Published in final edited form as:

Gait Posture. 2019 January ; 67: 9–11. doi:10.1016/j.gaitpost.2018.08.038.

Children with Autism Spectrum Disorder, Developmental Coordination Disorder, and typical development differ in characteristics of dynamic postural control: a preliminary study

Haylie L. Miller, Ph.D.¹, Priscila Caçola, Ph.D.², Gabriela Sherrod, B.S.¹, Rita M. Patterson, Ph.D.³, and Nicoleta L. Bugnariu, PT, Ph.D.¹

¹Department of Physical Therapy, University of North Texas Health Science Center, 3500 Camp Bowie Blvd., Fort Worth, TX, 76107, USA

²Department of Kinesiology, University of Texas at Arlington, 701 S. Nedderman Dr., Arlington, TX, 76019, USA

³Department of Family Medicine, University of North Texas Health Science Center, 3500 Camp Bowie Blvd., Fort Worth, TX, 76107, USA

Abstract

Background:

Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) and Developmental Coordination Disorder (DCD) are developmental disorders with distinct definitions and symptoms. However, both conditions share difficulties with motor skills, including impairments in postural control. While studies have explored postural sway variables in children with DCD and ASD as compared to typical development (TD), few have used kinematic data to assess the magnitude of differences between these two neurodevelopmental conditions. There are few sensitive and specific measures available to assess balance impairment severity in these populations.

Keywords

Autism Spectrum Disorder; Developmental Coordination Disorder; dynamic postural control; center of pressure; virtual environment; children

1. Introduction

Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) and Developmental Coordination Disorder (DCD) share similar behavioral and motor symptoms, but are not commonly studied together (Caçola,

Corresponding Author: Haylie L. Miller, Ph.D., Assistant Professor, Department of Physical Therapy, University of North Texas Health Science Center, (817) 735-7602, Haylie.Miller@unthsc.edu.

⁷-Conflict of Interest Statement

Declarations of interest: None

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Miller, & Williamson, 2017). Children with ASD and DCD have poor postural control compared to TD children (Lim et al., 2017; Wilson et al., 2012), and are at higher fall and injury risk (Jain et al., 2014; Fong, Tsang, & Ng, 2012). Postural control depends on visuomotor integration—the use of visual information to guide motor action (Assaiante & Amblard, 1992; Bertenthal, Rose, & Bai, 1997). Here, we examined differences in dynamic postural control in children with ASD and DCD. We used a novel task (Miller et al., 2017) that requires online use of visual feedback to support dynamic postural control.

This study provides a starting point for a new line of work using kinematic data to discriminate between the specific profiles of ASD, DCD, and TD. We compared acceleration and velocity of center of pressure (CoP), in these three groups. We expected differences in stability between the clinical groups and TD, and also that ASD and DCD would differ significantly from TD.

2. Method

2.1 Participants

This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of North Texas Health Science Center, and all parents gave informed consent prior to their children participating. We tested 10 children with ASD (9 male; $M_{age} = 13.00$, $SD_{age} = 2.54$, $range = 9–16$), 8 age-matched controls (4 male; $M_{age} = 10.20$, $SD_{age} = 3.41$, $range = 7–18$), and 10 children with DCD (9 male; $M_{age} = 9.30$, $SD_{age} = 1.25$, $range = 6–14$). ASD and DCD participants carried a prior diagnosis based on DSM-IV or DSM-V criteria (APA, 2000; 2013) and these were confirmed by the research team. The groups did not differ in mean full-scale IQ (ASD = 98.30, DCD = 104.40, TD = 114.13, $F(2, 25) = 2.76$, $p = 0.08$). Participants had IQ scores > 69 and no history of seizure disorders, neurological abnormalities, or current use of medications known to impair motor function. Those with a first-degree relative with ASD were ineligible for the TD group.

