



# Dance Improves Motor, Cognitive, and Social Skills in Children With Developmental Cerebellar Anomalies

Valentin Bégel<sup>1,2</sup> · Asaf Bachrach<sup>3</sup> · Simone Dalla Bella<sup>4,5,6,7</sup> · Julien Laroche<sup>8,9</sup> · Sylvain Clément<sup>1</sup> · Audrey Riquet<sup>10</sup> · Delphine Dellacherie<sup>1,10</sup>

Accepted: 7 June 2021

© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, part of Springer Nature 2021

## Abstract

In this multiple single-cases study, we used dance to train sensorimotor synchronization (SMS), motor, and cognitive functions in children with developmental cerebellar anomalies (DCA). DCA are rare dysfunctions of the cerebellum that affect motor and cognitive skills. The cerebellum plays an important role in temporal cognition, including SMS, which is critical for motor and cognitive development. Dancing engages the SMS neuronal circuitry, composed of the cerebellum, the basal ganglia, and the motor cortices. Thus, we hypothesized that dance has a beneficial effect on SMS skills and associated motor and cognitive functions in children with DCA. Seven children (aged 7–11) with DCA participated in a 2-month dance training protocol (3 h/week). A test–retest design protocol with multiple baselines was used to assess children’s SMS skills as well as motor, cognitive, and social abilities. SMS skills were impaired in DCA before the training. The training led to improvements in SMS (reduced variability in paced tapping), balance, and executive functioning (cognitive flexibility), as well as in social skills (social cognition). The beneficial effects of the dance training were visible in all participants. Notably, gains were maintained 2 months after the intervention. These effects are likely to be sustained by enhanced activity in SMS brain networks due to the dance training protocol.

**Keywords** Cerebellar anomalies · Sensorimotor synchronization · Rhythm · Rehabilitation · Dance

## Introduction

Developmental cerebellar anomalies (DCA) are rare diseases that affect cerebellar functions in less than one in 2000 [1]. The cerebellum is a pivotal brain region that contributes to motor and cognitive control as well as social and affective

functions [2–7]. It achieves maturity a few years after birth, making it particularly vulnerable to developmental disorders [8, 9]. Unfortunately, very few specific remediation strategies to compensate for DCA currently exist [10], possibly because of the rarity of this disease. The current research focuses on an innovative training protocol using dance to

✉ Delphine Dellacherie  
delphine.dellacherie@univ-lille.fr

<sup>1</sup> ULR 4072–PSITEC–Psychologie: Interactions, Temps, Emotions, Cognition, Univ. Lille, F-59000 Lille, France

<sup>2</sup> Present Address: Department of Psychology, McGill University, 1205 Dr Penfield Ave, Montreal, QC H3A 1B1, Canada

<sup>3</sup> UMR 7023, CNRS, Université Paris 8, 59/61 rue Pouchet, 75849 Paris, France

<sup>4</sup> International Laboratory for Brain, Music and Sound Research (BRAMS), 1430 Boulevard du Mont-Royal, Montreal, QC H2V 2J2, Canada

<sup>5</sup> Department of Psychology, University of Montreal, CP 6128 Succursale Centre-Ville, Montreal, QC H3C 3J7, Canada

<sup>6</sup> Centre for Research on Brain, Language and Music (CRBLM), Faculty of Medicine, McGill University, 3640 de la Montagne, Montreal, QC H3G 2A8, Canada

<sup>7</sup> Department of Cognitive Psychology, University of Economics and Human Sciences in Warsaw, Okopowa 59, Warsaw 01-043, Poland

<sup>8</sup> Labex Arts H2H, Université Paris 8, 2 Rue de la Liberté, 93526 Saint-Denis, France

<sup>9</sup> Present Address: Center for Translational Neurophysiology of Speech and Communication (CTNSC), Fondazione Istituto Italiano Di Tecnologia (IIT), Via Fossato di Mortara, 17/19, Ferrara 44121, Italy

<sup>10</sup> Department of Pediatric Neurology, University Hospital of Lille, 2 Av. Oscar Lambret, 59037 Lille, France

improve motor, cognitive, and social skills in children with DCA.

DCA can have various causes (e.g., Joubert and Dandy-Walker syndromes, intrauterine trauma, or intoxication). Cerebellar syndromes found in DCA are often explained by structural and volumetric anomalies of the cerebellum [11, 12]. They can also be diagnosed on the basis of clinical observations in the absence of neuroimaging evidence [13]. Predominantly, DCA is associated with congenital forms of cerebellar ataxia [14, 15]. Ataxia refers to abnormal organization of movement and impaired coordination of balance, gait, extremity and eye movements, and dysarthria. DCA is also consistently associated with cognitive deficits (e.g., in executive functions, visual-spatial skills, and linguistic abilities [6, 16–19]), and emotional, social, and communication deficits [3, 4, 6, 18, 20, 21].

The cerebellum plays a crucial role in motor control [5]. For example, it is involved in the control of oculomotor movements [22], speech [23], grasping [24], and voluntary limb movements [25]. A specific contribution of the cerebellum to these tasks is the control of precise, online adaptive and predictive timing [5, 7, 26]. The cerebellum is involved in coordinating an action with temporally predictable, rhythmic events [2, 5, 27–31], especially in auditory–motor interactions [32–35]. This is referred to as sensorimotor synchronization (SMS, [36, 37]. SMS is usually studied via finger tapping to predictable stimuli such as a metronome or music sequences [38]. The cerebellum is involved in the perception of sequences [39], a capacity that is required for SMS. In addition, cerebellar circuitry is necessary to produce and adapt the next motor response using error information (i.e., discrepancy between the tap and the sound) of the previous response [40].

More generally, the cerebellum is part of a distributed neural system, including the basal ganglia, motor, and premotor cortices, that enables temporal processing [41–46]. The cerebellum is crucial for timing and rhythmic tasks as well as for other motor and cognitive capacities in which timing and SMS are involved, such as gait [28]; [47], Dalla Bella, Benoit, Farrugia, Schwartz, & Kotz, 2015; [48], language [49, 50], and social interactions [51]. Therefore, it is not surprising that patients with DCA are usually impaired in a variety of the aforementioned motor, cognitive, and social capacities associated with SMS [4, 6, 16, 18].

To date, there is no direct evidence that SMS skills are affected in DCA, as no research studied SMS skills such as tapping to a metronome or music in these patients. Nevertheless, studies have reported other timing impairments with other cerebellar acquired or degenerative pathologies (e.g., spinocerebellar ataxia, infarction). They are visible in tasks requiring precise timing, such as eye movements, spatio-temporal prediction, predictive motor timing, and finger movements in overarm throwing [52–55]. Interestingly,

timing disorders are not confined to motor tasks, as cerebellar anomalies are also associated with poorer performance in perceptual tasks such as duration discrimination [53, 56, 55]. Provasi et al. [33] studied SMS and rhythm perception in children with acquired (not developmental) cerebellar tumors (medulloblastoma) and showed that patients displayed more tapping variability in SMS task, despite normal rhythm perception. Therefore, it is likely that patients with DCA also have difficulties in SMS.

Because of the role played by the cerebellum in motor and sensorimotor skills, dance is of particular interest for persons with cerebellar dysfunctions. Dance is an engaging activity involving an elaborate form of full body synchronization to a musical beat in a non-verbal communicative and aesthetic context [57, 58]. It engages neuronal networks including the premotor and parietal cortices (“action observation network”), the supplementary motor area (SMA), the motor cortex, the basal ganglia, and the cerebellum [59–64]. The anterior cerebellar vermis and cerebellar lobules V and VI appear as key structures for the entrainment of movement to external auditory timing cues in dance [60] and expert dancers reveal brain changes, structural and functional, in these regions. Expertise in dance is also associated with improved sensorimotor functions [65–67], and proprioceptive body representation [68], thus supporting the tight link between brain networks affected by dance training and the sensorimotor and proprioceptive functions.

