



King's Research Portal

DOI:

[10.1016/S1474-4422\(24\)00135-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422(24)00135-2)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Nielsen, G., Stone, J., Lee, T., Goldstein, L., Marston, L., Hunter, R., Carson, A., Holt, K., Marsden, J., Le Novere, M., Nazareth, I., Noble, H., Reuber, M., Strudwick, A.-M., Santana Suarez, B., & Edwards, M. (2024). Specialist physiotherapy for functional motor disorder in England and Scotland (Physio4FMD): a pragmatic, multicentre, phase 3 randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Neurology*, 23(7), 675-686. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422\(24\)00135-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422(24)00135-2)

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

1 **Specialist physiotherapy for functional motor disorder (Physio4FMD):**
2 **A pragmatic, multicentre, phase 3 randomised controlled trial**

3 Glenn Nielsen, Jon Stone, Teresa C Lee, Laura H Goldstein, Louise Marston, Rachael Maree Hunter, Alan
4 Carson, Kate Holt, Jon Marsden, Marie Le Novere, Irwin Nazareth, Hayley Noble, Markus Reuber, Ann-
5 Marie Strudwick, Beatriz Santana Suarez, Mark J Edwards, on behalf of the [Physio4FMD study group](#).

	Preferred Degree	Affiliation & Full Address
Glenn Nielsen	PhD	Neuroscience Research Centre, Institute of Molecular and Clinical Sciences, St. George's University of London, London SW17 0RE, UK
Professor Jon Stone	PhD	Centre for Clinical Brain Sciences, Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH16 4SB
Teresa C Lee	MSc	Department of Primary Care and Population Health, University College London, London, NW3 2PF, PRIMENT Clinical Trials Unit, University College London, London, NW3 2PF and Department of Statistical Science, University College London, London, WC1E 7HB
Professor Laura H Goldstein	PhD	King's College London, Department of Psychology, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, London SE5 8AF, UK
Professor Louise Marston	PhD	Department of Primary Care and Population Health, University College London, London, NW3 2PF and PRIMENT Clinical Trials Unit, University College London, London, NW3 2PF
Professor Rachael Maree Hunter	MSc	Department of Applied Health Research, University College London, London, and PRIMENT Clinical Trials Unit, University College London, London, NW3 2PF
Professor Alan Carson	MD	Centre for Clinical Brain Sciences, Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH16 4SB
Kate Holt	BSc	Neuroscience Research Centre, Institute of Molecular and Clinical Sciences, St. George's University of London, London SW17 0RE, UK
Marie Le Novere	MSc	Department of Applied Health Research, University College London, London, and PRIMENT Clinical Trials Unit, University College London, London, NW3 2PF
Professor Jon Marsden	PhD	School of Health Professions, Faculty of Health, University of Plymouth
Professor Irwin Nazareth	PhD	Department of Primary Care and Population Health, University College London, London, NW3 2PF and PRIMENT Clinical Trials Unit, University College London, London, NW3 2PF
Hayley Noble	MMedSci	Neuroscience Research Centre, Institute of Molecular and Clinical Sciences, St. George's University of London, London SW17 0RE, UK
Professor Markus Reuber	PhD	Academic Neurology Unit, University of Sheffield, Royal Hallamshire, Glossop Road, Sheffield, S10 2JF
Ann-Marie Strudwick	MSc	Neuroscience, Research and Innovation, King's College Hospital, 245a Coldharbour Lane, London SW9 8RR
Beatriz Santana Suarez	BSc	Neuroscience Research Centre, Institute of Molecular and Clinical Sciences, St. George's University of London, London SW17 0RE, UK
Professor Mark J Edwards	PhD	Department of Basic and Clinical Neuroscience, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, London SE5

	8AF, UK & Department of Neuropsychiatry, Maudsley Hospital, London, UK
Physio4FMD Author Group	

Corresponding author: Dr Glenn Nielsen
 Neuroscience Research Centre
 Institute of Molecular and Clinical Sciences
 St Georges University of London
 London
 SW17 0RE
gnielsen@sgul.ac.uk
 Tel: 0208 266 6858

Orcid ID and email

		Orcid ID
Dr Glenn Nielsen	gnielsen@sgul.ac.uk	0000-0001-6053-5670
Prof Jon Stone	jon.stone@ed.ac.uk	0000-0001-9829-8092
Teresa C Lee	teresa.lee@ucl.ac.uk	0009-0009-0917-860X
Prof Laura H Goldstein	laura.goldstein@kcl.ac.uk	0000-0001-9387-3035
Prof Louise Marston	l.marston@ucl.ac.uk	0000-0002-9973-1131
Prof Rachael Maree Hunter	r.hunter@ucl.ac.uk	0000-0002-7447-8934
Prof Alan Carson	alan.carson@nhslothian.scot.nhs.uk	0000-0002-7425-0964
Kate Holt	kholt@sgul.ac.uk	0009-0003-9529-2420
Prof Jon Marsden	jonathan.marsden@plymouth.ac.uk	0000-0002-2037-4902
Marie Le Novere	marielenovere@outlook.com	0000-0002-9479-8599
Prof Irwin Nazareth	i.nazareth@ucl.ac.uk	0000-0003-2146-9628
Hayley Noble	hayley.noble@icnarc.org	0000-0002-4267-1609
Prof Markus Reuber	m.reuber@sheffield.ac.uk	0000-0002-4104-6705
Ann-Marie Strudwick	a.strudwick1@nhs.net	0000-0003-2817-5219
Beatriz Santana Suarez	beatriz.santanasuarez@nhs.net	0000-0002-1902-8332
Prof Mark J Edwards	mark.j.edwards@kcl.ac.uk	0000-0002-8283-9015

Word count for text: 4441

Number of tables: 3

Number of figures: 3

Number of references: 38

1 ABSTRACT

2 **Background:** Functional motor disorder (FMD), the motor variant of functional neurological disorder, is
3 a disabling condition, commonly associated with poor health outcomes. Recent pathophysiological
4 models have inspired new treatment approaches, including the promising emergence of specialist
5 physiotherapy, although evidence from large randomised controlled trials is lacking. We aimed to assess
6 the clinical effectiveness of a specialist physiotherapy intervention for FMD compared to treatment as
7 usual.

8
9 **Methods:** Physio4FMD was a pragmatic, parallel arm, randomised controlled trial. Participants were
10 adults with a “clinically definite” diagnosis of FMD, diagnosed by a neurologist. Recruitment occurred at
11 11 hospitals in England and Scotland. Participants were randomised (1:1, stratified by site) using a
12 remote web-based application, to receive specialist physiotherapy (a 9-session plus follow-up
13 protocolised intervention), or treatment as usual (referred to local community neurological
14 physiotherapy). Data collection and analysis was blind to treatment allocation. The primary outcome
15 was the Physical Functioning domain of the Short Form 36 (SF36) questionnaire at 12-months post
16 randomisation. Secondary outcomes were a participant rated Clinical Global Impression Scale of
17 Improvement, SF36 health related quality of life, Revised Illness Perception Questionnaire (IPQ-R),
18 Functional Mobility Scale, Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS), fatigue 5-point scale, NHS
19 digital data for health service use, and confidence in the correctness of the diagnosis. Analysis followed
20 a modified intention to treat principle, using a complete case approach. Participants who were unable
21 to receive their randomised treatment due to the suspension of healthcare services during the
22 coronavirus pandemic were excluded from the primary analysis. Sensitivity analyses explored the
23 impact of COVID-19 mitigating strategies. The trial is registered with the International Standard
24 Randomised Controlled Trial registry, ISRCTN56136713.

25
26 **Findings:** Recruitment commenced 19 October 2018 and concluded 31 January 2022, with a 17-month
27 break during the COVID-19 pandemic. We randomised 179 participants to specialist physiotherapy and
28 176 to treatment as usual. Eighty-nine participants were excluded due to COVID-19 interruption to
29 treatment (n=27 specialist physiotherapy, n=62 treatment as usual). The primary outcome included data
30 from 241 participants (n=138 [91%] specialist physiotherapy, n=103 [90%] treatment as usual). The
31 primary outcome did not differ significantly between the groups; specialist physiotherapy 37.1 (SD 28.4)
32 vs treatment as usual 37.2 (SD 28.5), adjusted mean difference 3.5 (95% CI -2.3 to 9.3; p=0.23). Some
33 secondary outcomes were significantly different in favour of specialist physiotherapy, and no outcomes

1 significantly favoured treatment as usual. There were no serious adverse events related to specialist
2 physiotherapy.

3
4 **Interpretation:** Specialist physiotherapy resulted in more participants rating their motor symptoms as
5 having improved, and better scores on measures for mental health, but it did not result in better self-
6 reported physical functioning at 12-months. Both specialist and non-specialist physiotherapy appeared
7 to be a safe and valued treatment for selected patients with FMD. Future research should continue to
8 refine interventions for people with FMD and develop evidence-based methods to guide treatment
9 triage decisions.

10
11 **Funding:** National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR), Health Technology Assessment
12 Programme (project reference 16/31/63).