2.2 Apparatus & Procedures

The apparatus is represented in Figure 1, and procedures are described in detail elsewhere (Miller et al., 2017). We used a visual tracking task requiring participants to shift their center of pressure (CoP) to match the dynamic position of a user-controlled object. The target oscillated right and left at 8 frequencies (0.1–0.8 Hz) in a fixed randomized sequence. Each frequency was presented twice, for 5 seconds each time, and target frequency changed without warning. The task lasted 1 m 20 sec in total. We calculated CoP—the point at which ground reaction force is applied on the force plate—velocity and acceleration in the medial-lateral (side-to-side) and anterior-posterior (front-to-back) directions at each frequency. Higher velocity indicated fast movement; higher acceleration indicated less-fluid movement.

3. Results

3.1 Multivariate Model

We used multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) to test group differences in CoP accuracy (deviation from target), velocity (medial-lateral and anterior-posterior) and

acceleration (medial-lateral and anterior-posterior). There was a significant effect of Group, $F(8, 46) = 5.93$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = 0.51$, observed power = 0.99 in the multivariate model (see Table 1 for means and standard deviations). The between-subjects effect of group was significant for medial-lateral and anterior-posterior velocity and acceleration (all univariate $ps < .001$).

3.2 CoP Velocity

The between-subjects effect of Group was significant for CoP velocity in both the medial-lateral and anterior-posterior directions, $F(2, 25) = 16.01$ and 19.93 , $ps < .001$, $\eta^2s = 0.56$ and 0.62 . The ASD group had lower medial-lateral CoP velocity than the TD ($p = 0.02$, $M_{Diff} = 0.12$, $SE = 0.04$) or DCD ($p < .001$, $M_{Diff} = 0.22$, $SE = 0.04$) groups. The DCD and TD groups did not differ ($p = 0.09$). For the anterior-posterior direction, both the TD ($p = 0.002$, $M_{Diff} = 0.23$, $SE = 0.06$) and ASD ($p < .001$, $M_{Diff} = 0.33$, $SE = 0.05$) groups had higher CoP velocity than the DCD group, but did not differ from each other ($p = 0.22$).

3.3 CoP Acceleration

The between-subjects effect of Group was significant for CoP acceleration in both the medial-lateral and anterior-posterior directions, $F(2, 25) = 18.03$ and 21.37 , $ps < .001$, $\eta^2s = 0.59$ and 0.63 (Figure 2).

The ASD group had lower medial-lateral CoP acceleration than the TD ($p = 0.01$, $M_{Diff} = 27.30$, $SE = 8.71$) or DCD ($p < .001$, $M_{Diff} = 49.25$, $SE = 8.22$) groups. The medial-lateral CoP acceleration of the DCD group was marginally higher than the TD group ($p = 0.056$, $M_{Diff} = 21.95$, $SE = 8.71$). For the anterior-posterior direction, both the TD ($p = 0.001$, $M_{Diff} = 47.68$, $SE = 11.35$) and ASD ($p < .001$, $M_{Diff} = 68.45$, $SE = 10.70$) groups had lower CoP acceleration than the DCD group, but did not differ from each other ($p = 0.24$).

4. Discussion

Our preliminary results suggest that children with ASD and DCD differ in the speed profile of their movement during a dynamic postural control task. Consistently higher accelerations in the DCD group reflected a lack of fluidity to their movements. Non-fluid movements require greater energy expenditure and more corrections to over- and under-shoots than micro-accelerations used to make smaller, more fluid adjustments to CoP.

Movement patterns observed in our DCD group seem to support the *poor internal modeling hypothesis* (Kashiwagi et al., 2009)—that children with DCD can produce motor plans, but not effectively modify them. When tasks require rapid adaptation, slower feedback mechanisms are insufficient (Wilson, Smits-Engelsman, Caeyenberghs, & Steenbergen, 2017), and anticipatory control of CoP is necessary to overcome response latency.

