8(2):124-129.
30. Sporrang H, Palmerud G, Herberts P. Hand grip increases shoulder muscle activity, an EMG analysis with static hand contractions in 9 subjects. *Acta Orthop Scand*. 1996;67(5):485-490.
31. Karanicolas PJ, Bhandari M, Kreder H, et al. Evaluating agreement: conducting a reliability study. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 2009;91(suppl 3):99-106.
32. Coldham F, Lewis J, Lee H. The reliability of one vs. three grip trials in symptomatic and asymptomatic subjects. *J Hand Ther*. 2006;19(3):318-326 quiz 327.
33. Sim J, Wright C. *Research in Health Care: Concepts, Designs and Methods*. Cheltenham, Great Britain: Stanley Thornes (Publishers) Ltd; 2000.
34. Streiner DL, Norman GR. *Health Measurement Scales: A Practical Guide to Their Development and Use*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press; 2003.
35. Hicks C. *Research Methods for Clinical Therapists: Applied Project Design and Analysis*. Edinburgh; New York: Churchill Livingstone; 2004.
36. Cardarelli R, Seater MM. Evidence-based medicine, part 4. An introduction to critical appraisal of articles on harm. *J Am Osteopath Assoc*. 2007;107(8):310-314.
37. Camargo PR, Albuquerque-Sendin F, Avila MA, Haik MN, Vieira A, Salvini TF. Effects of stretching and strengthening exercises, with and without manual therapy, on scapular kinematics, function, and pain in individuals with shoulder impingement: a randomized controlled trial. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*. 2015;45(12):984-997.
38. Ellenbecker TS, Cools A. Rehabilitation of shoulder impingement syndrome and rotator cuff injuries: an evidence-based review. *Br J Sports Med*. 2010;44(5):319-327.
39. Kaya E, Zinnuroglu M, Tugcu I. Kinesio taping compared to physical therapy modalities for the treatment of shoulder impingement syndrome. *Clin Rheumatol*. 2011;30(2):201-207.
40. Walter SD, Eliasziw M, Donner A. Sample size and optimal designs for reliability studies. *Stat Med*. 1998;17(1):101-110.
41. Donner A, Eliasziw M. Sample size requirements for reliability studies. *Stat Med*. 1987;6(4):441-448.
42. Bechtol CO. Grip test; the use of a dynamometer with adjustable handle spacings. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 1954;36-A(4):820-824.
43. Roberts HC, Denison HJ, Martin HJ, et al. A review of the measurement of grip strength in clinical and epidemiological studies: towards a standardised approach. *Age Ageing*. 2011;40(4):423-429.
44. Peolsson A, Hedlund R, Oberg B. Intra- and inter-tester reliability and reference values for hand strength. *J Rehabil Med*. 2001;33(1):36-41.
45. Villafañe JH, Valdes K, Vanti C, Pillastrini P, Borboni A. Reliability of handgrip strength test in elderly subjects with unilateral thumb carpometacarpal osteoarthritis. *Hand (N Y)*. 2015;10(2):205-209.
46. Savva C, Karagiannis C, Rushton A. Test-retest reliability of grip strength measurement in full elbow extension to evaluate maximum grip strength. *J Hand Surg Eur Vol*. 2013;38(2):183-186.
47. American Society of Hand Therapists. *Clinical Assessment Recommendations*. Chicago, IL: The Society; 1992.
48. Mathiowetz V, Weber K, Volland G, Kashman N. Reliability and validity of grip and pinch strength evaluations. *J Hand Surg [Am]*. 1984;9(2):222-226.
49. Hogrel JY. Grip strength measured by high precision dynamometry in healthy subjects from 5 to 80 years. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*. 2015;16:139.
50. Villafañe JH, Valdes K, Buraschi R, Martinelli M, Bissolotti L, Negrini S. Reliability of the handgrip strength test in elderly subjects with Parkinson disease. *Hand (N Y)*. 2016;11(1):54-58.
51. Savva C, Giakas G, Efstathiou M, Karagiannis C. Test-retest reliability of handgrip strength measurement using a hydraulic hand dynamometer in patients with cervical radiculopathy. *J Manip Physiol Ther*. 2014;37(3):206-210.
52. Shechtman O, Gestewitz L, Kimble C. Reliability and validity of the DynEx dynamometer. *J Hand Ther*. 2005;18(3):339-347.
53. Bartlett JW, Frost C. Reliability, repeatability and reproducibility: analysis of measurement errors in continuous variables. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol*. 2008;31(4):466-475.
54. Shrout PE. Measurement reliability and agreement in psychiatry. *Stat Methods Med Res*. 1998;7(3):301-317.
55. Myles PS, Cui J. Using the Bland-Altman method to measure agreement with repeated measures. *Br J Anaesth*. 2007;99(3):309-311.
56. Bland JM, Altman DG. Statistical methods for assessing agreement between two methods of clinical measurement. *Lancet*. 1986;1(8476):307-310.
57. Mitsionis G, Pakos EE, Stafilas KS, Paschos N, Papakostas T, Beris AE. Normative data on hand grip strength in a Greek adult population. *Int Orthop*. 2009;33(3):713-717.
58. Clerke AM, Clerke JP, Adams RD. Effects of hand shape on maximal isometric grip strength and its reliability in teenagers. *J Hand Ther*. 2005;18(1):19-29.
59. Ng GYF, Fan ACC. Does elbow position affect strength and reproducibility of power grip measurements? *Physiotherapy*. 2001;87(2):68-72.
60. Hamilton GF, McDonald C, Chenier TC. Measurement of grip strength: validity and reliability of the sphygmomanometer and jamar grip dynamometer. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*. 1992;16(5):215-219.