

Table 1. Profile of HAM/TSP patients enrolled and improvement of motor function in the lower extremities and urinary function 12 weeks after treatment

Case No.	Age (years)	Sex	Duration of illness (years)	Concomitant therapy			Intermittent self-catheterization	OMDS*		Spasticity of the lower extremities	
				immunomodulator	drug for neurogenic bladder anticholinergic	α1 blocker		before treatment	after treatment	before treatment	improvement**
1	80	Female	23	No	Yes		Yes	6	6	Yes	Yes
2	64	Female	16	No	Yes		Yes	6	6	Yes	Yes
3	57	Male	51	PSL/ IFN-α	Yes		Yes	6	6	Yes	Yes
4	51	Female	36	No	Yes		Yes	9	9	Yes	Yes
5	67	Female	3	No			Yes	3	3	No	
6	61	Female	30	No			Yes	5	5	Yes	Yes
7	68	Female	12	No		Yes	No	4	4	Yes	Yes
8	64	Male	11	PSL		Yes	No	5	5	Yes	No
9	66	Male	23	PSL	Yes		Yes	9	9	Yes	Yes
10	76	Male	23	No			No	6	6	Yes	Yes
11	53	Female	7	No			Yes	6	6	Yes	No
12	62	Female	12	PSL		Yes	Yes	4	4	No	
13	44	Female	22	No			Yes	6	6	Yes	No
14	56	Male	10	No	Yes		Yes	5	5	Yes	Yes
15	71	Female	45	No	Yes		Yes	9	9	No	
16	78	Female	18	No	Yes		Yes	5	5	Yes	Yes
17	50	Female	19	No			No	5	5	Yes	Yes
18	63	Female	29	No	Yes		Yes	8	8	Yes	Yes
19	62	Female	9	PSL	Yes		Yes	8	8	Yes	No
20	60	Female	34	No	Yes		Yes	2	1	No	
21	46	Female	26	PSL		Yes	No	2	1	Yes	Yes
22	31	Female	7	No		Yes	No	4	3	Yes	Yes
23	56	Male	18	No			Yes	10	10	No	
24	56	Male	16	IFN-α			No	2	2	Yes	Yes
Remarks	mean ± SD;		mean ± SD;							% improvement:	
	60.1 ± 11.2		20.9 ± 12.1							78.9 (P=0.0003)***	

Table 1. (continued)

Case No.	Time required to walk 10 m (sec)			downstairs (sec)			Detrusor overactivity		Detrusor-sphincter dyssynergia	
	before treatment	after treatment	% improvement	before treatment	after treatment	% improvement	before treatment	after treatment	before treatment	after treatment
1	26.5	21.6	18.5		N.E.		No	No	No	No
2	15.5	9.8	36.8		N.E.		Yes	No	No	No
3	11.5	10.5	8.7	8.6	7.7	10.5	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
4		N.E.			N.E.		Yes	No	Yes	Yes
5	5.3	4.9	7.5	3.8	3.7	2.6	No	No	Yes	No
6	5.9	6.2	-5.1	4.1	4.2	-2.4	No	No	Yes	No
7	8.9	9.5	-6.7	9.2	7.9	14.1	No	No	No	No
8	12.6	13.3	-5.6	9.5	8.6	9.5	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
9		N.E.			N.E.		Yes	No	No	No
10	20	25.1	-25.5		N.E.		No	No	No	No
11	29.5	32.5	-10.2		N.E.		Yes	No	Yes	Yes
12	6.6	6.9	-4.5	4.4	4.3	2.3	Yes	No	Yes	No
13	22.8	21.3	6.6		N.E.		Yes	No	No	No
14	15.4	11.3	26.6	14.3	11.4	20.3	No	No	No	No
15		N.E.			N.E.		Yes	No	No	No
16	13.7	20.9	-52.6		N.E.		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
17	13.3	11.5	13.5	10.0	7.3	27	Yes	Yes	No	No
18		N.E.			N.E.		Yes	Yes	No	No
19		N.E.			N.E.		Yes	Yes	Yes	No
20	6.9	5.7	17.4	4.5	3.5	22.2	No	No	No	No
21	5.7	4.1	28.1	3.6	3.5	2.8	Yes	No	No	No
22	10.3	6.8	34	9.4	4.4	53.2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
23		N.E.			N.E.		No	No	Yes	No
24	4.5	4.3	4.4	3.2	3.4	-6.3	Yes	No	No	No
Remarks							% improvement:		% improvement:	
							58.8 (P=0.0094)***		45.5 (P=0.0736)***	

*OMDS; Osame's motor function score was rated from 0 to 13 according to the disability grade [13]. **Improvement in spasticity of more than one grade according to the modified Ashworth scale [14]. ***Statistical significance was determined by the McNemar test. N.E.; not evaluated because of high OMDS. PSL: prednisolone. IFN- α : interferon-alpha.