In contrast, the ASD group had lower medial-lateral accelerations, reflecting slower, more fluid patterns of movement. This is equally inefficient, but may stem from different mechanisms than those impaired in DCD. Prior work identified increased signaling latencies in sensory networks (Roberts et al., 2010) perhaps due to decreased white matter integrity (Deoni et al., 2015). This may slow motor network signaling in ASD (e.g., Travers et al.,

2015), rendering anticipatory *and* feedback mechanisms inefficient in motor plan modification.

CoP acceleration and velocity may be a sensitive and specific means of differentiating between ASD, DCD, and TD. While the small sample size limits generalizability and complex statistical modeling, clear patterns of group differences can inform future work. The patterns observed in our study highlight the potential utility of kinematic data from dynamic tasks in lieu of traditional quiet standing. Demands on visuomotor integration inherent to this type of task may illuminate an aspect of motor difficulty not previously explored in DCD and ASD.

Our preliminary findings lay new groundwork for an alternative approach to assessing postural control in DCD and ASD. These data represent an important step toward understanding how children modify motor plans during dynamic tasks, which more closely mirror everyday tasks demands. If future studies can establish that CoP acceleration patterns identified in our data are defining characteristics of postural control in DCD and ASD, these findings could inform development of more targeted diagnostic and therapeutic approaches.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the UNTHSC Human Movement Performance Laboratory team and the families who generously gave their time and energy to participate.

Funding:

This work was supported by the National Institutes of Health [KL2-TR001103; K01-MH107774] and the National Science Foundation [SMA-1514495].

References

- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (5th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- American Psychiatric Association. (2000). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (4th ed., Text Revision). Washington, DC: Author.
- Assaiante C, & Amblard B (1992). Peripheral vision and age-related differences in dynamic balance. *Human Movement Science*, 11(5), 533–548.
- Baio J, Wiggins L, Christensen DL, et al. (2018). Prevalence of Autism Spectrum Disorder among children aged 8 years—Autism and Developmental Disabilities Monitoring Network, 11 Sites, United States, 2014. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report Surveillance Summaries*, 67(SS-6), 1–23.
- Bertenthal BI, Rose JL, & Bai DL (1997). Perception-action coupling in the development of visual control of posture. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 23(6), 1631–1643. [PubMed: 9425672]
- Biotteau M, Chaix Y, Blais M, Tallet J, Péran P, & Albaret J-M (2016). Neural Signature of DCD: A critical review of MRI neuroimaging studies. *Frontiers in Neurology*, 7(227), 1–17. [PubMed: 26834696]
- Butz SM, Sweeney JK, Roberts PL, & Rauh MJ (2015). Relationships among age, gender, anthropometric characteristics, and dynamic balance in children 5 to 12 years old. *Pediatric Physical Therapy*, 27(2), 126–133. [PubMed: 25695196]
- Çağola P, Miller HL, & Williamson PO (2017). Behavioral comparisons in Autism Spectrum Disorder and Developmental Coordination Disorder: A systematic literature review. *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders*, 38, 6–18. [PubMed: 29057009]