During the last decade, promising results showed that dance training can be used successfully for improving motor and cognitive functions in a variety of conditions such as aging [69, 70], neurodegenerative diseases [71], stroke [72], and neurodevelopmental diseases [73]. For example, dance training showed beneficial effects on motor and cognitive skills in Parkinson’s disease [74–78], a condition associated with poorer rhythm and timing skills [79–81]. Beneficial effects of a dance training protocol on motor functions were also observed in children with ADHD [73], a condition also affecting the cortico-cerebello-striatal pathways and rhythmic capacities [82, 83], and in children with cerebral palsy [84, 85]. Moreover, consistent with the notion that dance is a social and highly engaging activity [57, 86–88], positive effects of this activity on psychosocial behavior and emotional responses are reported, especially in children with developmental disorders [73, 89, 90]. Yet, it is not clear whether these motor and socio-affective improvements are mediated by SMS skills, because most studies did not include SMS testing. More generally, the effect of dance on cerebellar deficits has not been evaluated so far, except in one recent case study reporting the effects of an 8-week dance training protocol (based on an adapted form of tango) in an adult with a non-congenital cerebellar ataxia [91]. After the dance training, this patient

displayed improved standing balance, gait characteristics, and functional mobility as well as self-declared improvements in emotion regulation and quality of life. This result is promising for the use of dance in cerebellar dysfunctions. However, so far, other physical therapy programs for patients with cerebellar dysfunctions, especially DCA, are scarce [10], and, to the best of our knowledge, none included SMS or rhythmic components [92–94]. We aimed to respond to this lack of rehabilitation methods in DCA by designing a sensorimotor training protocol based on dance.

The goal of this study was to test the effect of dance on a range of functions in children with DCA. This small-scale study included seven children with DCA who participated in a customized 7-week dance training program. Children with DCA were all diagnosed with cerebellar ataxia and displayed coordination disorders. Nevertheless, participants displayed different cerebellar signs (Table 1). We implemented a concurrent multiple baseline design adapted to small sample studies. With this method, the number of baselines (i.e., evaluation sessions before the protocol begins) was set randomly for each participant (between 4 and 7 baselines). This allows an accurate and rigorous assessment of the patient's initial performance. Therefore, the effects of the intervention can be highlighted more reliably than with a single baseline or with the same number of baselines for all participants, reinforcing the causality between treatment and performance change [95, 96]. In addition, analyses methods adapted to single-case studies were used [97]. Finally, a control group was tested in order to compare patients' skills with those of age-matched typically developing children and to control for the test–retest effect and the normal developmental evolution of the main tested domains.

Children SMS's skills when tapping to an external stimulus were evaluated. A battery of fine motor, cognitive tasks and social questionnaires was also used. We expected improved SMS skills after the training, with possible associated effects on motor, cognitive, and social skills.

## Methods

### Participants

#### Patients (CEREB)

**Case Histories** Seven children (2 females, all right-handed) with DCA, aged between 7.5 and 10.3 years at the inclusion stage, participated in the study (Table 1). Patients were recruited at the Centre de Référence Malformations et Maladies Congénitales du Cervelet (2M2, University Hospital of Lille) where they each received a multidisciplinary assessment including a neurological standard examination and a neuropsychological evaluation. No specific scale to evaluate congenital ataxia currently exists. Cerebellar functionality was evaluated with the items of the Scale for the Assessment and Rating of Ataxia (SARA) [98], although the quantitative items of this scale were not specifically developed for this type of congenital ataxia. The results at the SARA revealed the presence of cerebellar signs in all patients (see Table 1). All patients were diagnosed with cerebellar ataxia of unknown etiology (patients 1 to 6) or, in one case (patient 7), with cerebellar ataxia in the context of a Joubert's syndrome linked to mutations of the gene *CC2D2A*. Cerebellar ataxia was associated with malformations observable on structural brain imagery (MRI) in patients 1 (cisterna magna and slightly enlarged fourth ventricle), 4 (vermian dysplasia), 5 (abnormal fissuring of the superior vermis), and 7 (molar tooth sign, cerebellar dysplasia of superior vermis, and malformation of the cerebellar peduncles) whereas patients 2, 3, and 6 did not present any morphological malformation visible on a structural MRI. The exclusion criteria were as follows: (1) radiological picture or medical history consistent with a diagnosis of acquired lesions due to pre-natal or perinatal issues; (2) progressive cerebellar pathology; (3) metabolic diseases associated with congenital malformation of the cerebellum;

**Table 1** Demographics and cerebellar signs at the inclusion neurological evaluation

Patient	Age	Genre	A	HT	CD	DM	DA	T	S	F	N	OA	OM	OBF
1	10.3	M	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
2	7.8	F	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+
3	7.5	F	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+
4	8.2	M	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-
5	9.0	M	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+
6	7.11	M	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-
7	8.3	M	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+

A, Ataxia; HT, Hypotonia; CD, Coordination disorder/dysdiadochokinesis; DM, Dysmetria; DA, Dysarthria/speech disorder (articulation); T, Intentional tremors; S, Slowness; F, Fatigability; N, Nystagmus; OA, Oculomotor apraxia; OM, Other oculomotor disorders; OBF, Oro-bucco-facial apraxia

**Table 2** IQ scores of children with DCA. IQ indexes were calculated with the WISC-IV for patients 1, 4, 5, and 6 and with the WPPSI-IV for patients 2, 3, and 7 in accordance with the age of the patient at last intellectual evaluation

Patient	VCI	PRI	VSI	FRI	WMI	PSI
1	98	94	NT	NT	97	112
2	84	NT	106	118	106	74
3	95	NT	77	95	97	77
4	138	114	NT	NT	100	96
5	82	79	NT	NT	NT	76
6	89	NT	102	91	88	77
7	100	NT	85	95	NT	71

VCI, verbal comprehension index; PRI, perceptual reasoning index; VSI, visual-spatial index; FRI, fluid reasoning index; WMI, working memory index; PSI, processing speed index; note that in the WISC IV, the main indices are VCI, PRI, WMI, and PSI. In the WPPSI IV, the main indices are VCI, VSI, FRI, WMI, and PSI. NT, not tested (the index does not exist in the battery used)

(4) malformation affecting other cerebral structures besides the cerebellum; (5) epileptic seizures or febrile convulsions or even focal or generalized paroxysmal EEG abnormalities (spikes or spike-wave complexes), and (6) intellectual disability ( $IQ < 70$ ) in the patients' clinical history. Table 2 presents IQ indexes for each participant. All indexes are within the norms, although some patients' performances were in the low norms in verbal (VCI) and non-verbal (PRI) and visual-spatial (VSI) indexes. Most patients displayed borderline performances in processing speed (PSI). None of them had music or dance experience nor were engaged in extracurricular musical, dance, or sport activities during the study.

### Control Group (CONTROL)


A group of 19 children (CONTROL) aged between 7.00 and 10.58 years ( $M = 8.75$ ,  $SD = 1.27$ , 7 females) were tested twice with an 8-week interval on a subset of tasks in order to control the test–retest effect and the effect of normal development on the children performances. No children who displayed impairments in verbal comprehension and/or perceptual reasoning, with perceptual or motor impairments, neurological, psychiatric, or developmental disorders, were included in the control group. Children with dance and/or musical training were not included.

The study was approved by the National Ethics Committee (CPP Sud Est III, France, EudraCT: 2017-A03300-53). All participants and their parents gave their informed consent before testing and intervention in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki.

### Procedure

Figure 1 shows the experimental design for the CEREB group. Children in the CEREB group took part in a 7-week dance training protocol at the Eurasport center (University of Lille, France). Before and after the training, a complete individual testing session was administered to each participant (see “[Experimental Measures](#),” for a description of the tests). Testing included the evaluation of movement, sensorimotor, and cognitive skills. Questionnaires assessing social cognition, executive functioning, and anxiety were also administered. Two months after the training, a 2-h evaluation session was administered in order to evaluate the long-term effects of the training.

