

Letter to the Editor

Remote Administration of the MDS-UPDRS in the Time of COVID-19 and Beyond

Ruth B. Schneider^{a,b,*}, Taylor L. Myers^b, Christopher G. Tarolli^{a,b}, Katherine Amodio^a,
Jamie L. Adams^{a,b}, Stella Jensen-Roberts^b and E. Ray Dorsey^{a,b}

^a*Department of Neurology, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY, USA*

^b*Center for Health + Technology, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY, USA*

Accepted 28 June 2020

Keywords: Parkinson's disease, telemedicine, coronavirus

The COVID-19 pandemic has disrupted clinical research. Recognizing the importance of participant and research personnel safety, funding and regulatory agencies have issued guidance encouraging temporary modifications to research studies including a shift to remote assessments [1–3]. In the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic, the appeal of conducting remote research visits for individuals with Parkinson's disease (PD) is clear.

Operations for virtual PD research studies [4, 5], have been able to continue seamlessly. In contrast, in-person research studies have had to contend with missed or incomplete visits. In this personal viewpoint, we offer our perspective on remote Movement Disorder Society - Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale (MDS-UPDRS) motor assessment [6], for those considering or in the process of transitioning to remote video-based visits.

The feasibility of conducting a modified version of the MDS-UPDRS motor, without assessment of rigidity or postural stability [7], has been previously

demonstrated [8–10]; however, it has not been adequately validated against in-person assessment. A secondary analysis of clinical trial data (CALM-PD), which compared a modified Unified Parkinson Disease Rating Scale (UPDRS) motor to the standard UPDRS motor, concluded that the modified version would be cross-sectionally and longitudinally reliable [11]. Direct comparison of in-home, video-based versus in-person administration of the modified UPDRS motor demonstrated moderate overall agreement [8]. In a small study that compared in-person and video-based modified MDS-UPDRS motor assessment, median difference in scores was 3.0 (IQR 1.5–9.0) [12]. Of concern, lower extremity tremor could not be assessed in 10/11 participants. In a recently completed study embedded within a phase 3 clinical trial, 38 participants underwent remote assessment within 4 weeks of in-person assessment [13]. The correlation between the remote and in-person MDS-UPDRS motor was moderate (ICC=0.51), with lower correlations likely driven by completion by different examiners. Critically, no means for direct comparison of remote and in-person MDS-UPDRS motor scores exists, making interpretation of longitudinal data problematic [13]. The inability to assess rigidity

*Correspondence to: Ruth B. Schneider, MD, 265 Crittenden Blvd, Box MIND, Rochester, NY 14642, USA. Tel.: +1 585 273 1856; E-mail: Ruth_schneider@urmc.rochester.edu.

56 and postural instability impedes such direct com- 108
57 parison and complete phenotypic characterization. 109
58 Efforts are underway to validate the modified MDS- 110
59 UPDRS motor [4]. 111

60 Collectively, the authors have conducted hundreds 112
61 of remote MDS-UPDRS motor assessments of indi- 113
62 viduals at-risk for and with PD of different stages 114
63 of disease. We can confidently speak to the feasi- 115
64 bility and safety of conducting remote assessments. 116
65 We take precautions to minimize the risk of falls, 117
66 including requesting participants walk with their 118
67 assistive device (when applicable) and deferring gait 119
68 assessment when prudent. We collect the partici- 120
69 pant's location at the time of the visit in case of 121
70 emergency. Over two years, we conducted over 550 122
71 remote visits with PD participants across three sepa- 123
72 rate research studies [4, 5, 14]. We had one fall, which 124
73 occurred outside administration of the MDS-UPDRS 125
74 in a participant who experienced falls on a daily 126
75 basis and have never contacted emergency services. 127
76 Excluding rigidity and postural instability items, we 128
77 have been able to rate 98.3% (15,179/15,444) of 129
78 items with assessment of toe tapping, lower extremity 130
79 rest tremor, and leg agility most commonly missed. 131
80 Remote MDS-UPDRS assessment is safe and feasi- 132
81 ble. 133