- Debye M, Leclef F, Mazzaro M, Vanderveken C, De Siati D, & Deggouj N (2016). Maturation of the postural control in healthy children. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, 46(4–5), 253.
- Deoni SC, Zinkstok JR, Daly E, Ecker C, MRC AIMS Consortium, Williams SC, & Murphy DG (2015). White-matter relaxation time and myelin water fraction differences in young adults with autism. *Psychological Medicine*, 45(4), 795–805. [PubMed: 25111948]
- Fong SSM, Tsang WWN, & Ng GYF (2012). Altered postural control strategies and sensory organization in children with developmental coordination disorder. *Human Movement Science*, 31(5), 1317–1327. [PubMed: 22221468]
- Kashiwagi M, Iwaki S, Narumi Y, Tamai H, & Suzuki S (2009). Parietal dysfunction in developmental coordination disorder: a functional MRI study. *Neuroreport*, 20(15), 1319–24. [PubMed: 19730138]
- Jain A, Spencer D, Yang W, Kelly JP, Newschaffer CJ, Johnson J, . . . Dennen T (2014). Injuries among children with autism spectrum disorder. *Academic Pediatrics*, 14(4), 390–397. [PubMed: 24976351]
- Lim YH, Partridge K, Girdler S, Morris SL (2017). Standing postural control in individuals with Autism Spectrum Disorder: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 47(7), 2238–2253. [PubMed: 28508177]
- Loomes R, Hull L, & Mandy WPL (2017). What is the male-to-female ratio in Autism Spectrum Disorder? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 56(6), 466–474. [PubMed: 28545751]
- Miller HL, Patterson R, Wijayasinghe I, Popa D, & Bugnariu NL (2017). Development of a novel visuomotor integration paradigm by integrating a virtual environment with mobile eye-tracking and motion-capture systems. *IEEE Proceedings of the International Conference on Virtual Rehabilitation* doi: 10.1109/ICVR.2017.8007481
- Missiuna C, Gaines R, Soucie H, & McLean J (2006). Parental questions about developmental coordination disorder: A synopsis of current evidence. *Paediatrics & Child Health*, 11(8), 507–512. [PubMed: 19030319]
- Roberts TPL, Kahn SY, Rey M, Monroe JF, Cannon K, Blaskey L . . . & Edgar JC (2010). MEG detection of delayed auditory evoked responses in autism spectrum disorders: Towards an imaging biomarker for autism. *Autism Research*, 3(1), 8–18. [PubMed: 20063319]
- Smith AW, Ulmer FF, & Wong DP (2012). Gender differences in postural stability among children. *Journal of Human Kinetics*, 33, 25–32. [PubMed: 23487417]
- Travers BG, Bigler ED, Tromp DPM, Adluru N, Destiche D, Samsin D, . . . Lainhart JE (2015). Brainstem white matter predicts individual differences in manual motor difficulties and symptom severity in autism. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 45(9), 3030–3040. [PubMed: 26001365]
- Wechsler D (2011). *Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence—Second Edition (WASI-II)* San Antonio, TX: NCS Pearson.
- Wilson PH, Smits-Engelsman B, Caeyenberghs K, & Steenbergen B (2017). Toward a hybrid model of Developmental Coordination Disorder. *Current Developmental Disorders Reports*, 4(3), 64–71.
- Wilson PH, Ruddock S, Smits-Engelsman B, Polatajko H, Blank R (2012). Understanding performance deficits in developmental coordination disorder: a meta-analysis of recent research. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology*, 55(3), 217–228. [PubMed: 23106668]

Research Highlights

- ASD and DCD share similar difficulty with motor control.
- This study found differences in acceleration profiles between ASD, DCD, and TD.
- Children with DCD had less fluid movement than children with ASD or TD.
- Characteristics of dynamic postural control may inform more targeted interventions.

Figure 1. Participant completing the study task in the CAREN system, with the blue disc representing the target object, and the silver disc representing the participant's user-controlled object.

Figure 2.

Mean medial-lateral (M-L) and anterior-posterior (A-P) center of pressure (CoP) acceleration differs by group. For both the M-L and A-P directions, DCD group accelerations were significantly higher, and ASD group accelerations were significantly lower. Vertical bars show standard errors. Note: ASD = Autism Spectrum Disorder, TD = Typical Development, DCD = Developmental Coordination Disorder; * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001, † p = 0.056.

Table 1Means (*M*) and Standard Deviations (*SD*) for Center of Pressure (CoP) Velocity and Acceleration by Group

	Group	Medial-Lateral		Anterior-Posterior	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
CoP Velocity	TD	0.26	0.07	0.25	0.09
	ASD	0.13	0.03	0.14	0.06
	DCD	0.35	0.12	0.47	0.18
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
CoP Acceleration	TD	43.66	16.84	43.98	17.76
	ASD	16.37	7.34	23.20	12.27
	DCD	65.61	25.75	91.65	34.56