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Objectives: At the conclusion of this presentation, the learner will be able to:
- Evaluate different modes of technology used to improve participation in daily occupations with individuals with high-level spinal cord injury (SCI)
- Integrate current evidence into clinical practice
- Discuss implications for future practice, research, and education

PICO: Does the use of technology in individuals with cervical and thoracic level spinal cord injuries improve participation in daily occupations?

Methods:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cervical SCI, thoracic SCI, tetraplegia, quadriplegia</td>
<td>FES, robotic, OT, eye gaze, hand, grasp, neuroprostheses, technology</td>
<td>Function, participation, social, leisure, work, ADL, occupation, driving, QOL, self-care, activity, upper limb, upper extremity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Search Limitations: English language, human subjects, adolescents and adults, published 2000-2013

Databases Used: PubMed and CINAHL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Exclusion Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Cervical and thoracic level injuries</td>
<td>- Paraplegia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Upper extremity interventions</td>
<td>- Co-morbid physical disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Functional electrical stimulation (FES)</td>
<td>- Only incomplete injuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Neuroprostheses</td>
<td>- Interventions related to mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Electronic aids to daily living (EADL)</td>
<td>- Pediatric populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Functional activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Final Article Count Based on Inclusion & Exclusion Criteria: 14

Qualitative article critical review form: Letts et al., 2007
Quantitative article critical review form: Law et al., 1998

Results & Clinical Significance:

Surface FES
- Improved performance in communication management, home management, grooming, and feeding$^{1,10,11}$
- Improved performance in leisure participation$^{3,10}$
- Research conflicts on ease of home use$^{3,10}$

Implanted FES
- Improved participation in feeding and grooming$^{7,12,13,14}$
- Improved participation in communication and home management$^{7,12,13,15}$
- Improved performance satisfaction in meaningful activities$^{7,12,13,14,15}$

EADL
- Increased independence in ADLs, leisure participation and comfort in the home$^{4,6,16}$
- Improved perception of self-efficacy, competency, adaptability, and self-esteem$^{4,16}$
- Reduced caregiver utilization and/or paid assistance$^{5,8,16}$

ASIBOT
- Improved participation in drinking and brushing teeth$^{17}$

Tooth-click technology
- TC provided faster and more reliable clicks than speech recognition
- Persons with tetraplegia performed better with TC/OHM than TC/GHM- explanation is unknown$^{18}$
### Implications:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Implementation of implanted and surface FES in individuals with spinal cord injuries increase participation in ADLs</td>
<td>- Higher level of research to support use of technology in rehabilitation</td>
<td>- Explore training options to use various types of technology in practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Use of surface FES, implanted FES, and EADLs increases participation in IADLs</td>
<td>- Exploration of additional types of technology</td>
<td>- Provide patient and caregiver education on available technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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