82 However, several factors can affect the accuracy of 134
83 remote assessment. Environmental factors (lighting, 135
84 background, space) can reduce or prohibit assessment 136
85 of certain elements. With in-person visits, examiners 137
86 can easily visualize the entire body throughout the 138
87 visit, which enables accurate assessment of global 139
88 bradykinesia and rest tremor. To achieve this during a 140
89 remote visit, the camera should be approximately 6–8 141
90 feet from the participant. However, this is often not 142
91 possible. Moreover, evaluation at this distance may 143
92 impede assessment of hypomimia, postural tremor 144
93 and action tremor. Repositioning of the camera and 145
94 participant should be anticipated. In our opinion, 146
95 remote MDS-UPDRS assessment likely underrates 147
96 global bradykinesia and rest tremor. Additionally, 148
97 space may not allow for adequate assessment of gait 149
98 and freezing of gait. Technical factors (internet speed, 150
99 quality of connection and camera) can similarly limit 151
100 assessment. Laptops, tablets, and smartphones can be 152
101 easily repositioned whereas the inability to maneuver 153
102 desktop cameras may impede assessment of lower 154
103 extremities. Subtle bradykinesia or tremor can be 155
104 difficult to appreciate remotely, even under ideal con- 156
105 ditions. A poor connection can make assessment 157
106 more challenging, but may be helped by closer prox-
107 imity to the internet router.

Participant factors (age, access/familiarity with 108
technology, disease stage, cognitive status) can 109
present additional challenges. In our experience, 110
remote visits can be successfully conducted among 111
older individuals and those with substantial disabili- 112
ty [15] and may be even more valuable among 113
this group given their travel-related challenges and 114
higher risk for worse outcomes with COVID-19 [16]. 115
To improve participant comfort and the likelihood 116
of success, adequate preparation is critical. In test 117
visits, coordinators can explain how to connect, deter- 118
mine the ideal set-up, and review the evaluations. 119
The inclusion of care partners in visits can also 120
help mitigate some of these issues and their partici- 121
pation should be encouraged for participants with 122
more advanced disease. Lastly, investigator factors 123
(familiarity with the technology and with remote 124
examination) can impact assessment. Investigators, 125
even those well-experienced, should be trained on 126
remote assessment by viewing sample recordings of 127
remote MDS-UPDRS examinations and shadowing 128
a live visit. To assist researchers, we have made 129
the protocol and model consent form for one of 130
our virtual studies (AT-HOME PD) freely available 131
(<https://www.athomepd.org/professionals>). 132

Clinical researchers must find a way to safely 133
continue important research during the COVID- 134
19 pandemic. While remote MDS-UPDRS motor 135
assessment presents some challenges, many of these 136
can be mitigated, and in our opinion, remote assess- 137
ment is appropriate for many on-going research 138
studies. However, the specifics of the research should 139
guide this decision; we would not recommend remote 140
MDS-UPDRS motor assessment for a treatment trial 141
in which it is the primary outcome measure. One 142
viable alternative is the remote assessment of patient- 143
reported outcomes. Digital tools, such as wearable 144
sensors, which can provide objective, real-world 145
data have enormous potential as surrogate outcome 146
measures and may ultimately supplant remote MDS- 147
UPDRS assessment. More work is needed to validate 148
remote MDS-UPDRS motor assessment; however, 149
we anticipate that one long-term effect of the COVID- 150
19 pandemic will be that more researchers will 151
embrace the use of video-based visits and digital 152
tools. 153

154 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This commentary is based on research funded by 155
the National Institutes of Health and Michael J. Fox 156
Foundation for Parkinson's research. 157

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors have no conflicts of interest to report.

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURES (PRIOR 12 MONTHS)

Ruth B. Schneider is employed by the University of Rochester and has received grants and research support from National Institutes of Health, Michael J. Fox Foundation for Parkinson's Research, Biohaven Pharmaceuticals, Acadia Pharmaceuticals, and the CHDI Foundation.

Taylor L. Myers is employed by the University of Rochester and has no disclosures.

