Muscle strength assessment test

Patients who report weakness may mean fatigue, clumsiness, or true muscle weakness. Thus, the examiner must define the precise character of symptoms, including exact location, time of occurrence, precipitating and ameliorating factors, and associated symptoms and signs.Limbs are inspected for weakness (when extended, a weak limb drifts downward), tremor, and other involuntary movements. The strength of specific muscle groups is tested against resistance, and one side of the body is compared with the other. However, pain may preclude a full effort during strength testing.With hysterical or factitious weakness, resistance to movement may be initially normal, followed by a sudden giving way, or patients may not use supporting muscles appropriately. For example, patients with true deltoid weakness use accessory muscles that tilt their trunk and neck away from the weak deltoid because they want to prevent the examiner from overcoming their weakness. In contrast, in patients with factitious deltoid weakness (eg, due to malingering), the shoulder and head tilt toward the weak deltoid as the muscle is overcome, indicating their lack of effort.Subtle weakness may be indicated by decreased arm swing while walking, pronator drift in an outstretched arm, decreased spontaneous use of a limb, an externally rotated leg, slowing of rapid alternating movements, or impairment of fine dexterity (eg, ability to fasten a button, open a safety pin, or remove a match from its box).Strength should be graded. The following scale, originally developed by The Medical Research Council of the United Kingdom, is now used universally:0: No visible muscle contraction1: Visible muscle contraction with no or trace movement2: Limb movement, but not against gravity3: Movement against gravity but not resistance4: Movement against at least some resistance supplied by the examiner5: Full strengthThe difficulty with this and similar scales is the large range in strength possible between grades 4 and 5.Distal strength can be semiquantitatively measured with a handgrip ergometer or with an inflated blood pressure cuff squeezed by the patient.Functional testing often provides a better picture of the relationship between strength and disability. As the patient does various maneuvers, deficiencies are noted and quantified as much as possible (eg, number of squats done or steps climbed). Rising from a squatting position or stepping onto a chair tests proximal leg strength; walking on the heels and on tiptoe tests distal strength. Pushing with the arms to get out of a chair indicates quadriceps weakness. Swinging the body to move the arms indicates shoulder girdle weakness. Rising from the supine position by turning prone, kneeling, and using the hands to climb up the thighs and slowly push erect (Gowers sign) suggests pelvic girdle weakness.(See also How to Assess the Motor System and Introduction to the Neurologic Examination.)Test your KnowledgeTake a Quiz! Muscle strength grading is an essential clinical evaluation tool for assessing motor function. Commonly called manual muscle testing, muscle strength testing, or motor testing, this tool is used by clinicians, nurses, physical therapists, occupational therapists, chiropractors, and other healthcare professionals during orthopedic and neurological evaluations to identify neurological deficits, localized weakness related to musculoskeletal pain, and generalized weakness from deconditioning or aging. While widely accepted, muscle strength grading's reliability varies due to the subjective nature of assessing resistance during testing. Additionally, its applicability is limited in telehealth settings. This article explores these challenges and outlines best practices for improving muscle strength grading accuracy to enhance clinical decision-making and patient outcomes.Muscle strength testing is used to detect weakness, aiding in evaluating neuromuscular, musculoskeletal, and neurological conditions; this testing modality plays a crucial role in diagnosing disorders, tracking disease progression, guiding rehabilitation, and evaluating treatment effectiveness. As a key component of neurological exams, muscle strength testing is especially valuable for patients with stroke, brain injury, spinal cord injury, neuropathy, and amyotrophic lateral sclerosis.The Medical Research Council (MRC) Scale for Muscle Strength is the most widely accepted method of grading muscle strength clinically.[1] This method involves testing key muscles from the upper and lower extremities against the examiner’s resistance and grading the patient’s strength on a 0 to 5 scale, as listed below: 0: No muscle activation1: Trace muscle activation, such as a twitch, without achieving full range of motion2: Muscle activation with gravity eliminated, achieving full range of motion3: Muscle activation against gravity, full range of motion4: Muscle activation against some resistance, full range of motion5: Muscle activation against examiner’s full resistance, full range of motionIn the neurological exam, muscle tests are used to assess spinal nerve function by testing the strength of myotomes—muscle groups innervated by a single spinal nerve root. Testing the strength of these muscle groups gives the clinician insight into the motor status of the associated spinal nerve. The myotomes for assessing the motor function of the C3 through T1 spinal nerves, respectively, include the shoulder abductors, elbow flexors, elbow extensors, wrist extensors, finger flexors, and hand intrinsics. The myotomes for assessing the motor function of L1 through S1 spinal nerves, respectively, include the hip flexors, knee extensors, dorsiflexors, great toe extensors, and plantar flexors. Myotomal testing assists clinicians in detecting spinal cord or nerve root injuries and guides the diagnosis and treatment of neuromuscular conditions. Muscles can also be tested to evaluate individual peripheral nerves. For example, one could test the thumb abductors to evaluate the median nerve and the abductor digiti minimi to evaluate the ulnar nerve.