13

1 INTRODUCTION

2 Functional neurological disorder (FND) is a common presentation in neurological services.¹ Currently
3 there is consensus that it can be diagnosed accurately, is disabling, and often has a poor outcome if left
4 untreated.²⁻⁴ Treatment is most often thought of in terms of psychotherapeutic input but recently
5 physical rehabilitation has emerged as a promising intervention for the motor symptoms of FND.⁵
6 Contemporary approaches to 'rule in' the FND diagnosis relies on clinical features such as Hoover's sign
7 for functional weakness that highlight differences between impaired voluntary movement and
8 preserved automatic movement.⁶ This, along with new aetiological models has opened up more FND
9 specific targets for specialist physiotherapy interventions.

10
11 We developed a specialist physiotherapy protocol for the motor symptoms of FND, which we refer to
12 here as functional motor disorder (FMD). The intervention is informed by a Bayesian model of FND,⁷
13 and targets expectations, as well as excessive self-directed attention. Both expectation and attention
14 are presumed to be key mechanisms driving symptoms.⁸ The protocol builds on expert consensus
15 recommendations for physiotherapy for FMD.⁹ It was tested with promising outcomes in a prospective
16 cohort study and we further developed and tested the intervention in a randomised feasibility study.^{10,11}
17 In the feasibility study, 60 people with FMD were randomised to the specialist physiotherapy protocol,
18 comprising 9 sessions conducted over 5 consecutive days, or treatment as usual (TAU), defined as a
19 referral to community neurological physiotherapy. At six-months' follow-up, 72% of the participants in
20 the specialist physiotherapy group rated their symptoms as improved on a 5-point scale, compared to
21 18% receiving TAU. A range of physical outcome measures showed a moderate to large difference in
22 favour of specialist physiotherapy.

23
24 Here we report the main trial, Physio4FMD, based on the feasibility study. The primary aim was to
25 determine the clinical effectiveness of specialist physiotherapy compared to TAU (community
26 neurological physiotherapy) for people with FMD at 12 months post randomisation, with a 6-month
27 interim assessment.

29 METHODS

30 Study Design

31 We conducted a pragmatic, multi-centre, parallel group randomised controlled trial comparing a
32 specialist physiotherapy programme for FMD to TAU (referral to community neurological
33 physiotherapy). The study was conducted in the National Health Service (NHS) at 11 secondary and

1 tertiary care hospitals in England and Scotland. Ethics approval was granted by the London-Surrey
2 Borders Research Ethics Committee, reference number 18/LO/0486, 28 March 2018. The trial was
3 registered with the International Standard Randomised Controlled Trial registry, ISRCTN56136713. The
4 study protocol has been published.¹²

6 **Participants**

7 The study participants were adults attending outpatient neurology clinics and inpatients who had
8 received a diagnosis of FMD. Eligibility was determined by consultant neurologists collaborating in the
9 trial. The inclusion criteria were: (i) new or returning patients; (ii) a “clinically definite” diagnosis of FMD
10 according to the Gupta and Lang diagnostic classification criteria;¹³ (iii) age 18 or over; (iv) diagnostic
11 investigations have come to an end; (v) the patient is accepting of the intervention; and (vi) the motor
12 symptoms caused significant distress or impairment in social, occupational or other important areas of
13 functioning (subjectively described by the patient) and independent of other comorbidities. The
14 exclusion criteria were: (i) the recruiting neurologist deems the patient to have severe psychiatric
15 comorbidity which would interfere with the patient’s ability to participate in physiotherapy; (ii) the
16 patient has another diagnosis which explains the majority of their symptoms or disability; (iii) the
17 patient has pain, fatigue or dissociative seizures that would interfere with their ability to engage with
18 physiotherapy; (iv) disability to the extent that the patient requires assistance for toileting; (v) the
19 patient is unable to attend 9 sessions of physiotherapy over a 3-week period, within 6 weeks of their
20 initial neurology consultation; (vi) ongoing unresolved compensation claim or litigation; (vii) the patient
21 has no fixed address or is seeking rehousing through their council for disability access reasons; (viii)
22 unable to understand English sufficiently to complete questionnaires; (ix) the patient has a documented
23 learning disability that prevents them from answering questionnaires independently; and (x) the patient
24 lacks capacity to give consent. Eligibility was ultimately a clinical decision made by the neurologist,
25 rather than by cut-off scores from standardised assessment tools. Patients were not excluded based on
26 having pain, fatigue, dissociative seizures, anxiety and/or depression. These symptoms were only
27 considered as exclusionary if they were deemed to be severe enough to interfere with the patients’
28 ability to engage with the physiotherapy intervention. All participants gave written informed consent to
29 participate.

31 **Randomisation and masking**

32 After completing baseline assessment, participants were randomised (1:1) to specialist physiotherapy or
33 TAU by the trial manager at St George’s University of London. Randomisation was conducted using a
34 web-based application created by an independent company, “Sealed Envelope”.¹⁴ Block randomisation

1 with random block sizes was used to ensure even allocation between randomised groups, stratified by
2 site. The randomisation sequence was computer generated and programmed by an independent
3 statistician. Researchers collecting the trial outcomes, statisticians and health economists were masked
4 to treatment allocation, and participants were asked not to reveal their group allocation to research
5 workers. Due to the nature of the intervention, it was not possible to mask the trial manager,
6 participants or treating clinicians.

8 **Procedures**

9 *Both groups: the role of the neurologist*

10 Prior to enrolment in the trial, the diagnosis of FMD was made by a neurologist based on best practice
11 recommendations,³ and a follow-up consultation was booked within 12 months of the initial
12 consultation. Patients meeting the eligibility criteria were asked for their consent to be contacted about
13 the study by a research worker. During a face-to-face appointment with a member of the research
14 team, a second eligibility screening was conducted, informed consent obtained, and baseline
15 assessments were completed before randomisation. The study neurologists received training from
16 authors ME, JS, or GN. See the appendix for training details (pp 4) and for the participant information
17 sheet and consent form (pp 8).

19 *Specialist physiotherapy*

20 The intervention was a protocolised physiotherapy programme which could be adapted to the needs of
21 individuals. The programme consisted of 9 sessions delivered within a three-week period, plus a single
22 follow-up session after three months. The intervention had three broad aims; (i) to help patients
23 understand their symptoms; (ii) to retrain movement with redirection of attention; and (iii) to develop
24 self-management skills. Physiotherapy sessions were guided by an interactive workbook,¹⁵ which
25 formed part of the self-management plan. The treatment has been described in more detail
26 elsewhere.⁹⁻¹² The physiotherapists delivering the intervention were specialised in neurorehabilitation.
27 Prior to the trial, all had completed a 5-day training programme supported by an intervention manual.¹⁶
28 See the appendix for a description of the training (pp 16).

30 *Treatment as usual (TAU): (community neurological physiotherapy)*

31 The comparator condition was TAU, defined as a referral made by the diagnosing neurologist to the NHS
32 community neurological physiotherapy service. A referral letter was sent with the neurology
33 consultation letter, which stated the diagnosis of FMD and that the patient may benefit from
34 physiotherapy. As there is no formal pathway or guideline for FMD treatment in the NHS, we were
35 aware that the treatment received by this group would be of mixed quality. Due to the pragmatic

1 nature of the trial, we were unable to control whether physiotherapy was received or how many
2 sessions were offered to those allocated to this group.

3 4 *Follow-up (both groups)*

5 Follow-up assessments were conducted remotely at six- and 12-months via the participants' preferred
6 method; either an online form, return-mail paper forms, or by telephone. A fidelity and satisfaction
7 with treatment telephone questionnaire was conducted by the trial manager or a designated
8 (unblinded) research worker, between six- and 12-months post randomisation.

9 10 **Outcomes**

11 The primary outcome was the Physical Functioning domain of the SF36 at 12-months post
12 randomisation.¹⁷ The Physical Functioning domain includes 10 questions, rating the level of limitation
13 when attempting vigorous activities, moderate activities, lifting and carrying, mobilising, washing and
14 dressing. The maximum score of 100 indicates optimal physical function.

15
16 The secondary measures of clinical effectiveness were a participant-rated Clinical Global Impression of
17 Improvement (CGI-I) (5-point Likert scale,¹⁸ see appendix pp 17), the remaining seven domains of the
18 SF36,¹⁹ the Functional Mobility Scale (FMS),²⁰ the Revised Illness Perception Questionnaire (IPQ-R),²¹ the
19 Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS),²² a measure of Fatigue (5-point scale, see appendix pp
20 18),²³ Confidence in correctness of the diagnosis of FMD (10-point scale, see appendix pp 19),²⁴ and
21 healthcare use (digital data held by NHS England and NHS Scotland on hospital-based appointments and
22 admissions).^{25,26} The Extended Patient Health Questionnaire was completed at baseline only for
23 secondary exploratory analysis purposes (see appendix pp 20).^{27,28} All other outcome measures were
24 collected and analysed at six- and 12-months. Safety and adverse event data were collected as part of
25 self-report six- and 12-month questionnaires, during the assessment of fidelity telephone call, and in
26 follow-up clinical appointments.²⁹ A health economic analysis was also conducted and will be reported
27 separately.