For a subset of tasks (synchronization with a metronome and with music, verbal inhibition and switching from the NESPY-II), a concurrent multiple baseline design was used. We administered randomized baseline periods (i.e., each participant received a different number of short pre-intervention evaluations). Children were randomly assigned from 4 to 7

**Fig. 1** Experimental design for the CEREB children

multiple baselines. These short evaluation sessions lasted 15 min. Repeated measures with the same subset of tasks were also administered on a weekly basis during treatment. Since the intervention starts for all patients at the same time after a different number of baselines between participants, if an improvement is observed after the start of the intervention regardless of the number of baselines, this improvement can be attributed with more certainty to the intervention. In other words, this multiple baseline methodological design reinforces the inference of causal links between the intervention and the observed improvement.

## Training

CEREB children participated in a 7-week dance training protocol specifically developed for that purpose. A total of fourteen dance classes (one and a half hours each) were given regularly by a professional dance teacher. The dance training consisted in several playful exercises with different physical intensity. These exercises combined several components, with and without musical beat: (1) whole body movement to rhythmic music or without music; (2) sequence learning; (3) coordination with one or more partners, and (4) expressivity and creativity through movement improvisation. The order of the exercises was changed across sessions to make them less repetitive and more interesting. Instrumental music suitable for children was used. All excerpts had a salient beat. The tempo was moderate (80–100 BPM). Each exercise lasted about 7 min. Each session started with warm-up and ended with relaxation and stretching exercises.

During the sessions, the following three main types of exercises were proposed.

**Synchronization With Rhythms** With these exercises, children learned to perceive, produce, synchronize with rhythms, and adapt to rhythmic changes. For example, they had to walk in the room synchronizing their steps with a tambourine sound. Either the dance teacher or one of the children played the tambourine and chose the tempo speed, trying to keep it steady. A variation of this exercise was to step in hoops laid out on the floor, synchronizing each step with the rhythm. Other exercises involved the production of rhythmic sequences in group, using hand clapping or drumming on small percussion instruments, sometimes accompanied with singing.

**Body and Space Exploration** Various exercises were used to foster children's consciousness of the body and space. These exercises were performed with or without rhythmic sounds, such as percussion sounds played by the dance teacher or music. They consisted in improvised movements or progressive movements (e.g., moving from one position to another in a given number of beats). Other exercises

involved moving a small plastic ball in space with different instructions, such as touching other children with the ball or bringing it to different places in the room.

**Choreographies** In each session, moments were dedicated to improvisation and creation. Choreographies were created using movements proposed by the children or the dance teacher. These choreographies were rehearsed at each session and new movements were added. These exercises were designed to encourage creativity and interactions between the children.

## Experimental Measures

### Rhythm Assessment

**Perceptual Rhythm Assessment** The Beat Alignment Test (BAT, [99]) was taken from the Battery for the Assessment of Auditory and Sensorimotor Timing Abilities (BAASTA, [38]). The task was to judge whether a metronome was aligned or not with the beat of music. Two 20-beat musical excerpts from Bach's «Badinerie» and two from Rossini's «William Tell Overture» were played at a tempo of 600 ms of inter-beat interval (IBI). After 7 beats, a metronome (isochronous tones with a triangle timbre) was superimposed onto the music. When unaligned, tones occurred earlier or later than the beat by 33% of the quarter note duration (phase shift, 12 stimuli), or the interval between the tones was increased or decreased by 10% of the quarter note duration (period shift, 12 stimuli). Stimuli were presented in pseudo-randomized order with PsychoPy 2 (<http://www.psychopy.org/>) installed on a Dell computer (XPS 13 9360 Model). Auditory stimuli were delivered via headphones (Sennheiser HD280) at a comfortable sound level (60 dB). Responses were provided verbally by the children and entered by the experimenter by pressing one of the two response keys (“yes” or “no”). “Yes” indicated the situation when the child considered that the metronome was aligned with the musical beat. The sensitivity index ( $d'$ ) was used as an unbiased measure of detection performance. It is obtained by calculating the standardized difference between the Hits (i.e., when a misaligned metronome was correctly detected) and False alarms (i.e., when a misalignment was erroneously reported):  $z(H) - z(FA)$ .

**Motor and Sensorimotor Rhythmic Tasks** Motor and sensorimotor rhythmic skills were assessed using finger tapping tasks from the BAASTA [38]. A self-paced finger tapping task (referred to as unpaced tapping) was used to assess participants' spontaneous motor tempo and variability. Sensorimotor rhythmic skills were assessed using finger tapping to the beat of a metronome or music (referred to as paced

tapping). For tapping tasks, a tablet version of BAASTA was used (Acer Iconia Tab 10 model) [83, 100]. Note that the timing precision of the presentation of the stimuli on the tablet was 1% of the inter onset interval. Auditory stimuli were delivered via headphones (Sennheiser HD280). Stimuli were presented at a comfortable sound level (60 dB). Children had to tap with their index finger on the tablet. In unpaced tapping, participants had to produce regular finger taps with their dominant hand at a comfortable rate for 60 s. In paced tapping to metronome and music, children's capacity to track the beat was tested with finger tapping synchronization tasks. The metronome sequences included 60 piano tones (tone frequency = 1319 Hz) of 600 ms IBI. Two additional conditions with slow (750 ms) and fast (450 ms) IBIs were used at pre- and post-testing (but not in weekly evaluations). Sixty-four-beat musical excerpts taken from Bach's «Badinerie» and Rossini's «William Tell Overture» (beat = quarter note) were used in paced tapping with music. The IBI was 600 ms, which is within the range for optimal rhythm perception [101–103]. All stimuli were repeated twice. Artifacts and outliers were discarded as follows. Artifacts were taps leading to inter-taps intervals (ITIs) smaller than 100 ms. In addition, taps were considered as outliers when the ITI between the actual tap and the preceding tap was smaller than  $Q1 - 3 \times \text{interquartile range (IQR)}$  or greater than  $Q3 + 3 \times \text{IQR}$ , where  $Q1$  is the first quartile and  $Q3$  is the third quartile [38]. The first ten taps of each trial were discarded. In unpaced tapping, the mean ITI was computed. The coefficient of variation (CV) of the ITI (the ratio of the SD of the ITIs over the mean ITI) was calculated as a measure of motor variability. In paced tapping, the CV of the ITI was used as a measure of motor variability during a synchronization task. In paced tapping with a metronome, the mean performance at the two trials was calculated for each tempo. The four music trials were averaged for tapping with music.

### Balance and Fine Motor Control

Subtests from the Movement Assessment Battery for Children (M-ABC-II, [104]) (static and dynamic balance, manual dexterity) and the NEPSY-II [105] (hand imitation) were used to assess balance and motor skills. Three subtests from the M-ABC-II (placing pegs in a peg board, threading a lace, and drawing a line into a trail) were used to evaluate manual dexterity. The percentile score at manual dexterity on the French version of the M-ABC-II [106] was calculated for each patient. In static and dynamic balance (M-ABC-II), three subtests from the M-ABC-II (one-leg balance, walking on a line, and hopping on mats) were used. The final scores were the average time the child kept on the balance board for the one-leg balance task (maximum = 30 s), the total number of steps for the walking on a line task (maximum = 15), and

the number of hops (one-leg hops, one trial of 5 hops maximum per leg) averaged across the two legs for the hopping on mats task (maximum = 5). The percentile score at static and dynamic balance on the French version of the M-ABC-II [106] was also calculated for each patient. In hand imitation (NEPSY-II), the experimenter presented up to 12 different positions with his hand. Children were asked to reproduce the position. The task was done first with the dominant hand and was repeated with the non-dominant hand. A total score (maximum = 24) was calculated.