[1][2][3]Muscle strength testing can provide crucial information for accurate differential diagnosis in many clinical scenarios. To differentiate weakness caused by C8-T1 radiculopathy from ulnar neuropathy, assess the strength of specific intrinsic hand muscles. To test these muscles, instruct the patient to abduct the thumb approximately 90° relative to the palm (abductor pollicis brevis) and oppose the thumb to the fifth finger (opponens pollicis). Weakness in these muscles typically suggests C8-T1 radiculopathy, whereas preserved strength indicates ulnar neuropathy.[4] To differentiate foot drop (weakness in foot dorsiflexion) caused by L4-L5 lumbar radiculopathy from common peroneal nerve palsy, assess foot inversion strength. To test foot inversion, instruct the patient to turn the sole of the foot inward against resistance, with the foot slightly plantarflexed. Weakness during foot inversion typically suggests lumbar radiculopathy, whereas preserved strength indicates common peroneal nerve palsy.To ensure accurate muscle strength testing, proper technique is essential. Tight or restrictive clothing should be removed to allow the examiner to see the muscles being tested and observe the quality of muscle contraction. The examiner should stabilize the joint to improve test specificity and prevent compensation from other muscles, compromising the test results.Muscles should first be tested with gravity eliminated by positioning the patient so that muscle contraction and movement occur perpendicular to gravity. If the patient cannot engage the muscle in this position, the examiner should place a hand on the muscle and instruct the patient to contract again, assessing for any palpable muscle twitching. A twitch indicates a strength score of 1, while the absence of movement indicates a score of 0. If the patient achieves full range of motion with gravity eliminated, testing proceeds against gravity. Successfully moving through the full range of motion against gravity earns a score of at least 3. The examiner then applies light manual resistance; if the muscle withstands it, strength is scored as 4. Finally, maximal resistance is applied, and if the muscle maintains control against strong force, it is scored as 5. The unaffected or less affected side should be tested first to establish a baseline for comparison. Assessing all 4 limbs ensures a comprehensive evaluation and aids in diagnosing weakness patterns, such as involvement limited to the upper or lower extremities or affecting proximal muscles rather than distal ones.[3]The MRC method is widely used, easy to perform, and requires no specialized equipment. However, it has limitations. Scoring is subjective, relying on the examiner’s perception, and variability exists in the amount of resistance applied, as examiner strength differs. The test does not account for musculoskeletal conditions like tendinopathy or arthritis that may cause pain or limit movement. Patient effort can also affect accuracy due to pain, comprehension issues, psychological factors, or secondary gain. Additionally, while the grading system categorizes strength levels, it does not provide a direct quantitative measurement of strength.[5]Alternatives to the MRC manual muscle testing system aim to quantify strength in pounds, Newtons, or other units. This requires specialized equipment, most commonly dynamometers. Dynamometry offers a more precise measurement of muscle force and enables the detection of strength changes over time that may not be subjectively recognized using the MRC scale. Hand-grip dynamometry, a widely used method, involves the patient squeezing a handle that measures and records the applied force. Limitations of dynamometry include the need for costly or specialized equipment, limited muscle groups that can be tested, and limited availability of testing equipment to clinicians across specialties or settings.[6]Another method of strength assessment focuses on evaluating the quality of functional movements, such as squatting or performing a step-up. Functional strength tests allow the examiner to assess strength within a natural context—fundamental movement patterns essential for daily activities—a limitation of the MRC method and dynamometry. For example, assessing the performance of the squat corresponds to sit-to-stand transfers, and step-ups aid in evaluating the ability to ascend and descend stairs. However, functional strength tests do not provide a grade or numeric quantity that can be tracked over time to gauge improvement.[6]Muscle strength grading scales may require modifications to accommodate unique patient populations. Pediatric assessments may need to consider developmental stage and cooperation levels, utilizing observational examination methods when necessary. In individuals with significant cognitive impairment or limited comprehension, functional observations of daily tasks and gross motor activities often replace traditional grading methods. Similarly, non-volitional strategies may have higher clinical utility in critical care patients.