28 29 **Statistical analysis**

30 The target sample size was calculated using the ANCOVA method to detect a nine-point difference in
31 the SF36 Physical Functioning with 90% power at the 5% level of significance.¹² Assuming a standard
32 deviation of 22 and inflating the sample by a factor of 1.4 to account for therapist effect, we calculated
33 that a minimum of 105 participants were needed per group. The target sample size was inflated by 20%
34 to account for dropouts, giving a sample size of 132 per group. Additional participants were recruited in

1 an extension of the trial to mitigate the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Our COVID-19 mitigation
2 strategies were based on published guidance,^{30–32} further details are available in the published analysis
3 plans and appendix (pp 21).³³ The analysis plan was prespecified and published prior to database lock.³³
4 It details the mitigation strategies and corresponding sensitivity analyses to explore the impact of these
5 decisions.³³ Data were analysed following a modified intention to treat principle, utilising a complete
6 case approach.

7
8 The primary outcome was analysed using linear mixed effects modelling, with the physiotherapist and
9 clusters of 1 in the TAU group as the random effect, controlling for baseline values and adjusting for
10 site. Secondary outcomes with continuous scales were analysed using linear mixed models, adjusting for
11 baseline. The CGI-I was dichotomised into (i) Much improved or Improved; and (ii) No change, Worse, or
12 Much worse. The 5-point fatigue scale was similarly dichotomised into (i) no fatigue or slight fatigue;
13 and (ii) moderate, severe, or extreme fatigue. The dichotomised scores were analysed using mixed
14 effects logistic regression, adjusting for baseline values for fatigue and site using fixed effects (site was
15 removed from the model for the 5-point fatigue scale due to insufficient degrees of freedom). Digital
16 hospital episode statistics were analysed using mixed effects negative binomial regression. Proportions,
17 means and standard deviations are reported for self-reported health care usage. We did not adjust for
18 multiple testing. We conducted pre-specified sensitivity analyses to explore the impact of COVID-19 on
19 the trial, the impact of our COVID-19 mitigation strategies, and a dose response analysis (see published
20 analysis plans and appendix pp 21 for further details).³³ We explored compliance with the intervention,
21 which was defined as attending five or more sessions of specialist physiotherapy.³³

22
23 In a post hoc analysis, we looked at the number of participants that made a clinically significant
24 improvement in the primary outcome. The minimum clinically important difference for the SF36 has
25 been found to differ by population studied and this value has not been established in FMD.³⁴ We
26 therefore chose a conservative value of 10 points based on other conditions.³⁴

27
28 Analyses were conducted using STATA version 18. The conduct of the trial was monitored by an
29 independent Trial Steering Committee (which included expert clinicians, a statistician, health economist
30 and patient representatives), and an independent Data Monitoring and Ethics Committee.

31 32 **Role of the funding source**

33 The funder of the study had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation,
34 or writing of the report.

1 RESULTS

2 Recruitment occurred over 24 months in two blocks, 19 October 2018 – 11 March 2020 and 3 August
3 2021 – 31 January 2022, with a 17-month break during the COVID-19 pandemic. A total of 355
4 participants were randomised to specialist physiotherapy (n=179) or TAU (n=176). Due to the nature of
5 the recruitment method, we were unable to collect data on the number screened for inclusion.

6
7 Participants were categorised into four groups based on their interaction with the COVID-19 pandemic.
8 Group A (n=25) completed follow-up before 23 March 2020 (when national COVID-19 lockdown was
9 instigated in the UK). Group B (n=134) completed treatment before 23 March 2020, but completed
10 follow-up after 23 March 2020. Group C (n=89) were randomised but did not receive treatment prior to
11 23 March 2020, and completed follow-up after 23 March 2020. Group D (n=88) were recruited in the
12 extension after 3 August 2021. The 19 participants unaccounted for in these groups were lost to follow-
13 up at the time groups were determined and their treatment status could not be established. An
14 additional 6 participants were subsequently lost to follow-up (Figure 1). Participants in Group C were
15 excluded from the primary analysis,³³ on the basis that the COVID-19 lockdowns prevented them from
16 receiving their allocated treatment. The TAU group was more frequently represented in Group C due to
17 longer waits to start physiotherapy (n=27 specialist physiotherapy, n=62 TAU).

18
19 The primary analysis (Groups A, B and D) included 247 participants (n=141 specialist physiotherapy,
20 n=106 TAU). Data on the primary outcome were obtained for 138 (91%) participants in specialist
21 physiotherapy, and 103 (90%) participants in TAU. All randomised participants (Groups A – D) with
22 follow-up data were included in the sensitivity analyses, n=314 participants (158 intervention, 157
23 control) with 88% retention for the primary outcome.

24
25 Baseline characteristics are reported for Groups A, B and D (Table 1). Baseline data for Group C are
26 reported in the appendix (pp 23). The mean age of participants was 44.7 (SD 14.6), 74% were female
27 and the mean symptom duration was 4.8 (SD 6.3) years (median 2.6, IQR 1.2 – 5.6). Participant-reported
28 past medical history is reported in the appendix (pp 25).

29
30 The median time between randomisation and commencing treatment for specialist physiotherapy was
31 36 days (IQR 24.8–57.8) and for TAU 97 days (IQR 60.2–176.2). The median duration of treatment (days
32 between first and final treatment session) was 15 days for specialist physiotherapy (IQR 10.0–21.5) and
33 93 days (IQR 47–148.5) for TAU. The median time between completing treatment and completing the
34 primary (12-month) outcome was 310 days (IQR 281.5–323) for specialist physiotherapy and 179 days

1 (IQR 123–237·5) for TAU. The median number of treatment sessions completed in the specialist
2 physiotherapy group was 9 (IQR 8–9) and 4 (IQR 2–7) in TAU. See appendix for details of the timing (pp
3 30) and contents (pp 36) of treatment for both randomised groups.

4
5 Demographic characteristics of the physiotherapists delivering specialist physiotherapy, assessment of
6 fidelity, and satisfaction with treatment data are presented in the appendix (pp 31–41). In summary, the
7 data suggested high ratings of intervention fidelity. Compared to TAU, participants receiving specialist
8 physiotherapy were more satisfied with their physiotherapists (100% were completely satisfied or
9 satisfied vs 77·3%); more satisfied with their treatment (96·7% were completely satisfied or satisfied vs
10 65·3%); and rated their physiotherapists as having a greater understanding of their movement problem
11 (median score out of 10 was 10 vs 8).

12
13 The primary and secondary outcomes at 12-months are shown in Table 2. The primary outcome, the
14 SF36 Physical Functioning domain, did not differ between treatment arms at 12-months (adjusted mean
15 difference 3·5, 95% CI -2·3 to 9·3, $p=0\cdot232$).

16
17 In secondary outcomes at 12-months, the CGI-I showed a difference in favour of specialist
18 physiotherapy; 58·7% rated their symptoms as “much improved” or “improved”, compared to 38·2% of
19 TAU (odds ratio [OR] 2·3, 95% CI 1·4 to 3·9). The Mental Health domain was significantly better for
20 specialist physiotherapy (adjusted mean difference 5·4, 95% CI 0·9 to 9·8), and there were no significant
21 differences for the remaining SF36 domains (Physical Role, Bodily Pain, General Health, Energy/Vitality,
22 Social Functioning, and Emotional Role). Confidence in the diagnosis was greater for specialist
23 physiotherapy (adjusted mean difference 0·8, 95% CI 0·2 to 1·4). For the IPQ-R, two items were
24 significantly different in favour of specialist physiotherapy (Personal Control and Illness Coherence) and
25 there were no significant differences for the remaining items (Identity, Causes, Timeline, Timeline
26 cyclical, Consequences, Treatment control, and Emotional representation). No differences between
27 groups were found for the remaining secondary outcomes (Functional Mobility Scale, HADS Anxiety or
28 Depression, Fatigue 5-point scale, and health care use). Treatment as usual was not favoured in any
29 outcome. Figure 2 shows the standardised effect sizes at six and 12-months. See the appendix (pp 42-
30 50) for figures and tables of all outcomes, including digital health care data (pp 46), and outcomes for
31 outcomes at six-months post randomisation (pp 47).

32
33 We found that 92·2% were compliant with the specialist physiotherapy intervention (defined as
34 attending five or more sessions). Sensitivity analyses revealed that including Group C in the analysis had
35 no impact on the significance of the primary outcome. When analysing data from all randomised

1 participants, the adjusted mean difference between groups was 4.3, favouring specialised therapy (95%
2 CI -0.8 to 9.4). The primary and secondary outcomes for Group C and further details are reported in the
3 appendix (pp 51–55). The dose-response analysis suggested that attending more sessions is associated
4 with better scores for the primary outcome. However, due to the high compliance this finding is a
5 relative one with only nine participants having attended less than eight sessions. Due to high levels of
6 compliance and low levels of missing data, the pre-planned analyses to explore the effect of compliance
7 and missing data were not required.

8
9 Adverse events and serious adverse events are reported in Table 3. In total, 59 serious adverse events
10 were reported by groups A, B and D. One event resulted in death, which was death by suicide of a
11 participant receiving specialist physiotherapy. The medical notes for this case were recalled, examined,
12 and it was concluded that a possible relationship was unlikely as there were other clear risk factors
13 directly associated with the event. All events were classified as unrelated to treatment, although
14 possible relationships cannot be completely ruled out. See appendix for additional details (pp 58-61).
15 We investigated any event that potentially indicated a new neurological diagnosis, or an incorrect
16 original diagnosis of FMD. Details are available in the appendix (pp 62). One case of diagnostic error was
17 identified, resulting in a misdiagnosis rate of 0.3% at 12 months.

