## Results Table

### Biofeedback – Upper Extremity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author, Year</th>
<th>PEDro Score, Country</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Outcome and significance:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Basmajian et al. 1982 | PEDro score: 6 | 6 | EMG/Biofeedback Therapy vs. Physical Therapy using neurophysiological approach | (-) Upper Extremity Function Test  
(-) Minnesota Rate of Manipulation Test  
(-) Nine Hole Peg Test |
| Basmajian et al. 1987 | PEDro score: 6 | 6 | EMG/Biofeedback Therapy vs. Physical Therapy using neurofacilitatory | (-) Upper Extremity Function Test  
(-) Finger Oscillation test |
| Crow et al. 1989 | PEDro score: 8 | 8 | EMG/Biofeedback Therapy vs. Sham EMG/biofeedback | (+) Action Research Arm Test *  
(+ Brunnstrom-Fugl Meyer Test * |
| Greenberg et al. 1980 | PEDro score: 5 | 5 | EMG/Biofeedback vs. Conventional Occupational Therapy | (-) Active elbow extension measured using a goniometer |
| Hurd et al. 1980 | PEDro score: 6 | 6 | Actual myofeedback vs. simulated myofeedback | (-) Active and passive range of motion measured in degrees  
(-) Maximum electrical activity of the muscle contracted alone in millivolts |
| Prevo et al. 1982 | PEDro score: 3 | 3 | EMG/Biofeedback Therapy vs. Conventional Therapy | (-) Performance of isolated voluntary movements  
(-) Arm and the hand function |