### Neuropsychological Assessment

A battery of neuropsychological tests was submitted. Subtests were taken from the Test of Everyday Attention for Children (TEA-ch, [107]) (motor inhibition, cognitive flexibility) and the NEPSY-II [105] (verbal inhibition and switching, verbal and non-verbal fluencies). The motor inhibition task (TEA-ch) is a go-no go task consisting of pointing at squares while listening to short sequences of tones and stopping to point when a different timbre occurs. The final score is the number of good responses. In cognitive flexibility (TEA-ch), children had to count the number of “creatures” (i.e., green little monsters) visible all along their burrow. Arrows are interspersed among the creatures and pointed either upwards or downwards. They were instructed to begin counting the creatures one by one and to change the direction of counting when the sense of the next arrow was downwards, until the last creature was presented. The final score was calculated based on the number of good responses (quality index) and the time spent (speed index) to complete the task. Verbal inhibition and switching (NEPSY-II) consisted in a series of black and white shapes (squares and circles or upwards or downwards arrows) that children had to denominate or tell the direction (denomination condition). In two other conditions, they were instructed to give the name of the other shape or of the other direction (inhibition) and to name the shape or give the direction when it was black and to give the name of the other shape or direction when it was white (change condition). The total number of errors and the time of execution were calculated for each condition. The total of errors across conditions was also calculated. In verbal fluencies (NEPSY-II), participants were asked to generate as many words as they could within a specific semantic category (animals and foods/drinks) or initial letter (S and F) category for 60 s. A score of semantic fluency and a score of initial letter category were calculated by cumulating the total number of correct words generated in each category. In non-verbal fluencies (NEPSY-II), children had to connect structured or random dots presented in squares taking care not to form the same pattern as in previous squares. The total number of correct squares filled was considered as the final score for each condition, and a composite score

for non-verbal fluencies was calculated by adding the two conditions.

## Questionnaires

Questionnaires filled by the children and by the parents were used to assess executive functions in everyday life, social cognition, and anxiety. The Behavior Rating Inventory of Executive Function (BRIEF) parent version [108], a validated questionnaire, was used to measure the child's executive function competence in the real-world setting. Six sub-scores (the higher the score, the better) were provided: inhibition, cognitive flexibility, emotional control, initiation, working memory, planification/organization, organization of materials, and self-control. A global composite score was also computed. A social cognition and theory of mind questionnaire created by our research team was administered. It consisted in a series of 15 five-level Likert scale questions evaluating children capacities in social cognition and theory of mind. The final score is the sum of the scores obtained for each question. Higher scores indicate higher estimated capacities. Finally, anxiety reported by the children was evaluated using the Revised Children's Manifest Anxiety Scale (R-CMAS, [109]). A global score was calculated. Low scores indicated high anxiety.

## Statistical Analysis

**Exploratory Group Statistical Analyses** We first conducted exploratory group statistical analyses. For all tasks, we compared CEREB children's performances before and after the training with Wilcoxon signed-rank test. When a difference was observed, we also compared the difference between the pre-test and the follow-up test and between the post-test and the follow-up test. For tasks that have been included in the multiple baselines (synchronization with a metronome and with music, verbal inhibition, and switching from the NESPY-II), the mean of the last four multiple baselines was used as the pre-training measure. In addition, we calculated the difference between the post- and the pre-training (delta pre/post), the follow-up and pre-training (delta pre/follow-up) in the CEREB group, and between the retest and the test (delta test/retest) in CONTROL. For tasks in which a significant difference between the pre- and the post-training evaluations was observed, we used Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney U test to compare the delta of the CEREB and the CONTROL groups. It is important to note that given the small sample size of the CEREB group and the multiple tests, statistical power of group analyses is very limited. We used them only to highlight overall tendencies for CEREB children to display improved performance after the training.

**Single-Cases Statistical Analyses** Statistical analyses adapted to the study of single cases [97] were used to evaluate patients' performance before and after the training. CEREB performances at the pre- and post-training were compared to controls' using statistics adapted for the analysis of single cases (DissocBayes program, [97]). For each patient, a subgroup of six to eight age-matched (i.e., they were less than 6 months older or 1 year younger than the patient) control participants was constituted. The mean of the last four multiple baselines was used as the pre-training measure for multiple baseline tasks.

## Results

### Exploratory Group Analyses

Table 3 shows tasks for which a significant difference between the pre- and the post-training results was found. Note that almost all patients displayed a significant impairment before the training at these tasks (see below, "Single-Case Analysis" section).

**Perceptual, Motor, and Sensorimotor Rhythmic Tasks** When patients synchronized with a metronome and with music, tapping variability (CV) was significantly reduced after the training. The change was significantly greater in CEREB than in CONTROL. The differences with baseline were maintained at follow-up (metronome: follow-up,  $M=0.18$ ,  $SD=0.17$ ,  $Z=2.20$ ,  $p<0.05$ ,  $r=0.83$ ; music: follow-up,  $M=0.30$ ,  $SD=0.16$ ,  $Z=2.36$ ,  $p<0.01$ ,  $r=0.89$ ). No overall significant change was observed in perceptual rhythmic skills (BAT) and unpaced tapping ( $p>0.05$ ) in CEREB.

**Balance and Fine Motor Control** Hopping on mats was improved after the training in CEREB, and the difference was maintained at follow-up (follow-up,  $M=3.79$ ,  $SD=1.87$ ;  $Z=2.38$ ,  $p<0.05$ ,  $r=0.90$ ). The change in hopping on mats was significantly larger in CEREB than in CONTROL. No differences were observed between the pre- and the post-tests in the other variables ( $p>0.05$ ).

**Neuropsychological Assessment** In neuropsychological tests, cognitive flexibility was improved after the training, both in terms of number of correct answers and time; the difference was maintained at follow-up for good answers (follow-up,  $M=5.66$ ,  $SD=1.03$ ;  $Z=2.13$ ,  $p<0.01$ ,  $r=0.87$ ). The change was significantly greater in CEREB than in CONTROL for both correct answers and time. A difference was also found in the number of errors of the change condition in verbal inhibition and switching (before,  $M=8.62$ ,  $SD=5.64$ ; after,  $M=5.71$ ,  $SD=5.68$ ;  $Z=2.37$ ,  $p<0.01$ ,  $r=0.89$ ) and in the total number of errors (before,  $M=16.36$ ,

**Table 3** Differences between the pre- and the post-training and between CEREB and CONTROL groups. Tasks for which a significant difference was observed are presented

Variable	CEREB pre-post comparison				Comparison CEREB and CONTROLS					
	Mean pre (SD)	Mean post (SD)	Z	p	Effect size (r)	Delta patients (SD)	Delta controls (SD)	Z	p	Effect size (r)
Tapping with a metronome (CV)	0.35 (0.05)	0.19 (0.11)	2.37	<0.01**	0.89	-0.16 (0.08)	0.03 (0.15)	3.32	<0.001***	0.65
Tapping with music (CV)	0.41 (0.12)	0.22 (0.09)	2.37	<0.01**	0.89	-0.19 (0.11)	0.00 (0.03)	2.86	<0.005***	0.56
Hopping on mats	1.86 (1.38)	3.57 (2.09)	2.30	<0.05*	0.87	1.71 (1.19)	-0.05 (0.28)	3.88	<0.001***	0.76
Cognitive flexibility speed	7.24 (2.87)	12.8 (10.3)	2.20	<0.05*	0.90	-5.19 (8.47)	-1.08 (1.22)	1.84	<0.05*	0.36
Cognitive flexibility quality	4.67 (1.86)	3 (1.91)	2.27	<0.05*	0.93	1.33 (0.52)	0.32 (0.75)	2.71	<0.05*	0.46
Cognitive flexibility at home	16.57 (3.6)	13.86 (3.39)	1.87	<0.05*	0.71	2.71 (3.30)	0.18 (1.13)	2.11	<0.05*	0.47
Social cognition	59.43 (8.28)	55.14 (7.78)	1.86	<0.05*	0.70	4.29 (4.89)	-0.47 (4.89)	2.71	<0.01**	0.53