18
19 In post hoc analysis, we looked at the number of participants that made a clinically significant
20 improvement in the primary outcome. In the specialist physiotherapy group, 67 (48.6%) reported a 10-
21 point improvement, compared to 39 (38.2%) in TAU.

1 **Figure 1. Trial Profile**

2
3 **Table 1. Baseline Characteristics (Groups A, B and D)**

4 Footnotes:

5 a indicates variables with missing data, so the denominator is less than 141 for specialist physiotherapy
6 or 106 for treatment as usual.

7 B Multiple sites/body parts could be affected.

8
9 **Table 2. Primary and secondary outcomes (Groups A, B and D)**

10 Footnotes:

11 *Denotes a statistically significant difference.

12 a Intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) for specialist physiotherapy group=0.095 (95% CI 0.000 to 0.247)

13 b Odds ratio of improving if assigned to specialist physiotherapy (much improved or improved vs no
14 change, worse, or much worse).

15 c Functional Mobility Scale rates the assistance needed over three distances: 5 metres, 50 metres, 500
16 metres. Each distance is rated from 1-6: 1=uses wheelchair; 2=uses walker/frame; 3=uses crutches;
17 4=uses walking stick(s); 5=independent but needs to hold rail on stairs; 6=independent on all surfaces.

18 d HADS Anxiety and Depression cut-off score of 8+ has been found to have acceptable sensitivity and
19 specificity for cases of anxiety and depression (Bjelland et al 2002)

20 e Odds ratio of milder fatigue if assigned to specialist physiotherapy (no or slight fatigue vs moderate,
21 severe, or extreme).

22 Reference: Bjelland, I., Dahl, A. A., Haug, T., & Neckelmann, D. (2002). The validity of the Hospital
23 Anxiety and Depression Scale An updated literature review. Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 52, 69–
24 77.

25
26 **Table 3. Adverse and serious adverse events**

27 Footnotes:

28 ^a COVID Group X, were those who were unassigned to a COVID group as they were lost to follow-up at
29 the time the COVID groups were assigned, or they had withdrawn from the study.

30 ^b Adverse events were defined as any untoward medical occurrence, regardless of causal relationship
31 with treatment, and not meeting the criteria for a serious adverse event.

32 ^c Serious adverse events were defined as any untoward occurrence that resulted in death, was life-
33 threatening, required hospitalisation or prolongation of existing hospitalisation, resulted in persistent or
34 significant disability or incapacity, or consists of a congenital anomaly or birth defect, or was otherwise
35 considered medically significant by the investigator. No serious adverse events were deemed to be
36 related to receiving physiotherapy.

37
38 **Figure 2. Continuous outcome measures, effect size (ES) and 95% confidence interval (CI) at six and**
39 **12-months, adjusting for baseline values and sites and standardising by baseline values of each**
40 **outcome due to differences in scale.**

41 Footnotes:

42 Abbreviations: SP=specialist physiotherapy; TAU=treatment as usual; N=maximum number of
43 participants; n=number of participants with available data.

44
45 **Figure 3. Participant rated Clinical Global Impression scale of Improvement at six- and 12-months.**

46 Legend: Participant rated perception of improvement, in answer to the question, "After physiotherapy,
47 the problem with my movement is..." Odds ratio of improvement at 6-months for specialist
48 physiotherapy compared treatment as usual was 4.7 (95% CI 2.6 to 8.6); odds ratio at 12-months 2.3
49 (1.4 to 3.9).

DISCUSSION

This is the first powered, randomised controlled trial of physical rehabilitation for FMD. Although treatment groups did not differ for the primary outcome, the specialist physiotherapy group were twice as likely to report an improvement in their motor symptoms at 12-months. Additionally, specialist physiotherapy led to higher scores for SF36 Mental Health at 12-months. The specialist physiotherapy group had more confidence that their diagnosis was correct, and higher scores of IPQ-R items relating to self-efficacy. With the caveat that participants were screened for their suitability for physiotherapy by expert neurologists, physiotherapy proved to be safe with no serious adverse events related to treatment.

In the specialist physiotherapy group, 59% rated their motor symptoms as improved, and 49% recorded a 10-point improvement in the SF36 Physical Functioning score from baseline. In TAU, 38% rated their motor symptoms as improved and 38% had 10-point improvement in SF36 Physical Functioning. The heightened perception of improvement compared to physical functioning score in specialist physiotherapy may be simply a consequence of improved motor functioning but could also be explained in part through the findings of improved understanding of symptoms, greater perception of control over symptoms, greater confidence in the correctness of the diagnosis, and greater SF36 Mental Health scores. Altogether these changes are likely to reflect greater self-efficacy and a reduced threat value of symptoms leading to a greater perception of improvement.

Outcome measurement is notoriously difficult in FMD, with challenges including symptom heterogeneity, variability of symptom severity, and multifactorial causes of disability and distress.³⁵ These factors impact the validity of assessment tools and their sensitivity to change. The disparity between the SF36 Physical functioning and CGI-I raises questions about their relative value as an outcome measure. A recent consensus recommendation for a core outcome measure set for FND recommended the CGI-I as the most useful measure, due to its relative resistance to symptom variability and heterogeneity.³⁶ With this measure we found a difference between treatment groups in favour of specialist physiotherapy. There is an absence of validated objective outcome measures for FMD.³⁶ Measures such as the Simplified Functional Movement Disorders Rating Scale,³⁷ rely on the subjective assessment of a third-party observer and so are not truly objective. Although this measure would have added a valuable dimension of data to our study, its use was beyond the practical limits of this pragmatic trial. In lieu of other practicable objective measures, we included digital health use data as a proxy measure of change, with which we did not find any significant differences.

1 The results for the primary outcome differ from the preceding feasibility study, which showed a
2 moderate to large treatment effect size at six-months for SF36 Physical Functioning.¹¹ However, the CGI-
3 I outcomes are more closely aligned. In the current study, improvement at six-months was reported in
4 63% of specialist physiotherapy and 28% of TAU participants. In the feasibility study these values were
5 72% and 18%. The improved performance of TAU in the current study is notable and may in part explain
6 the lack of difference between randomised groups. It is possible that the quality of community
7 physiotherapy has improved in the five years since the feasibility study, related to increased awareness,
8 published clinical resources for physiotherapists, international conferences, and the founding of an
9 international society.⁶ This is supported by data from the feasibility interview which shows that most
10 participants in TAU received treatments that were in line with consensus recommendations.⁹ The
11 improved scores in both groups from baseline to 12-months also supports this argument; although
12 some of this improvement could be explained by regression towards the mean.

13
14 Other factors that may account for differences from the feasibility study include the greater complexity
15 of participants in this trial at baseline as indicated by worse physical and mental health scores. The
16 intervention was delivered more intensively in the feasibility study (over five consecutive days), which
17 may be associated with greater effectiveness. Differences in therapist skill and practice in delivering the
18 intervention across the two studies might have affected the efficacy of the intervention.

19
20 The only other published randomised trial of rehabilitation for FMD compared three-weeks of inpatient
21 multidisciplinary treatment for functional gait disorder to a waiting list control (no treatment).³⁸ The
22 study found an immediate treatment effect of 8.4 units of the Functional Mobility Scale and 11.7 units
23 of the Short Form 12 (SF12) Physical score, which was maintained and slightly improved at 12-months
24 follow-up (14.1 units). Direct comparisons to this study are limited by differences in study design and
25 the patient cohort (gait disorder vs mixed motor symptoms, and symptom duration 9.5 months vs 4.8
26 years). Both studies report similar levels of improvement from baseline to 12-months, assuming that
27 SF36 Physical Functioning domain and SF12 Physical score are comparable.


28
29 We acknowledge our study has limitations. By chance, randomisation may have disadvantaged the
30 specialist physiotherapy group, which had a slightly longer mean symptom duration, and the higher
31 rates of previous physiotherapy and occupational therapy may have meant these individuals benefited
32 less from additional treatment. Conversely, the lower mean number of treatment sessions in TAU and
33 lower satisfaction with treatment is likely to have worked in favour of specialist physiotherapy. With a
34 large number of secondary outcomes, significance may have occurred by chance, and we did not correct
35 for multiple comparisons. However, 14 out of 54 comparisons (26%) were significantly different in

1 favour of specialist physiotherapy and this is a greater number than would be expected by chance
2 alone. Most of our outcome measures were participant reported. We designed a pragmatic trial with a
3 real-world comparator. We therefore did not attempt to control the treatment received by this group.
4 The resulting treatment varied in terms of content, quality, duration, and waiting time. Longer waiting
5 times for treatment in TAU meant that these participants had concluded their treatment closer to the 6
6 and 12-month assessment points, which may have influenced the results (the effect of specialist
7 physiotherapy needed to last longer). Sensitivity analyses did not show significant differences in
8 participants recruited before and after the pandemic for the primary outcome, although it is impossible
9 to rule out potential confounding factors of the treatment interruptions caused by COVID-19 or our
10 mitigating strategies. We cannot rule out placebo and nocebo effects associated with the randomised
11 groups. We attempted to minimise these nonspecific effects in the way we described the trial
12 treatments to potential participants (for more details see neurologist training in the appendix pp 4, and
13 patient information sheet, appendix pp 8). Strengths of our study include the large sample size, a high
14 rate of compliance and retention, follow-up over 12 months, and blinding of those involved with data
15 collection and analysis. Generalisability is supported in that the intervention was carried out at multiple
16 sites, with high fidelity, following training and support with supervision.