Christopher G. Tarolli is employed by the University of Rochester and has received honoraria from the American Academy of Neurology and the Davis Phinney Foundation. He has received grants and research support from National Institutes of Health, Michael J. Fox Foundation for Parkinson's Research, American Academy of Neurology Institute, Biosensics, and Greater Rochester Health Foundation.

Katherine Amodeo is employed by the University of Rochester and has received grants and research support from the Michael J Fox Edmund J. Safra Fellowship in Movement Disorders from July 2017–July 2019. She is an investigator and/or medical monitor for clinical trials supported by Genentech Roche Ltd, EIP Pharma Inc, Michael J. Fox foundation for Parkinson's Research, National Institutes of Health, Acadia Pharmaceuticals, and Biogene.

Jamie L. Adams is employed by the University of Rochester and has consulted for VisualDx. She has received honoraria from Huntington Study Group and grants and research support from National Institutes of Health, Michael J. Fox Foundation for Parkinson's Research, Biogen, Safra Foundation, and Empire Clinical Research Investigator Program.

Stella Jensen-Roberts is employed by the University of Rochester and has no disclosures.

Earl R. Dorsey is employed by the University of Rochester and has ownership interests in Grand Rounds, an online second opinion service. He has consulted for 23 and Me, Abbott, Abbvie, Amwell, Biogen, Clintrex, CuraSen, DeciBio, Denali Therapeutics, GlaxoSmithKline, Grand Rounds, Huntington Study Group, Informa Pharma Consulting, medical-legal services, Mednick Associates, Medopad, Olson Research Group, Origent Data Sciences, Inc., Pear Therapeutics, Prilenia, Roche,

Sanofi, Shire, Spark Therapeutics, Sunovion Pharmaceuticals, Voyager Therapeutics, and ZS Consulting. He has received honoraria from Alzheimer's Drug Discovery Foundation, American Academy of Neurology, American Neurological Association, California Pacific Medical Center, Excellus BlueCross BlueShield, Food and Drug Administration, MCM Education, Michael J. Fox Foundation, Stanford University, UC Irvine, and University of Michigan. He has received grants and research support from Abbvie, Acadia Pharmaceuticals, AMC Health, BioSensics, Burroughs Wellcome Fund, Greater Rochester Health Foundation, Huntington Study Group, Michael J. Fox Foundation, National Institutes of Health, Nuredis, Inc., Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute, Pfizer, Photopharmics, Roche, and Safra Foundation.

REFERENCES

- [1] Guidance for NIH-funded Clinical Trials and Human Subjects Studies Affected by COVID-19, National Institutes of Health, <https://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-20-087.html>, March 16, 2020, Accessed May 1, 2020.
- [2] U.S. Food and Drug Administration, FDA Guidance on Conduct of Clinical Trials of Medical Products during COVID-19 Public Health Emergency, <https://www.fda.gov/media/136238/download>, March 2020, Accessed May 1, 2020.
- [3] Guidance on the Management of CLinical Trials during the COVID-19 (Coronavirus) Pandemic, https://ec.europa.eu/health/sites/health/files/files/eudralex/vol-10/guidanceclinicaltrials_covid19_en.pdf, April 28, 2020, Accessed May 1, 2020.
- [4] Myers T SR, Anthwal S, Kayson E, Omberg L, Tarolli C, Macklin E, Daeschler M, Dorsey ER, Mangravite L, Schwarzhild M, Simuni T (2019) Assessing tele-health outcomes in multiyear extensions of Parkinson's disease trials (AT-HOME PD): Initiation of a long-term observational study, 5th World Parkinson Congress, Kyoto, Japan: World Parkinson Coalition.
- [5] Myers T SR, Jensen-Roberts S, Rowbotham HM, Luff MK, Chanoff E, Amodeo K, Sharma S, Alcalay RN, Cannon P, Dorsey ER, Holloway R, (2020) Recruitment of a virtual nationwide cohort of LRRK2 G2019S carriers, American Academy of Neurology Annual Meeting, Presented Virtually.
- [6] Goetz CG, Tilley BC, Shaftman SR, Stebbins GT, Fahn S, Martinez-Martin P, Poewe W, Sampaio C, Stern MB, Dodel R, Dubois B, Holloway R, Jankovic J, Kulisevsky J, Lang AE, Lees A, Leurgans S, LeWitt PA, Nyenhuis D, Olanow CW, Rascol O, Schrag A, Teresi JA, van Hilten JJ, LaPelle N, Movement Disorder Society UPDRS Revision Task Force (2008) Movement Disorder Society-sponsored revision of the Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale (MDS-UPDRS): Scale presentation and clinimetric testing results. *Mov Disord* **23**, 2129-2170.