$SD = 13.29$ ; after,  $M = 10.86$ ,  $SD = 9.62$ ;  $Z = 1.95$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ,  $r = 0.74$ ). However, these differences were not confirmed at follow-up (number of errors of the change condition, follow-up,  $M = 8$ ,  $SD = 12.61$ ;  $Z = 1.10$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ,  $r = 0.42$ ; total number of errors, follow-up,  $M = 9.33$ ,  $SD = 7.03$ ;  $Z = 1.16$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ,  $r = 0.47$ ). In addition, the change was similar in CONTROL and in CEREB for both the number of errors in the change condition (CEREB,  $M = -2.9$ ,  $SD = 2.92$ ; CONTROL,  $M = -1.68$ ,  $SD = 2.89$ ;  $Z = 0.55$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ,  $r = 0.11$ ) and the total number of errors (CEREB,  $M = -5.5$ ,  $SD = -5.96$ ; CONTROL,  $M = -2.28$ ,  $SD = 5.52$ ;  $Z = 1.12$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ,  $r = 0.22$ ). No improvements were observed in other neuropsychological tests ( $p > 0.05$ ).

**Questionnaires** No effect of the training was observed on the overall score of the executive function questionnaire, but there was an improvement in the cognitive flexibility sub-score (cognitive flexibility at home). Scores reported on the social cognition questionnaire were also better after the training. In these two questionnaires, the differences were not maintained at follow-up (cognitive flexibility at home, follow-up,  $M = 13.6$ ,  $SD = 3.78$ ;  $Z = 0.27$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ,  $r = 0.10$ ; social cognition questionnaire, follow-up,  $M = 59.33$ ,  $SD = 10.38$ ;  $Z = 1.26$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ,  $r = 0.52$ ). The improvement was significantly greater in CEREB (delta pre/post) as compared with CONTROL for both cognitive flexibility at home and social cognition. No effects were found at the R-CMAS ( $p > 0.05$ ).

Table 4 shows the results at the first and second sessions for controls. For hopping on mats, the average performance of control participants (4.97) before the training was very close to the maximum score (5). Consequently, an improvement of balance between the first and the second sessions would not be detected by this task. A significant difference at the speed index of the cognitive flexibility task was observed, meaning that control participants did the task more quickly in the second session. This difference is not as large as the one observed in the CEREB group though.

### Single-Case Analysis

**Motor Rhythmic Skills** Statistics calculated with the Dissocs-Bayes program [97] are presented in Table 5. In tapping with a metronome (CV), patients 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7 were impaired at pre-training, but only patient 3 was still impaired at post-training. In tapping with music (CV), patients 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7 were significantly impaired at pre-training. Patients 5 and 6 did not show measurable impairment after the training.

**Neuropsychological Assessment** Single-case statistics are presented in Table 6. In balance (hopping on mats),



**Table 4** Differences between the first and second testing sessions (CONTROL group)

Variable	Mean first session (SD)	Mean second session (SD)	Z	p
Tapping with a metronome (CV)	0.09 (0.08)	0.12 (0.12)	1.25	=0.22
Tapping with music (CV)	0.14 (0.11)	0.13 (0.08)	0.20	=0.86
Hopping on mats	4.95 (0.16)	4.89 (0.31)	-0.61	=0.75
Cognitive flexibility speed	5.50 (1.37)	4.42 (1.05)	-3.06	<0.05*
Cognitive flexibility quality	6.26 (0.73)	6.58 (0.61)	1.73	=0.15
Cognitive flexibility at home	20.00 (2.83)	20.06 (3.07)	0.45	=0.70
Social cognition	67.74 (5.90)	66.41 (4.20)	-1.48	=0.22

all patients displayed an impairment before the training. Patients 1, 4, and 6 had comparable performances after the training. Note that most control participants obtained the maximum score (5) at this task. In cognitive flexibility (speed), patients 5, 6, and 7 had a performance significantly poorer than controls at pre-training. This impairment was still found at post-training. At the quality index of cognitive flexibility, patients 2, 4, 6, and 7 were impaired before the training, and patients 1 and 5's performances

were borderline. Patients 4 and 5 displayed a normal performance at post-training in comparison with the control group. Note that patient 3 did not pass the cognitive flexibility task. At the cognitive flexibility at home index, patients 1, 2, 3, and 7 were significantly impaired before the training. Among them, patients 3 and 7 displayed a normal performance after the training. Finally, in social cognition, patients 2, 3, and 5 had significantly lower scores than controls at pre-training.

**Table 5** Individual scores in perceptual and motor rhythmic skills for each DCA patient in comparison with an age-matched control group. Statistics are calculated with Bayesian single-case methods [97]. Columns Pre show the comparison between the control group

and patients' performance before the testing and columns Post show the comparison between the control group and patients' performance after the testing

Variable	Pre			Post		
	Patient's score	Control group Mean (SD)	p	Patient's score	Control group Mean (SD)	p
<b>Patient 1</b>						
Tapping with a metronome (CV)	0.29	0.12 (0.14)	=0.15	0.10	0.12 (0.13)	=0.38
Tapping with music (CV)	0.42	0.15 (0.15)	=0.07	0.13	0.14 (0.12)	=0.47
<b>Patient 2</b>						
Tapping with a metronome (CV)	0.33	0.01 (0.01)	<0.005***	0.25	0.11 (0.07)	=0.06
Tapping with music (CV)	0.43	0.12 (0.05)	<0.005***	0.26	0.12 (0.04)	<0.05*
<b>Patient 3</b>						
Tapping with a metronome (CV)	0.42	0.07 (0.01)	<0.005***	0.39	0.11 (0.07)	<0.01**
Tapping with music (CV)	0.55	0.12 (0.05)	<0.005***	0.34	0.12 (0.04)	<0.005***
<b>Patient 4</b>						
Tapping with a metronome (CV)	0.31	0.08 (0.02)	<0.001***	0.09	0.13 (0.15)	=0.41
Tapping with music (CV)	0.15	0.12 (0.07)	=.35	0.13	0.14 (0.06)	0.44
<b>Patient 5</b>						
Tapping with a metronome (CV)	0.31	0.07 (0.03)	<0.001***	0.11	0.06 (0.01)	<0.005***
Tapping with music (CV)	0.46	0.14 (0.09)	<0.005***	0.13	0.09 (0.04)	0.19
<b>Patient 6</b>						
Tapping with a metronome (CV)	0.39	0.08 (0.02)	<0.001***	0.26	0.13 (0.15)	=0.23
Tapping with music (CV)	0.39	0.12 (0.07)	<0.01*	0.25	0.14 (0.06)	=0.07
<b>Patient 7</b>						
Tapping with a metronome (CV)	0.39	0.08 (0.02)	<0.001***	0.13	0.13 (0.15)	0.5
Tapping with music (CV)	0.42	0.12 (0.07)	<0.01**	0.31	0.14 (0.06)	0.023*

**Table 6** Individual scores in motor and cognitive skills for each DCA patient in comparison with an age-matched control group. Statistics are calculated with Bayesian single-case methods with the Dissoc-Bayes program [97]. Columns Pre show the comparison between

the control group and patients' performance before the testing and columns Post show the comparison between the control group and patients' performance after the testing