17
18 Questions for future research include, do interventions delivered earlier in the trajectory of FMD
19 improve outcome? What are the optimal ingredients, duration and intensity for physiotherapy? In view
20 of the heterogeneity of the patient population, research should identify which patients are most likely
21 to benefit from specialist physiotherapy and how to meet the needs of those who are unlikely to
22 benefit. More evidence is needed to guide the addition of multidisciplinary expertise to the
23 rehabilitation of some patients, such as psychological therapy and occupational therapy, as well as
24 considering potential adjuncts to physiotherapy, such as neuromodulation, hypnosis, and non-specific
25 exercise. Finally, research is needed to develop validated subjective and objective outcome measures
26 for FMD.

27
28 In conclusion, the specialist physiotherapy protocol for FMD did not result in better self-reported
29 physical functioning compared to (non-FMD specialist) neurological physiotherapy. Both treatment
30 groups showed improved mean Physical Functioning scores over the 12-month study period. However,
31 the specialist physiotherapy group were more likely to rate their motor symptoms as improved. These
32 changes occurred despite baseline assessments revealing long symptom durations and high levels of
33 physical disability, anxiety and depression. Taken together with the very high levels of satisfaction with
34 treatment, specialist physiotherapy appears to be a valued and safe treatment option for a proportion
35 of people with FMD.

Figure 1. Trial Profile



1 **Table 1. Baseline Characteristics (Groups A, B and D)**

	Specialist Physiotherapy (n=141)	Treatment as usual (n=106)	Total (n=247)
Age, years			
Mean (SD)	45.0 (14.3)	44.4 (14.9)	44.7 (14.6)
Median (IQR)	48 (33 – 55)	45 (31 – 55)	46 (33 – 55)
Gender			
Male	37 (26.2%)	27 (25.5%)	64 (25.9%)
Female	104 (73.8%)	79 (74.5%)	183 (74.1%)
Ethnicity			
White	126 (89.4%)	97 (91.5%)	223 (90.3%)
Black	6 (4.3%)	1 (0.9%)	7 (2.8%)
Asian	6 (4.3%)	2 (1.9%)	8 (3.2%)
Mixed	2 (1.4%)	5 (4.7%)	7 (2.8%)
Other	1 (0.7%)	1 (0.9%)	2 (0.8%)
Relationship status and dependents			
Married or cohabitating with partner	72 (54.6%)	64 (59.4%)	136 (55.1%)
Single, separated, or widowed	64 (45.4%)	43 (40.6%)	107 (43.3%)
Has dependents	52 (36.9%)	41 (38.7%)	93 (37.7%)
Care needs			
Has a carer	56 (39.7%)	27 (25.5%)	83 (33.6%)
Has a paid carer	17 (12.1%)	7 (6.6%)	24 (9.7%)
Highest qualification, years of education			
No qualification	11 (7.8%)	4 (3.8%)	15 (6.1%)
General Certificate of Secondary Education	35 (24.8%)	25 (23.6%)	60 (24.3%)
A level	25 (17.7%)	16 (15.1%)	41 (16.6%)
National Vocational Qualification	26 (18.4%)	17 (16.0%)	23 (9.3%)
Higher National Certificate/Diploma	16 (11.4%)	7 (6.6%)	45 (18.2%)
Degree	18 (12.8%)	27 (25.5%)	45 (18.2%)
Higher Degree	9 (6.4%)	9 (8.5%)	18 (7.3%)
Other	1 (0.7%)	1 (0.9%)	2 (0.8%)
Years of education (SD)	14.2 (3.8)	14.4 (2.8)	14.3 (3.4)
Employment status			
Working or studying	49 (34.8%)	37 (34.9%)	86 (34.8%)
Not working/studying because of sickness	40 (28.4%)	31 (29.3%)	71 (28.7%)
Not working because of unemployment	42 (29.8%)	29 (27.4%)	71 (28.7%)
Other	10 (7.1%)	9 (8.5%)	19 (7.7%)
Previous treatment			
Physiotherapy	69 (49.6%) ^a	42 (40.4%) ^a	111 (45.7%) ^a
Psychology	25 (18.0%) ^a	17 (16.4%) ^a	42 (17.3%) ^a
Occupational Therapy	22 (15.8%) ^a	8 (7.7%) ^a	30 (12.3%) ^a
Specialist inpatient rehabilitation	5 (3.7%) ^a	4 (3.9%) ^a	9 (3.7%) ^a
Symptom duration, years			
Mean (SD)	5.2 (7.2)	4.4 (4.9)	4.8 (6.3)
Median (IQR)	2.6 (1.3 – 6.0)	2.6 (1.1 – 5.4)	2.6 (1.2 – 5.6)
Dominant motor symptom			
Weakness	47 (33.3%)	31 (29.2%)	78 (31.6%)
Gait disturbance	45 (31.9%)	35 (33.0%)	80 (32.4%)
Tremor	21 (14.9%)	13 (12.3%)	34 (13.8%)
Mixed movement disorder	19 (13.5%)	16 (15.1%)	35 (14.2%)
Jerks	7 (5.0%)	6 (5.7%)	13 (5.3%)
Dystonia / fixed dystonia	2 (1.4%)	5 (4.7%)	7 (2.8%)
Body part affected, dominant hand^b			

Left upper limb	68 (48.3%)	43 (40.6%)	111 (44.9%)
Right upper limb	68 (48.3%)	45 (42.5%)	113 (45.7%)
Left lower limb	99 (70.2%)	74 (69.8%)	173 (70.0%)
Right lower limb	92 (65.3%)	75 (70.8%)	167 (67.6%)
Head/neck	36 (25.5%)	20 (18.8%)	56 (22.7%)
Trunk	31 (22.0%)	13 (12.3%)	44 (17.8%)
Dominant hand, right	128 (90.8%)	97 (91.5%)	225 (91.1%)

- 1
- 2 ^a indicates variables with missing data, so the denominator is less than 141 for specialist physiotherapy or 106 for treatment as usual.
- 3
- 4 ^b Multiple sites/body parts could be affected.

1 **Table 2. Primary and secondary outcomes (Groups A, B and D)**

	Specialist physiotherapy n=152 maximum	Treatment as usual n=114 maximum	Difference adjusting for baseline (95% CI)
SF36 Physical Functioning, mean (SD) Scale range 0-100			
Baseline	26.3 (23.1)	30.9 (23.2)	
Participants with available data	141 (93%)	106 (93%)	
12-months	37.1 (28.4)	37.2 (28.5)	3.534 (-2.258, 9.325) ^a
Participants with available data	138 (91%)	103 (90%)	
SF36 Physical Role Limitations, mean (SD) Scale range 0-100			
Baseline	20.9 (21.3)	21.9 (22.2)	
Participants with available data	141 (93%)	106 (93%)	
12-months	33.0 (26.9)	31.8 (27.0)	2.267 (-3.687, 8.221)
Participants with available data	138 (91%)	103 (90%)	
SF36 Bodily Pain, mean (SD) Scale range 0-100			
Baseline	28.4 (22.7)	32.6 (23.3)	
Participants with available data	141 (93%)	106 (93%)	
12-months	35.4 (26.4)	37.1 (25.6)	1.144 (-4.615, 6.902)
Participants with available data	138 (91%)	103 (90%)	
SF36 General Health Perceptions, mean (SD) Scale range 0-100			
Baseline	34.2 (19.4)	37.1 (21.7)	
Participants with available data	141 (93%)	106 (93%)	
12-months	34.9 (18.9)	35.5 (20.9)	1.796 (-1.977, 5.570)
Participants with available data	136 (89%)	103 (90%)	
SF36 Energy/Vitality, mean (SD) Scale range 0-100			
Baseline	22.2 (16.7)	22.3 (18.0)	
Participants with available data	141 (93%)	106 (93%)	
12-months	29.8 (20.3)	26.1 (18.7)	3.752 (-0.874, 8.377)
Participants with available data	137 (90%)	103 (90%)	
SF36 Social Functioning, mean (SD) Scale range 0-100			
Baseline	29.5 (22.6)	30.8 (26.5)	
Participants with available data	141 (93%)	106 (93%)	
12-months	38.8 (27.7)	38.1 (27.5)	1.068 (-5.356, 7.492)
Participants with available data	137 (90%)	103 (90%)	
SF36 Emotional Role Limitations, mean (SD) Scale range 0-100			
Baseline	48.7 (34.3)	50.8 (36.8)	
Participants with available data	141 (93%)	106 (93%)	
12-months	51.1 (32.0)	48.9 (33.5)	3.638 (-2.850, 10.126)
Participants with available data	138 (91%)	103 (90%)	
SF36 Mental Health, mean (SD) Scale range 0-100			
Baseline	52.3 (21.5)	54.0 (21.7)	
Participants with available data	141 (93%)	106 (93%)	
12-months	55.1 (23.3)	51.4 (23.9)	5.360 (0.940, 9.779)*