[7]During muscle strength testing, patients may inadvertently compensate for weak muscles by activating adjacent or stronger muscle groups, known as substitution. Substitution may give a misleading impression of normal strength. To prevent substitution, the examiner must stabilize adjacent joints, position the limb appropriately, and carefully observe or palpate the targeted muscle to confirm its isolated activation during testing.Various alternative muscle strength grading scales—from simplified to more complex—have been proposed to overcome specific limitations of the MRC scale. Simplified scales, such as those reducing the grading categories from 6 to 4, have been designed to enhance consistency in clinicians' assessments, especially in differentiating intermediate strength levels.[8] Conversely, more complex versions incorporate parameters like active range of motion or quantified resistance to capture subtle clinical changes.[9] Despite the potential benefits of more complex systems, they have not gained widespread adoption.Muscle strength testing offers valuable prognostic information, particularly following acute neurological events such as stroke or spinal cord injury where weakness is a key clinical sign. When combined with a thorough neurological examination—including assessments of sensation, reflexes, and coordination—muscle strength testing significantly improves diagnostic accuracy. Early and precise assessment can help forecast recovery trajectories and support clinical decisions on the appropriate type and intensity of rehabilitation, which promotes optimal functional recovery and enhances overall patient quality of life. Selecting the appropriate muscles for testing should be guided by the suspected diagnosis and aim to evaluate deficits across all limbs systematically. Ongoing and consistent strength evaluations also aid in the early detection of disease progression, allowing for timely modifications to treatment plans. Accurate and consistent testing techniques are essential to maintain validity and reliability. The MRC manual muscle testing method is widely used across healthcare disciplines, as it requires no specialized equipment, demonstrates acceptable interrater reliability, and is straightforward to apply in clinical settings. Alternative quantitative approaches, such as hand-grip dynamometry, provide precise and objective muscle strength measurements suitable for longitudinal tracking. Dynamometry reduces examiner subjectivity, enhancing consistency in measuring muscle strength changes over time. However, this method requires specialized equipment, limiting its broader clinical use.Functional strength assessments evaluate a patient's capacity to perform daily tasks independently, highlighting the real-world implications of muscle weakness. This method is especially useful in settings where strength directly affects essential functional abilities, such as mobility, balance, and self-care. In patients with fictitious or hysterical weakness, initial resistance to movement may seem normal before abruptly giving way. Additionally, they may fail to engage adjacent or supportive muscles appropriately, causing strength to appear impaired.Despite its widespread clinical utility, the MRC muscle strength grading scale presents several notable limitations. First, selecting muscles tested may lack direct clinical relevance to the patient's functional status or presenting complaint. Consequently, this diminishes the practical value of strength assessments, particularly in complex clinical scenarios. Second, individual examiner variation significantly impacts the reliability and consistency of strength assessments. Additionally, traditional strength grading scales primarily assess concentric muscle contractions, neglecting eccentric and isometric contractions crucial for comprehensive functional evaluation. This focus limits the assessment's clinical utility, particularly in patients with abnormal muscle tone, rigidity, or spasticity. Further, the standard muscle strength grading scale may not universally apply to all patient populations. Patients with severe cognitive impairment, profound movement disorders, or fluctuating motor symptoms may struggle to perform or sustain required testing maneuvers, leading to unreliable results.The precise evaluation of motor strength in a telehealth setting remains challenging unless a healthcare professional is next to the patient. The telehealth evaluation can be limited to observing antigravity movements and probably movements with gravity eliminated. Telehealth can also include observation of functional movements such as standing up from a sitting position and heel-and-toe walking.[10] Recent research underscores the necessity of adapting traditional muscle strength grading scales for telemedicine. A modified Delphi consensus recommended a simplified tele-strength examination protocol. This protocol uses a standardized 4-point scale (0: no movement; 1: slight muscle movement; 2: movement but not against gravity; 3: antigravity movement; 4: antigravity movement against resistance). The resistance assessment involves patients using a common household object weighing approximately 2 pounds, such as a full 32-ounce water bottle. This method helps standardize assessments remotely, although further validation studies are needed to confirm its clinical effectiveness and reliability.