Variable	Pre			Post		
	Patient's score	Control group Mean (SD)	<i>p</i>	Patient's score	Control group Mean (SD)	<i>p</i>
<b>Patient 1</b>						
Hopping on mats	4.5	5.00 (0.00)	<0.001***	5	5.00 (0.00)	0.5
Cognitive flexibility speed	5.19	5.31 (0.76)	=0.44	4.5	3.96 (0.46)	0.15
Cognitive flexibility quality	4	6.00 (1.00)	=0.06	4	6.43 (0.79)	0.07
Cognitive flexibility at home	14	19.33 (2.25)	<0.05*	13	20 (2.83)	<0.05*
Social cognition	61	68.14 (4.77)	=0.11	69	65.67 (3.27)	=0.19
<b>Patient 2</b>						
Hopping on mats	2	4.92 (0.20)	<0.000***	3.5	4.67 (0.52)	<0.05*
Cognitive flexibility speed	9.43	6.24 (1.91)	=0.09	6.78	5.31 (1.24)	=0.16
Cognitive flexibility quality	4	6.33 (0.42)	<0.005***	5	6.83 (0.41)	<0.005***
Cognitive flexibility at home	10	20.83 (2.4)	<0.005***	13	20.67 (2.73)	<0.05*
Social cognition	39	67.17 (8.93)	<0.05*	48	67.50 (5.86)	<0.05*
<b>Patient 3</b>						
Hopping on mats	0	4.92 (0.20)	<0.005***	0.5	4.67 (0.62)	<0.005***
Cognitive flexibility speed	NA	NA	NA	NA		
Cognitive flexibility quality	NA	NA	NA	NA		
Cognitive flexibility at home	12	20.83 (2.40)	<0.005***	21	20.67 (2.73)	=0.46
Social cognition	61	67.17 (8.93)	<0.05*	62	67.50 (5.86)	=0.212
<b>Patient 4</b>						
Hopping on mats	2	4.83 (0.26)	<0.001***	5	4.66 (0.52)	=0.29
Cognitive flexibility speed	6.05	6.2 (2.01)	=0.47	5.35	4.45 (1.09)	=0.24
Cognitive flexibility quality	5	6.33 (0.52)	<0.05*	7	6.83 (0.41)	=0.36
Cognitive flexibility at home	14	19.83 (3.54)	=0.09	15	19.4 (4.16)	=0.19
Social cognition	58	64.83 (8.25)	=0.24	68	64 (4.30)	=0.21
<b>Patient 5</b>						
Hopping on mats	2	4.94 (0.18)	<0.001***	4	5 (0.00)	<0.001***
Cognitive flexibility speed	8.60	4.76 (0.80)	<0.001***	6.43	4.02 (0.69)	<0.01**
Cognitive flexibility quality	5	6.37 (0.74)	=0.06	6	6.37 (0.52)	=0.26
Cognitive flexibility at home	20	18.87 (3.52)	=0.38	20	19.28 (0.59)	=0.43
Social cognition	59	66.37 (2.67)	<0.05*	60	66.12 (2.70)	<0.05*
<b>Patient 6</b>						
Hopping on mats	2	4.83 (0.26)	<0.001***	5	4.66 (0.52)	=0.29
Cognitive flexibility speed	10.33	6.2 (2.01)	=0.057	7.77	4.45 (1.09)	<0.05*
Cognitive flexibility quality	1	6.33 (0.52)	<0.001***	3	6.83 (0.41)	<0.001***
Cognitive flexibility at home	16	19.83 (3.54)	=0.18	20	19.4 (4.16)	=0.45
Social cognition	52	64.83 (8.25)	=0.1	49	64 (4.30)	<0.01**
<b>Patient 7</b>						
Hopping on mats	1	4.83 (0.26)	<0.001***	1	4.66 (0.52)	<0.001***
Cognitive flexibility speed	35	6.2 (2.01)	<0.001***	12.62	4.45 (1.09)	<0.001***
Cognitive flexibility quality	1	6.33 (0.52)	0.000***	2	6.83 (0.41)	0.000***
Cognitive flexibility at home	11	19.83 (3.54)	<0.05*	14	19.4 (4.16)	=0.14
Social cognition	56	64.83 (8.25)	=0.18	60	64 (4.30)	=0.21

## Discussion

This interventional study explored the effect of a dance training protocol in children with DCA. Seven patients participated in fourteen dance classes over a period of 7 weeks. Before and after the training, we tested children with DCA's movement, sensorimotor, and cognitive skills, as well as social and affective functions. The results showed a positive change in rhythmic sensorimotor (finger tapping with a metronome and music), motor (balance), cognitive (cognitive flexibility), and social (social cognition) skills in most patients. We compared these changes with the evolution of these skills in a group of age-matched control participants over the same period of time. This confirmed that the improvement was greater in the CEREB patients than in typically developing children, and not merely due to a test–retest effect. Given the rarity of DCA and the complexity of the training protocol, only a small number of participants could be included in this study. We used single-case analyses with a multiple baseline experimental design to compare the performance of each patient before and after the training.

Children with DCA's difficulties in SMS were manifest: six patients out of seven displayed a more variable performance than controls when tapping to the beat of a metronome or music. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time that rhythmic difficulties are reported in developmental anomalies affecting the cerebellum. This result highlights the important role played by the cerebellum in synchronization already suggested by studies showing rhythmic deficits in acquired cerebellar dysfunction [33]. Recent neuroimaging evidence also support the idea that the cerebellum is important for rhythm perception and neural tracking of beat and rhythm [29–31, 34, 110].

After the dance training protocol, most patients had SMS performances comparable to those of controls. Their motor variability while synchronizing with a metronome or music was reduced (i.e., the performance was improved). Our study suggests that SMS skills can be improved in children with DCA. This confirms the hypothesis that dance, which enhances sensorimotor functions in other populations [66, 67], may boost these functions in cerebellar disorders. Dance training involves various sensorimotor tasks, and it is possible that similar effects would be obtained with other forms of sensorimotor training. This result could indicate that the cerebral network sustaining SMS can be trained to match an average functioning with specific remediation techniques. The cerebellum is belonging to this cerebral network that also involves the basal ganglia, the motor, and premotor cortices [41–46]. Dance is a complex activity that recruits a vast array of brain regions, including the cerebellar-cortical and basal

ganglia-cortical networks (i.e., the supplementary motor area, the motor cortex, the basal ganglia, and the cerebellum,[59–64]. It is reasonable to hypothesize that the recruitment of some of these dance associated regions would underlie the observed positive effects.

One question that remains unanswered is whether the training had a direct effect on the cerebellum. The observed improvement can also be underpinned by compensatory mechanisms in the brain involving the other brain structure sustaining timing, such as the basal ganglia [50]. Further studies involving neuroimaging could be used to confirm this hypothesis.

The cerebellar-cortical and basal ganglia-cortical networks that sustain SMS are also involved in various motor [47, 48, 111], cognitive [49, 50, 112], and social [51] skills. Therefore, it is not surprising that a dance protocol would affect other seemingly unrelated skills, confirming the idea that the sensorimotor training may exhibit a broader spectrum of remediation effects.

Balance involves some common structures with the SMS brain network such as the cerebellum and basal ganglia [113]. The effect of dance on balance associated brain network might be directly linked to the improvement of the SMS skills. Nevertheless, the changes are not necessarily limited to SMS brain networks. Dance involves balance training as well and hence possibly stimulates several other balance associated cerebral structures distinct from the SMS ones (e.g., frontal, temporal and parietal cortices, and the thalamus, [60, 64, 113]).

Cognitive skills (cognitive flexibility) were also improved by the dance training. This might seem surprising at first sight, as dance is a physical activity that mainly involves motor and SMS skills. It is important to note, however, that cognitive flexibility is a complex ability that involves different subdomains such as inhibition, working memory, and switching [114]. Recent studies showed that these capacities correlate with SMS skills in children [83, 115]. Therefore, we cannot rule out the possibility that the gain in cognitive flexibility is linked to the SMS training, even though some other factors such as the exercise of creativity through body improvisation might have acted in synergy. Indeed, cognitive flexibility is linked to creativity [116]. Moreover, in a review on interventions to aid executive functions in children, Diamond and Lee [117] concluded that addressing emotional, social, and physical development was more efficient than focusing narrowly on executive functions only [117]. Therefore, with its creative, social, and physical components, dance appears as an ideal candidate to boost executive functions, and more specifically cognitive flexibility. Note that previous studies reported the effect of dance on cognitive flexibility in aging people [70] and in pre-school children [118]. This

suggests that the effect of dance on cognitive flexibility is not limited to the current study's protocol and patients.