Participants with available data	137 (90%)	103 (90%)	
Participant rated Clinical Global Impression Scale of Improvement (frequency)			
12-month			
Participants with available data	138 (91%)	102 (89%)	
Much Improved	36 (26.1%)	14 (13.7%)	
Improved	45 (32.6%)	25 (24.5%)	
No Change	41 (29.7%)	47 (46.1%)	
Worse	12 (8.7%)	10 (9.8%)	
Much Worse	4 (2.9%)	6 (5.9%)	
Good outcome (Much Improved, or Improved)	81 (58.7%)	39 (38.2%)	
Poor outcome (No Change, Worse, or Much Worse)	57 (41.3%)	63 (61.8%)	
Odds ratio of improving (95% CI) ^b			2.315 (1.361, 3.938)*
Functional Mobility Scale, mean (SD) ^c Scale range 3-18			
Baseline	11.4 (4.5)	11.5 (4.4)	
Participants with available data	140 (92%)	104 (91%)	
12-months	12.2 (4.5)	11.9 (4.6)	0.598 (-0.198, 1.395)
Participants with available data	136 (89%)	97 (85%)	
Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale: Anxiety, mean (SD) ^d Scale Range 0-21			
Baseline	10.3 (5.0)	9.5 (5.2)	
Participants with available data	140 (92%)	105 (92%)	
12-months	10.0 (5.2)	9.4 (4.9)	-0.531 (-1.412, 0.350)
Participants with available data	135 (89%)	97 (85%)	
Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale: Depression, mean (SD) ^d Scale Range 0-21			
Baseline	8.8 (4.1)	8.3 (4.4)	
Participants with available data	140 (92%)	105 (92%)	
12-months	8.5 (4.7)	8.2 (4.8)	-0.203 (-1.200, 0.795)
Participants with available data	135 (89%)	97 (85%)	
Fatigue 5-point scale (frequency)			
Baseline			
Participants with available data	141 (93%)	106 (93%)	
No tiredness/fatigue	3 (2.1%)	2 (1.9%)	
Slight	12 (8.5%)	16 (15.1%)	
Moderate	68 (48.2%)	35 (33.0%)	
Severe	42 (29.8%)	38 (35.9%)	
Extreme	16 (11.4%)	15 (14.2%)	
No Fatigue or Slight Fatigue	15 (10.4)	18 (17.0%)	
Moderate, Severe, or Extreme Fatigue	129 (89.6)	88 (83.0%)	
12-month			
Participants with available data	136 (89%)	97 (85%)	
No tiredness/fatigue	5 (3.7%)	2 (2.1%)	
Slight	18 (13.2%)	14 (14.4%)	
Moderate	44 (32.4%)	32 (33.0%)	
Severe	36 (26.5%)	36 (37.1%)	
Extreme	33 (24.3%)	13 (13.4%)	

No Fatigue or Slight Fatigue	23 (16.9%)	16 (16.5%)	
Moderate, Severe, or Extreme Fatigue	113 (83.1%)	81 (83.5%)	
Odds ratio of milder fatigue (95% CI) ^e			1.102 (0.621, 1.955)
Confidence in the diagnosis, mean (SD) Scale range 0-10			
Baseline	8.1 (2.0)	8.0 (2.2)	
Participants with available data	141 (93%)	106 (93%)	
12-months	8.1 (2.3)	7.4 (2.8)	0.781 (0.193, 1.369)*
Participants with available data	134 (88%)	94 (82%)	
Revised Illness Perception Questionnaire, mean (SD) Scale range 0-14			
Identity Baseline	9.0 (2.7)	8.6 (2.9)	
Participants with available data	139 (91%)	105 (92%)	
Identity 12-months	9.3 (2.7)	9.1 (3.0)	-0.247 (-0.839, 0.345)
Participants with available data	132 (87%)	94 (82%)	
Scale range 18-90			
Causes Baseline	40.8 (10.4)	40.9 (12.0)	
Participants with available data	139 (91%)	105 (92%)	
Causes 12-months	42.0 (10.2)	41.7 (10.6)	-0.183 (-2.404, 2.038)
Participants with available data	132 (87%)	94 (82%)	
Scale range 6-30			
Timeline Baseline	20.6 (4.4)	20.3 (4.5)	
Participants with available data	140 (92%)	106 (93%)	
Timeline 12-months	22.8 (4.5)	22.2 (4.0)	-0.194 (-1.175, 0.787)
Participants with available data	132 (87%)	94 (82%)	
Scale range 4-20			
Timeline cyclical Baseline	14.2 (3.7)	14.0 (3.95)	
Participants with available data	141 (93%)	106 (93%)	
Timeline cyclical 12-months	13.7 (3.7)	13.7 (3.7)	-0.188 (-1.021, 0.644)
Participants with available data	133 (87%)	94 (82%)	
Scale range 6-30			
Consequences Baseline	24.0 (4.0)	23.9 (3.6)	
Participants with available data	140 (92%)	105 (92%)	
Consequences 12-months	22.6 (4.5)	22.8 (4.0)	-0.573 (-1.508, 0.362)
Participants with available data	132 (87%)	94 (82%)	
Scale range 6-30			
Personal control Baseline	18.6 (4.0)	19.7 (3.8)	
Participants with available data	140 (92%)	105 (92%)	
Personal control 12-months	19.4 (4.4)	19.0 (4.2)	1.108 (0.138, 2.079)
Participants with available data	133 (87%)	94 (82%)	
Scale range 5-25			
Treatment control Baseline	16.3 (2.6)	16.9 (2.6)	
Participants with available data	140 (92%)	105 (92%)	
Treatment control 12-months	15.7 (3.7)	15.9 (3.5)	0.339 (-0.512, 1.190)
Participants with available data	133 (87%)	94 (82%)	
Scale range 5-25			
Illness coherence Baseline	13.3 (4.7)	13.7 (4.7)	

Participants with available data	141 (93%)	106 (93%)	
Illness coherence 12-months	17.2 (4.9)	15.6 (5.0)	1.669 (0.592, 2.745)*
Participants with available data	133 (87%)	94 (82%)	
Scale range 6-30			
Emotional representation Baseline	21.4 (5.3)	20.4 (5.3)	
Participants with available data	141 (93%)	106 (93%)	
Emotional representation 12-months	19.5 (5.5)	19.6 (4.7)	-0.911 (-1.999, 0.176)
Participants with available data	133 (87%)	94 (82%)	
Scale range 56-294			
TOTAL Baseline	176.0 (16.8)	175.5 (21.6)	
Participants with available data	133 (87%)	102 (89%)	
TOTAL 12-months	178.0 (17.9)	176.2 (19.5)	0.171 (-3.422, 3.764)
Participants with available data	129 (85%)	94 (82%)	
Extended Patient Health Questionnaire, mean (SD) Scale range 0-31			
Assessed at baseline only	16.9 (5.7)	15.7 (5.7)	
Participants with available data	135 (89%)	105 (92%)	

1

2 *Denotes a statistically significant difference.

3 ^a Intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) = 0.017.

4 ^b Odds ratio of improving if assigned to specialist physiotherapy (much improved or improved vs no
5 change, worse, or much worse).

6 ^c Functional Mobility Scale rates the assistance needed over three distances: 5 metres, 50 metres, 500
7 metres. Each distance is rated from 1-6: 1=uses wheelchair; 2=uses walker/frame; 3=uses crutches;
8 4=uses walking stick(s); 5=independent but needs to hold rail on stairs; 6=independent on all surfaces.

9 ^d HADS Anxiety and Depression cut-off score of 8+ has been found to have acceptable sensitivity and
10 specificity for cases of anxiety and depression (Bjelland et al 2002)

11 ^e Odds ratio of milder fatigue if assigned to specialist physiotherapy (no or slight fatigue vs moderate,
12 severe, or extreme).

13

14 Reference:

15 Bjelland, I., Dahl, A. A., Haug, T., & Neckelmann, D. (2002). The validity of the Hospital Anxiety and
16 Depression Scale An updated literature review. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 52, 69–77.

1 **Table 3. Adverse and Serious Adverse Events**

	COVID Groups A, B and D		COVID Groups C and X ^a	
	Specialist Physiotherapy n=141	Treatment as usual n=106	Specialist Physiotherapy n=38	Treatment as usual n=70
Adverse Events^b				
Participants with at least 1 event	41 (29.1%)	26 (24.5%)	6 (15.8%)	9 (12.9%)
Total number of events	64	32	9	13
Relationship to treatment				
Not related	56	32	9	13
Possibly	1	0	0	0
Probably	6	0	0	0
Definitely	1	0	0	0
Serious Adverse Events^c				
Participants with at least 1 event	24 (17.0%)	18 (17.0%)	4 (10.6%)	9 (12.8%)
Total events reported	35	24	9	10
Total number of deaths	1	0	0	0

2 ^a COVID Group X, were those who were unassigned to a COVID group as they were lost to follow-up at the time
3 the COVID groups were assigned, or they had withdrawn from the study.