[11] Finally, emerging technological innovations such as artificial intelligence-assisted video analysis, wearable sensors, and robotic motor-assessment tools represent potential solutions to these limitations.[12]Muscle strength testing is an essential component of neurological assessments. Testing is vital for diagnosing neurological deficits and differentiating true muscle weakness from impaired balance or endurance. Accurate strength assessment informs clinical decisions, necessitating precise and consistent interprofessional practices.Effective healthcare outcomes depend upon clear, standardized communication among physicians, advanced practice providers, nurses, and therapists regarding strength testing results. Recent studies emphasize the importance of standardized examination protocols, especially in telemedicine, to improve consistency and reliability among clinicians. Interprofessional responsibilities in muscle strength evaluation include appropriate training of team members, adherence to standardized grading methods, and clear documentation of results to support continuity of care. In telehealth settings, it is crucial for clinicians to understand technological limitations and employ adaptive methods, such as simplified strength grading scales and defined test maneuvers, to ensure the reliability of the examination despite remote interactions.Ethical considerations include communicating the limitations of muscle strength testing to patients, being transparent about any diagnostic uncertainties, and obtaining informed consent. The healthcare team must responsibly decide when remote evaluations necessitate supplementary in-person examinations to guarantee patient safety and diagnostic accuracy. Continued education, regular interprofessional training sessions, and standardized protocols are essential for optimizing the interprofessional team's performance, enhancing diagnostic reliability, and improving patient outcomes in in-person and telehealth settings.Review Questions1.Compston A. Aids to the investigation of peripheral nerve injuries. Medical Research Council: Nerve Injuries Research Committee. His Majesty's Stationery Office: 1942; pp. 48 (iii) and 74 figures and 7 diagrams; with aids to the examination of the peripheral nervous system. By Michael O'Brien for the Guarantors of Brain. Saunders Elsevier: 2010; pp. [8] 64 and 94 Figures. Brain. 2010 Oct;133(10):2838-44. [PubMed: 20928945]2.WILLIAMS M. Manual muscle testing, development and current use. Phys Ther Rev (1948). 1956 Dec;36(12):797-805. [PubMed: 13378993]3.WINTZ MM. Variations in current manual muscle testing. Phys Ther Rev (1948). 1959 Jul;39(7):466-75. [PubMed: 13667456]4.Stoker GE, Kim HJ, Riew KD. Differentiating c8-t1 radiculopathy from ulnar neuropathy: a survey of 24 spine surgeons. Global Spine J. 2014 Feb;4(1):1-6. [PMC free article: PMC3908974] [PubMed: 24494175]5.Ciesla N, Dinglas V, Fan E, Kho M, Kuramoto J, Needham D. Manual muscle testing: a method of measuring extremity muscle strength applied to critically ill patients. J Vis Exp. 2011 Apr 12;(50) [PMC free article: PMC3169254] [PubMed: 21505416]6.Brandsma JW, Schreuders TA, Birke JA, Piefer A, Oostendorp R. Manual muscle strength testing: intraobserver and interobserver reliabilities for the intrinsic muscles of the hand. J Hand Ther. 1995 Jul-Sep;8(3):185-90. [PubMed: 8535479]7.Connolly BA, Jones GD, Curtis AA, Murphy PB, Douiri A, Hopkinson NS, Polkey MI, Moxham J, Hart N. Clinical predictive value of manual muscle strength testing during critical illness: an observational cohort study. Crit Care. 2013 Oct 10;17(5):R229. [PMC free article: PMC4057053] [PubMed: 24112540]8.Vanhoutte EK, Faber CG, van Nes SI, Jacobs BC, van Doorn PA, van Koningsveld R, Cornblath DR, van der Kooi AJ, Cats EA, van den Berg LH, Notermans NC, van der Pol WL, Hermans MC, van der Beek NA, Gorson KC, Eurelings M, Engelsman J, Boot H, Meijer RJ, Lauria G, Tennant A, Merkies IS., PeriNomS Study Group. Modifying the Medical Research Council grading system through Rasch analyses. Brain. 2012 May;135(Pt 5):1639-49. [PMC free article: PMC3338921] [PubMed: 22189568]9.Paternostro-Sluga T, Grim-Stieger M, Posch M, Schuhfried O, Vacariu G, Mittermaier C, Bittner C, Fialka-Moser V. Reliability and validity of the Medical Research Council (MRC) scale and a modified scale for testing muscle strength in patients with radial palsy. J Rehabil Med. 2008 Aug;40(8):665-71. [PubMed: 19020701]10.Angelopoulou E, Koros C, Stanitsa E, Stamelos I, Kontaxopoulou D, Fragkiadaki S, Papatriantafyllou JD, Smaragdaki E, Vourou K, Pavlou D, Bamidis PD, Stefanis L, Papageorgiou SG. Neurological Examination via Telemedicine: An Updated Review Focusing on Movement Disorders. Medicina (Kaunas). 2024 Jun 09;60(6) [PMC free article: PMC11205653] [PubMed: 38929575]11.Haddad AF, Burke JF, Mummaneni PV, Chan AK, Safaee MM, Knightly JJ, Mayer RR, Pennicooke BH, Digiorgio AM, Weinstein PR, Clark AJ, Chou D, Dhall SS. Telemedicine in Neurosurgery: Standardizing the Spinal Physical Examination Using A Modified Delphi Method. Neurospine. 2021 Jun;18(2):292-302. [PMC free article: PMC8255762] [PubMed: 34218612]12.Faheem F, Zafar Z, Razzak A, Kalia JS. Implementing Virtual Care in Neurology - Challenges and Pitfalls. J Cent Nerv Syst Dis. 2022;14:11795735221109745. [PMC free article: PMC9252001] [PubMed: 35795886] Disclosure: Usker Naqvi declares no relevant financial relationships with ineligible companies. Disclosure: Konstantinos Margetis declares no relevant financial relationships with ineligible companies. Disclosure: Andrew Sherman declares no relevant financial relationships with ineligible companies.