- 261 [7] Goetz CG, Stebbins GT, Luo S (2020) Movement Disorder
262 Society-Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale use in the
263 Covid-19 era. *Mov Disord* **35**, 911. 286
- 264 [8] Cubo E, Gabriel-Galan JM, Martinez JS, Alcubilla CR,
265 Yang C, Arconada OF, Perez NM (2012) Comparison of
266 office-based versus home Web-based clinical assessments
267 for Parkinson's disease. *Mov Disord* **27**, 308-311. 287
- 268 [9] Dorsey ER, Wagner JD, Bull MT, Rizzieri A, Grischkan J,
269 Achey MA, Sherer T, Chowdhury S, Meunier C, Cappel-
270 letti L, Rucker C, Richard IH, Schwarz H, Kang G, Ahmad
271 SH, Biemiller RA, Biglan KM (2015) Feasibility of virtual
272 research visits in Fox Trial Finder. *J Parkinsons Dis* **5**,
273 505-515. 288
- 274 [10] Dorsey ER, Deuel LM, Voss TS, Finnigan K, George BP,
275 Eason S, Miller D, Reminick JI, Appler A, Polanowicz J,
276 Viti L, Smith S, Joseph A, Biglan KM (2010) Increasing
277 access to specialty care: A pilot, randomized controlled trial
278 of telemedicine for Parkinson's disease. *Mov Disord* **25**,
279 1652-1659. 289
- 280 [11] Abdolahi A, Scoglio N, Killoran A, Dorsey ER, Biglan KM
281 (2013) Potential reliability and validity of a modified version
282 of the Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale that could
283 be administered remotely. *Parkinsonism Relat Disord* **19**,
284 218-221. 290
- 285 [12] Stillerova T, Liddle J, Gustafsson L, Lamont R, Silburn
286 P (2016) Remotely assessing symptoms of Parkinson's
287 disease using videoconferencing: A feasibility study. *Neurol
288 Res Int* **2016**, 4802570. 289
- [13] Tarolli CG AK, Bull MT, Goldenthal S, O'Brien M,
290 Simuni T, Zimmerman G, Biglan KM, Dorsey ER, (2020)
291 Virtual research visits in individuals with Parkinson dis-
292 ease enrolled in a clinical trial: REACT-PD Study, American
293 Academy of Neurology Annual Meeting, Presented Virtu-
294 ally. 295
- [14] Schneider RB MT, Daeschler M, Tarolli C, Adams J, Bar-
295 bano R, Riley L, Amondikar N, Auinger P, Diaz M, Dorsey
296 ER, Marras C, Tanner C (2020) Validation of Fox Insight
297 cohort via virtual research visits, American Academy of
298 Neurology Annual Meeting, Presented Virtually. 299
- [15] Tarolli CG, Zimmerman GA, Goldenthal S, Feldman B,
300 Berk S, Siddiqi B, Kopil CM, Chowdhury S, Biglan KM,
301 Dorsey ER, Adams JL (2020) Video research visits for
302 atypical parkinsonian syndromes among Fox Trial Finder
303 participants. *Neurol Clin Pract* **10**, 7-14. 304
- [16] Zhou F, Yu T, Du R, Fan G, Liu Y, Liu Z, Xiang J, Wang
305 Y, Song B, Gu X, Guan L, Wei Y, Li H, Wu X, Xu J, Tu
306 S, Zhang Y, Chen H, Cao B (2020) Clinical course and risk
307 factors for mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in
308 Wuhan, China: A retrospective cohort study. *Lancet* **395**,
309 1054-1062. 310

Uncorrected Author Manuscript