The improvement produced by the training extended to social skills. More specifically, parents reported enhancement of their children's social cognition and theory of mind, such as the capacities to express their own emotions, to adapt their behavior to others in a social context, and to infer on other's mental states. The collective training protocol proposed in this study may have contributed to develop children's social skills by stimulating their capacity to anticipate others' movement. Motor synchronization between individuals leads to increased pro-social behavior [119–121]. In addition, interpersonal synchronization involved in dance increases the sense of connectedness with partners [88]. Dance also fosters the allocation of attention to others' cognitive and mental states [57], and dance training is linked to enhanced empathic abilities [122]. Notably, cognitive flexibility is important for social behavior, especially in the ability to shape behavior to the social context [123]. Cognitive flexibility is also correlated with measures of empathy [124, 125]. In contrast, other cognitive skills, such as memory, processing speed, or attention, play a limited role in social behavior [125]. Therefore, the concurrent improvement in synchronization, social skills, and cognitive flexibility is not surprising. However, the causal relations between these competences are still to be explored. The effect of a dance training protocol on these capacities in typically developing children was not tested in this study and remains unexplored. Provasi et al. [33] showed that a 30-min practice of SMS reduced tapping variability in children with acquired lesions of the cerebellum but not in controls. Testing whether a dance training protocol also impacts differently children with DCA and controls will be important to further understand the mechanisms that sustain the effect of dancing.

The functions that were enhanced after the dance training are crucial for everyday life activities. This transfer effect may in turn significantly improve patients' quality of life. Notably, the effect found on a behavioral test of cognitive flexibility is corroborated by the parents' evaluation, meaning that the effect in everyday life was noticed by the parents and reflects a functional improvement. Cognitive flexibility is of great importance for the executive adaptation of behavioral and cognitive responses to the environment. It is of particular importance for different skills such as mathematics [126], language [127], and planification [128]. Enhancing cognitive flexibility abilities would improve patients' quality of life and boost their academic performance. In general, executive functions are a good predictor of school achievement [129]. In addition, social skills are also a good predictor of school achievement [130, 131]. The fact that movement and balance skills were also improved further indicates that patients' everyday life can be improved by the dance training protocol on several dimensions.

Because of their difficulties, children with DCA cannot take part in most extracurricular physical activities with children of their age. This in turn reduces their chances to progress. Thus, in addition to the lack of specific treatment or training available for DCA [10], the range of activities for these children to participate in is limited. Some types of dance can be too challenging for them, but the results of this study confirm that dance can be proposed to DCA patients. The dance training protocol we proposed is promising because it is adapted to each child's skills. Children with various disorders and symptoms can participate in the same dance class. Besides, there is no competition and no judgment on the aesthetic production of the children, which helps to set trustful environment. Dance is also an activity that can be tailored to participants' special needs. Training protocols can therefore be adapted to different populations, such as adolescents or adults with cerebellar anomalies, using various types of dance.

In summary, very encouraging sensorimotor, motor, cognitive, and social improvements were exhibited by children with DCA as a consequence of a dance training protocol. The cerebellum is a key structure of the central nervous system and its role in various motor [5, 7, 26], cognitive [18, 19, 49], as well as social [51] and affective functions is well known. Consequently, some or all of these domains are affected in patients with DCA. Finding ways to enhance patients with DCA's motor, cognitive, and social skills is a challenge that we addressed using dance in this study. Dance is an activity that stimulates different aspects of behavior, especially sensorimotor functions. The beneficial effect of dance is likely to be partly due to increased activity in the sensorimotor cortico-cerebello-striatal pathways. This research paves the way for larger scale studies on dance as a tool for remediation in cerebellar dysfunctions.

**Acknowledgements** We would like to thank the clinicians who conducted patients' evaluations: Dr. Marie-Pierre Lemaître, Camille Falot, and Yohan Bourez. We also thank Véronique Brunel, the dance teacher who created and conducted the dance program. Finally, we thank Séverine Farley for language editing.

**Funding** The research was supported by the "Fondation Maladies Rares" ("TEMDANCE" grant).

## Declarations

**Conflict of Interest** The authors declare no competing interests.

## References

1. Musselman KE, Stoyanov CT, Marasigan R, Jenkins ME, Konczak J, Morton SM, Bastian AJ. Prevalence of ataxia in children: a systematic review. *Neurology*. 2014;82(1):80–9. <https://doi.org/10.1212/01.wnl.0000438224.25600.6c>.