4 ^b Adverse events were defined as any untoward medical occurrence, regardless of causal relationship with
5 treatment, and not meeting the criteria for a serious adverse event.


6 ^c Serious adverse events were defined as any untoward occurrence that resulted in death, was life-threatening,
7 required hospitalisation or prolongation of existing hospitalisation, resulted in persistent or significant disability or
8 incapacity, or consists of a congenital anomaly or birth defect, or was otherwise considered medically significant
9 by the investigator. No serious adverse events were deemed to be related to receiving physiotherapy.

10

1 **Figure 2. Continuous outcome measures**


2 **Continuous outcome measures, effect size (ES) and 95% confidence interval (CI) at six and 12-months,**
 3 **adjusting for baseline values and sites and standardising by baseline values of each outcome due to**
 4 **differences in scale.**

5 Footnotes: Abbreviations: SP=specialist physiotherapy; TAU=treatment as usual; N=maximum number
 6 of participants; n=number of participants with available data.
 7



1 **Figure 3. Participant rated Clinical Global Impression scale of Improvement at**
 2 **six- and 12-months.**

3 Legend: Participant rated perception of improvement, in answer to the question, “After physiotherapy,
 4 the problem with my movement is...” Odds ratio of improvement at 6-months for specialist
 5 physiotherapy compared treatment as usual was 4.7 (95% CI 2.6 to 8.6); odds ratio at 12-months 2.3
 6 (1.4 to 3.9).
 7



8

PANEL: RESEARCH IN CONTEXT

Evidence before this study

We searched Ovid Medline from inception (1946 to May 09, 2023) with the following search strategy: conditions terms (“functional neurological”, “functional movement”, “psychogenic”, “conversion”, “hysterical”, “hysteria”, “non-organic”, “nonorganic”, “functional neurological symptom disorder”, “dissociative neurological symptom disorder”, and “Conversion Disorder/”); AND intervention terms (“physiotherapy”, “physical therapy”, “rehabilitation”, “exercise”, “Physical Therapy Modalities/” and “Neurological Rehabilitation/”); AND study terms (“Randomized Controlled Trial/”, “Cohort Studies/”, and “Case Reports”). We conducted additional searches using Google Scholar and we hand searched reference lists.

There were no powered randomised controlled trials (RCT). There were two randomised studies, each with 60 participants. The first compared 3-weeks of inpatient multidisciplinary rehabilitation for functional gait disorder to a four-week waitlist control, after which the control group crossed over to receive the intervention. The other randomised study was the feasibility study for the current RCT, where we tested similar intervention and control conditions. In both studies, scores of physical health but not mental health were maintained at 12-months (uncontrolled follow-up data) and six-months respectively. Our search identified 15 single patient case studies, 36 cohort studies (with subject numbers ranging from 3 to 305), and one RCT comparing hypnosis and multidisciplinary rehabilitation to multidisciplinary rehabilitation alone (the two arms of this trial are considered as a single cohort for the purposes of this review).

In summary, there are a growing number of studies describing promising outcomes from physical-based interventions for FMD. There has been an absence of evidence from adequately powered RCTs, and a lack of controlled follow-up data beyond 6-months.

Added value off this study

The Physio4FMD trial is the first fully-powered RCT of a physical-based intervention for FMD and the largest randomised study of people with FMD published to date. The intervention was protocolised and was described in a way that allows it to be replicated and refined by others. We have also shown that large, randomised trials of a complex intervention involving people with FMD can be delivered with high levels of compliance and retention.

1 Implications of all the available evidence

2 We found no difference between specialist physiotherapy and treatment as usual for our primary
3 outcome, SF36 Physical Functioning. Both specialist and non-specialist physiotherapy groups improved
4 in measures of physical function. In secondary outcomes, more participants in the specialist
5 physiotherapy group rated their motor symptoms improved. Specialist physiotherapy also had a
6 superior effect on measures of mental health and self-efficacy. The results also suggest that
7 physiotherapy, where patients are selected for treatment and physiotherapists are supported by
8 experienced clinicians, is safe. However, there were high rates of unrelated serious adverse events,
9 reflecting the complex nature of this patient population, the existence of multi-comorbidity and the
10 need for multidisciplinary support. Taken together with all the available evidence, physiotherapy
11 appears to be a valuable treatment for selected people with FMD.

Contributors

GN led the study and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. GN, AC, ME, LG, RH, JM, LM, IN, MR, JS contributed to the study design and funding acquisition and were involved at all stages. GN and KH designed the trial intervention, wrote the intervention workbook and treatment manual, trained the physiotherapists, and provided supervision to the specialist physiotherapist group. LM and TL designed and completed the statistical analysis. BSS and HN were trial managers. AMS was the lead research assistant and verified the data. GN and BSS also verified the data. All authors were members of the Trial Management Group. All authors helped to interpret the data, to critically revise the manuscript for important intellectual content and approved the final version. All authors had full access to all the data in the study and accept responsibility to submit for publication.

Declaration of interests

GN receives research funding from the NIHR. LM research funding from NIHR. MJE does medical expert reporting in personal injury and clinical negligence cases, including in cases of functional neurological disorder (FND). MJE has shares in Brain & Mind, which provides neuropsychiatric and neurological rehabilitation in the independent medical sector, including in people with functional neurological disorder. MJE has received financial support for lectures from the International Parkinson's and Movement Disorders Society and the FND Society (FNDS). MJE receives royalties from Oxford University Press for his book The Oxford Specialist Handbook of Parkinson's Disease and Other Movement Disorder. M.J.E has received honoraria for medical advice to Teva Pharmaceuticals. MJE receives grant funding, including for studies related to FND, from the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR) and the Medical Research Council (MRC). MJE is an associate editor of the European Journal of Neurology. MJE is a member of the international executive committee of the International Parkinson's and Movement Disorders Society and a board member of the FNDS. MJE is on the medical advisory boards of the charities FND Hope UK and Dystonia UK. JS reports honoraria from UptoDate, personal fees from Expert Witness Work and grants from National Research Scotland. He runs a free self-help website, www.neurosymptoms.org, for patients with Functional Neurological Disorder. He is secretary of the FND Society and on the medical advisory boards of the charities FND Hope UK and FND Action. All other authors declare no competing interests.

1 **Data sharing**

2 Deidentified participant data can be made available by request to the corresponding author. Requests
3 will be considered after planned analyses and reporting have been completed by the investigators.
4 Access will require submission of a protocol that is approved by a review committee and a signed data
5 access agreement. Due to our data sharing agreement and for patient confidentiality reasons, we are
6 not able to provide access to hospital episode statistics data from NHS England and NHS Scotland.
7

8 **Acknowledgments**

9 Thank you to our trial participants, and our service user collaborators for their important contribution to
10 the design and management of the study. We thank our independent Trial Steering Committee and
11 Data Monitoring and Ethics Committee for their guidance and support. We thank the PRIMENT Clinical
12 Trials Unit team for their support, guidance and oversight of the trial set up and day to day
13 management. This study is funded by the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR), Health
14 Technology Assessment Programme (project reference 16/31/63) – A randomised controlled trial of
15 specialist physiotherapy for functional motor disorder (Physio4FMD). Funding has been further granted
16 by the NIHR HTA for a 22-month costed extension. This study also represents independent research
17 (LHG) part-funded by the NIHR Maudsley Biomedical Research Centre at the South London and
18 Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust and King’s College London. The study benefited from the support of the
19 CRN South London Study Support Service. Thank you to FND charities FND Hope International, FND
20 Hope UK, FND Action and FND Dimensions for their support. The views expressed are those of the
21 authors and not necessarily those of the NIHR, NHS or the Department of Health and Social Care. For
22 the purposes of open access, the authors have applied a Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence
23 to any Accepted Author Manuscript version arising from this submission.
24
25

1 REFERENCES

- 2 1 Carson A, Lehn A. Epidemiology. In: Hallett M, Stone J, Carson A, eds. Functional Neurologic
3 Disorders, Vol 139 of the Handbook of Clinical Neurology series. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2016: 47–
4 60.
- 5 2 Stone J, Carson A, Duncan R, *et al.* Symptoms ‘unexplained by organic disease’ in 1144 new
6 neurology out-patients : how often does the diagnosis change at follow-up ? 2009; **132**: 2878–
7 88.
- 8 3 Espay AJ, Aybek S, Carson A, *et al.* Current concepts in diagnosis and treatment of functional
9 neurological disorders. *JAMA Neurol* 2018; **75**: 1132–41.
- 10 4 Gelauff J, Stone J, Edwards MJ, Carson A. The prognosis of functional (psychogenic) motor
11 symptoms: a systematic review. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2014; **85**: 220–6.
- 12 5 Nielsen G, Stone J, Edwards MJ. Physiotherapy for functional (psychogenic) motor symptoms: A
13 systematic review. *J Psychosom Res* 2013; **75**: 93–102.
- 14 6 Perez DL, Edwards MJ, Nielsen G, Kozłowska K, Hallett M, Curt LaFrance W. Decade of progress in
15 motor functional neurological disorder: Continuing the momentum. *J Neurol Neurosurg*
16 *Psychiatry* 2021; **92**: 668–77.
- 17 7 Edwards MJ, Adams RA, Brown H, Parees I, Friston KJ. A Bayesian account of ‘hysteria’. *Brain*
18 2012; **135**: 3495–512.
- 19 8 Jungilligens J, Paredes-Echeverri S, Popkirov S, Barrett LF, Perez DL. A new science of emotion:
20 implications for functional neurological disorder. *Brain* 2022; **145**: 2648–63.
- 21 9 Nielsen G, Stone J, Matthews A, *et al.* Physiotherapy for functional motor disorders: a consensus
22 recommendation. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2015; **86**: 1113–9.
- 23 10 Nielsen G, Ricciardi L, Demartini B, Hunter R, Joyce E, Edwards MJ. Outcomes of a 5-day
24 physiotherapy programme for functional (psychogenic) motor disorders. *J Neurol* 2015; **262**:
25 674–81.
- 26 11 Nielsen G, Buszewicz M, Stevenson F, *et al.* Randomised feasibility study of physiotherapy for
27 patients with functional motor symptoms. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2017; **88**: 484–90.
- 28 12 Nielsen G, Stone J, Buszewicz M, *et al.* Physio4FMD: protocol for a multicentre randomised
29 controlled trial of specialist physiotherapy for functional motor disorder. *BMC Neurol* 2019; **19**:
30 242.
- 31 13 Gupta A, Lang AE. Psychogenic movement disorders. *Curr Opin Neurol* 2009; **22**: 430–6.
- 32 14 SealedEnvelope. Randomisation and online databases for clinical trials.
33 <https://www.sealedenvelope.com/> (accessed June 26, 2019).

- 1 15 Nielsen G, Holt K. Physio4FMD Programme Workbook 2.0. *St George's, University of London Online resource* 2023. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.24376/rd.sgul.23967024.v1>.
- 2
- 3 16 Nielsen G, Holt K. Physio4FMD Intervention Manual. *St George's, University of London Online resource* 2023. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.24376/rd.sgul.23967156.v1>.
- 4
- 5 17 Syddall HE, Martin HJ, Harwood RH, Cooper C, Aihie Sayer A. The SF-36: a simple, effective measure of mobility-disability for epidemiological studies. *J Nutr Health Aging* 2009; **13**: 57–62.
- 6
- 7 18 Sharpe M, Walker J, Williams C, *et al*. Guided self-help for functional (psychogenic) symptoms: a randomized controlled efficacy trial. *Neurology* 2011; **77**: 564–72.
- 8
- 9 19 Jenkinson C, Coulter A, Wright L. Short form 36 (SF36) health survey questionnaire: normative data for adults of working age. *BMJ* 1993; **306**: 1437–40.
- 10
- 11 20 Graham HK, Harvey A, Rodda J, Nattrass GR, Pirpiris M. The Functional Mobility Scale (FMS). *J Pediatr Orthop* 2004; **24**: 514–20.
- 12
- 13 21 Moss-Morris R, Weinman J, Petrie KJ, Horne R, Cameron LD, Buick D. The Revised Illness Perception Questionnaire (IPQ-R). *Psychol Health* 2002; **16**: 1–16.
- 14
- 15 22 Zigmond AS, Snaith RP. The Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale. *Acta Psychiatr Scand* 1983; **67**: 361–70.
- 16
- 17 23 Yang Y, Rowen D, Brazier J, Tsuchiya A, Young T, Longworth L. An exploratory study to test the impact on three 'bolt-on' items to the EQ-5D. *Value Health* 2015; **18**: 52–60.
- 18
- 19 24 Goldstein LH, Mellers JDC, Landau S, *et al*. COgnitive behavioural therapy vs standardised medical care for adults with Dissociative non-Epileptic Seizures (CODES): a multicentre randomised controlled trial protocol. *BMC Neurol* 2015; **15**: 98.
- 20
- 21
- 22 25 NHS Digital. Hospital Episode Statistics. DOI:<https://digital.nhs.uk/data>.
- 23
- 24 26 ISD Services | Electronic Data Research and Innovation Service (eDRIS) | ISD Scotland. <https://www.isdscotland.org/products-and-services/edris/> (accessed Oct 2, 2023).
- 25
- 26 27 Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JBW. The PHQ-9: Validity of a brief depression severity measure. *J Gen Intern Med* 2001; **16**: 606–13.
- 27
- 28 28 Carson AJ, Stone J, Hansen CH, *et al*. Somatic symptom count scores do not identify patients with symptoms unexplained by disease: a prospective cohort study of neurology outpatients. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2015; **86**: 295–301.
- 29
- 30 29 ICH Expert Working Group. Guideline for Good Clinical Practice E6 (ICH-GCP). *ICH Harmonised Tripartite Guideline* 1996; **1996**: i–53.
- 31
- 32 30 MHRA. Guidance on minimising disruptions to the conduct and integrity of clinical trials of medicines during COVID-19. 2020. <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/guidance-on-minimising-disruptions-to-the-conduct-and-integrity-of-clinical-trials-of-medicines-during-covid-19> (accessed Jan 5, 2022).
- 33
- 34
- 35

- 1 31 EMA. Points to consider on implications of Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) on methodological
2 aspects of ongoing clinical trials. 2020. [https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/points-consider-implications-coronavirus-disease-covid-19-methodological-aspects-ongoing-clinical_en-0.pdf)
3 [guideline/points-consider-implications-coronavirus-disease-covid-19-methodological-aspects-](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/points-consider-implications-coronavirus-disease-covid-19-methodological-aspects-ongoing-clinical_en-0.pdf)
4 [ongoing-clinical_en-0.pdf](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/points-consider-implications-coronavirus-disease-covid-19-methodological-aspects-ongoing-clinical_en-0.pdf) (accessed Jan 5, 2022).
- 5 32 FDA. Conduct of Clinical Trials of Medical Products During the COVID-19 Public Health Emergency
6 Guidance for Industry, Investigators, and Institutional Review Boards For questions on clinical
7 trial conduct during the COVID-19 pandemic, please email Clinicaltri. 2020.
8 <https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-> (accessed Jan 5, 2022).
- 9 33 Marston L, Le M, Ricciardi F, *et al.* COVID-19 and the Physio4FMD trial : Impact , mitigating
10 strategies and analysis plans. *Contemp Clin Trials Commun* 2023; **33**: 101124.
- 11 34 Keurentjes JC, Van Tol FR, Fiocco M, Schoones JW, Nelissen RG. Minimal clinically important
12 differences in health-related quality of life after total hip or knee replacement: A systematic
13 review. *Bone Joint Res* 2012; **1**: 71–7.
- 14 35 Nicholson TR, Carson A, Edwards MJ, *et al.* Outcome measures for functional neurological
15 disorder: A review of the theoretical complexities. *Journal of Neuropsychiatry and Clinical*
16 *Neurosciences* 2020; **32**. DOI:10.1176/appi.neuropsych.19060128.
- 17 36 Pick S, Anderson DG, Asadi-Pooya AA, *et al.* Outcome measurement in functional neurological
18 disorder: a systematic review and recommendations. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2020; : jnnp-
19 2019-322180.
- 20 37 Nielsen G, Ricciardi L, Meppelink A, Holt K, Teodoro T, Edwards MJ. A simplified version of the
21 Psychogenic Movement Disorders Rating Scale: The Simplified Functional Movement Disorders
22 Rating Scale (S-FMDRS). *Mov Disord Clin Pract* 2017; **4**: 710–6.
- 23 38 Jordbru AA, Smedstad LM, Klungsøyr O, Martinsen EW. Psychogenic gait disorder: A randomized
24 controlled trial of physical rehabilitation with one-year follow-up. *J Rehabil Med* 2014; **46**: 181–7.

25
26

1 **Physio4FMD Study Group**

FIRST NAME	SECOND NAME
Emily	Beaves
David	Breen
Christine	Burness
Simone	Caddy
Hannah	Callaghan
Andrew	Carberry
Luke	Chetham
Andrea	Clyne
Susie	Cobb
Jan	Coebergh
Lewis	Cook
Patrick	Cookson
Paul	Cooper
Clare	Diamond
Lee	Drake
Victoria	Dunn
Paula	Gardiner
Thomas	Gilbertson
Dawn	Golder
Rebecca	Gregory
Helen	Harbinson
Rory	Higgins
Ingrid	Hoeritzauer
Laura	Irvine
Jeremy	Isaacs
Emily	Jay
Danielle	Kearney
Uzma	Khan
James	Magro
Elizabeth	Mallam
Eleanor	Harle
Luke	Massey
Sarah	McRae
Shagun	Misra
Steph	Mitchell
Cameron	Moss
Esther	Mountain
Shona	Murray
Rachel	Newby
Marianne	Novak
Annie	Ross
Anna	Rutherford

Gillian	Sare
Rhiannon	Sears
Will	Sedley
Sumeet	Singhal
Biba	Stanton
Charlotte	Stone
Gillian	Szeto
Lauren	Tarr
Tiago	Teodoro
Volker	Teweleit
Michael	Walsh
Rhian	Warman
Mahinda	Yogarajah

1