2. Bareš M, Apps R, Avanzino L, Breska A, D'Angelo E, Filip P, ... Petter E. A. Consensus paper: decoding the contributions of the cerebellum as a time machine. From neurons to clinical applications. *Cerebellum*. 2018; 18(2), 266–286. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12311-018-0979-5>
3. Hoche F, Guell X, Sherman JC, Vangel MG, Schmahmann JD. The cerebellar contribution to social cognition. *The Cerebellum*. 2016;15(6):S23. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ana.24247>.
4. Koziol LF, Budding D, Andreasen N, D'Arrigo S, Bulgheroni S, Imamizu H, ... Yamazaki T. Consensus paper: the cerebellum's role in movement and cognition. *Cerebellum*. 2014; 13(1), 151–177. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12311-013-0511-x>.
5. Manto M, Bower JM, Conforto AB, Delgado-García JM, Da Guarda SNF, Gerwig M, ... Timmann D. Consensus paper: roles of the cerebellum in motor control—the diversity of ideas on cerebellar involvement in movement. *Cerebellum*. 2012; 11(2), 457–487. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12311-011-0331-9>.
6. Schmahmann JD, Sherman JC. The cerebellar cognitive affective syndrome. *Brain*. 1998;121(4):561–79. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/121.4.561>.
7. Therrien AS, Bastian AJ. The cerebellum as a movement sensor. *Neurosci Lett*. 2019;688:37–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neulet.2018.06.055>.
8. ten Donkelaar HJ, Lammens M, Wesseling P, Thijssen HOM, Renier WO. Development and developmental disorders of the human cerebellum. *J Neurol*. 2003;250(09):1025–36. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00415-003-0199-9>.
9. Wang VY, Zoghbi HY. Genetic regulation of cerebellar development. *Nat Rev Neurosci*. 2001;2(7):484–91. <https://doi.org/10.1038/35081558>.
10. Brenna V. Patients with cerebellar pathology: rehabilitation of cognitive functions. In *Paediatric Neurological Disorders With Cerebellar Involvement—Diagnosis and Management*. 2014; 27: 221–234 (John Libbey Eurotext). D'arigo, S; Riva, D; Valente, EM.
11. Boltshauser E. Cerebellum—small brain but large confusion: a review of selected cerebellar malformations and disruptions. *Am J Med Genet*. 2004;126(4):376–85. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajmg.a.20662>.
12. Poretti A, Boltshauser E, Doherty D. Cerebellar hypoplasia: differential diagnosis and diagnostic approach. *Am J Med Genet C Semin Med Genet*. 2014;166(2):211–26. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajmg.c.31398>.
13. Ryan MM, Engle EC. Acute ataxia in childhood. *J Child Neurol*. 2003;18:309–16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08830738030180050901>.
14. Fogel BL. Childhood cerebellar ataxia. *J Child Neurol*. 2012;27(9):1138–45. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0883073812448231>.
15. Marsden JF. Cerebellar ataxia. In Day BL, Lord SR (Eds.), *Handbook of Clinical Neurology*. 2018 (pp. 261–281). <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-444-63916-5.00017-3>.
16. Bodranghien F, Bastian A, Casali C, Hallett M, Louis ED, Manto M, ... van Dun K. Consensus paper: revisiting the symptoms and signs of cerebellar syndrome. *Cerebellum*. 2016; 15(3), 369–391. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12311-015-0687-3>
17. De Smet HJ, Paquier P, Verhoeven J, Mariën P. The cerebellum: its role in language and related cognitive and affective functions. *Brain Lang*. 2013;127(3):334–42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandl.2012.11.001>.
18. Schmahmann JD. Disorders of the cerebellum. *J Neuropsychiatry Clin Neurosci*. 2004;16:367–78. <https://doi.org/10.1212/wnl.32.7.790>.
19. Schmahmann JD, Guell X, Stoodley CJ, Halko MA. The theory and neuroscience of cerebellar cognition. *Annu Rev Neurosci*. 2019;42:337–64. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-neuro-070918-050258>.
20. Bolduc M-E, Limperopoulos C. Neurodevelopmental outcomes in children with cerebellar malformations : a systematic review. *Dev Med Child Neurol*. 2009;51(4):256–67. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8749.2008.03224.x>.
21. Guell X, Hoche F, Schmahmann JD. Metalinguistic deficits in patients with cerebellar dysfunction: empirical support for the dysmetria of thought theory. *Cerebellum*. 2015;14(1):50–8. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12311-014-0630-z>.
22. Thier P, Markanday A. Role of the vermal cerebellum in visually guided eye movements and visual motion perception. *Ann Rev Vision Sci*. 2019;5(1):247–68. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-vision-091718-015000>.
23. Ackermann H. Cerebellar contributions to speech production and speech perception: psycholinguistic and neurobiological perspectives. *Trends Neurosci*. 2008;31(6):265–72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tins.2008.02.011>.
24. Nowak DA, Topka H, Timmann D, Boecker H, Hermsdörfer J. The role of the cerebellum for predictive control of grasping. *Cerebellum*. 2007;6(1):7–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14734220600776379>.
25. Ebner TJ, Hewitt AL, Popa LS. What features of limb movements are encoded in the discharge of cerebellar neurons? *Cerebellum*. 2011;10(4):683–93. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12311-010-0243-0>.
26. Bastian AJ. Learning to predict the future: the cerebellum adapts feedforward movement control. *Curr Opin Neurobiol*. 2006;16(6):645–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conb.2006.08.016>.
27. Braitenberg V, Heck D, Sultan F. The detection and generation of sequences as a key to cerebellar function: experiments and theory. *Behav Brain Sci*. 1997;20(2):229–77. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X9700143X>.
28. Damm L, Varoqui D, Cochen De Cock V, Dalla Bella S, Bardy B. Why do we move to the beat? A multi-scale approach, from physical principles to brain dynamics. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*; 2019. (December). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2019.12.024>.
29. Molinari M, Leggio MG, De Martin M, Cerasa A, Thaut M. Neurobiology of rhythmic motor entrainment. *Ann N Y Acad Sci*. 2003;999(1):313–21. <https://doi.org/10.1196/annals.1284.042>.
30. Molinari M, Leggio MG, Thaut MH. The cerebellum and neural networks for rhythmic sensorimotor synchronization in the human brain. *The Cerebellum*. 2007;6(1):18–23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14734220601142886>.
31. Paquette S, Fujii S, Li HC, Schlaug G. The cerebellum's contribution to beat interval discrimination. *Neuroimage*. 2017;163:177–82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2017.09.017>.
32. Doyon J, Penhune V, Ungerleider LG. Distinct contribution of the cortico-striatal and cortico-cerebellar systems to motor skill learning. *Neuropsychologia*. 2003;41(3):252–62. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0028-3932\(02\)00158-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0028-3932(02)00158-6).
33. Provasi J, Doyère V, Zélati PS, Kieffer V, Perdry H, El Massioui N, ... Droit-Volet S. Disrupted sensorimotor synchronization, but intact rhythm discrimination, in children treated for a cerebellar medulloblastoma. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*. 2014; 35(9), 2053–2068. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2014.04.024>.
34. Schwartze M, Keller PE, Kotz SA. Spontaneous, synchronized, and corrective timing behavior in cerebellar lesion patients. *Behav Brain Res*. 2016;312:285–93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbr.2016.06.040>.
35. Zatorre RJ, Chen JL, Penhune VB. When the brain plays music: auditory-motor interactions in music perception and production. *Nat Rev Neurosci*. 2007;8(7):547–58. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn2152>.

36. Repp BH. Sensorimotor synchronization: a review of the tapping literature. *Psychon Bull Rev.* 2005;12(6):969–92. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03206433>.
37. Repp BH, Su Y-H. Sensorimotor synchronization: a review of recent research (2006–2012). *Psychon Bull Rev.* 2013;20(3):403–52. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-012-0371-2>.
38. Dalla Bella S, Farrugia N, Benoit CE, Begel V, Verga L, Harding E, Kotz SA. BAASTA: battery for the assessment of auditory sensorimotor and timing abilities. *Behav Res Methods.* 2017;49(3):1128–45. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-016-0773-6>.
39. Molinari M, Chiricozzi FR, Clausi S, Tedesco AM, Lisa MD, Leggio MG. Cerebellum and detection of sequences, from perception to cognition. *Cerebellum.* 2008;7:611–5. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12311-008-0060-x>.
40. Shadmehr R, Smith MA, Krakauer JW. Error correction, sensory prediction, and adaptation in motor control. *Annu Rev Neurosci.* 2010;33:89–108. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-neuro-060909-153135>.
41. Breska A, Ivry RB. Taxonomies of timing: where does the cerebellum fit in? *Curr Opin Behav Sci.* 2016;8:282–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2016.02.034>.
42. Coull J, Nobre A. Dissociating explicit timing from temporal expectation with fMRI. *Curr Opin Neurobiol.* 2008;18(2):137–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conb.2008.07.011>.
43. Coull JT, Cheng R-K, Meck WH. Neuroanatomical and neurochemical substrates of timing. *Neuropsychopharmacology.* 2011;36(1):3–25. <https://doi.org/10.1038/npp.2010.113>.
44. Grahn JA. The role of the basal ganglia in beat perception: neuroimaging and neuropsychological investigations. *Ann N Y Acad Sci.* 2009;1169:35–45. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.2009.04553.x>.
45. Grahn JA, Brett M. Rhythm and beat perception in motor areas of the brain. *J Cogn Neurosci.* 2007;19(5):893–906. <https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn.2007.19.5.893>.
46. Kotz SA, Schwartz M. Differential input of the supplementary motor area to a dedicated temporal processing network: functional and clinical implications. *Front Integr Neurosci.* 2011;5(86):86. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnint.2011.00086>.
47. Bengtsson SL, Ehrsson HH, Forssberg H, Ullén F. Effector-independent voluntary timing: behavioural and neuroimaging evidence. *Eur J Neurosci.* 2005;22(12):3255–65. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-9568.2005.04517.x>.
48. Lang EJ, Apps R, Bengtsson F, Cerminara NL, De Zeeuw CI, Ebner T J, ... Xiao J. ... The roles of the olivocerebellar pathway in motor learning and motor control. A consensus paper. *Cerebellum.* 2017; 16(1), 230–252. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12311-016-0787-8>.
49. Murdoch BE. The cerebellum and language: historical perspective and review. *Cortex.* 2010;46(7):858–68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2009.07.018>.
50. Schwartz M, Kotz SA. A dual-pathway neural architecture for specific temporal prediction. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev.* 2013;37(10):2587–96. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2013.08.005>.
51. Van Overwalle F, Manto M, Leggio M, Delgado-García JM. The sequencing process generated by the cerebellum crucially contributes to social interactions. *Med Hypotheses.* 2019;128:33–42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mehy.2019.05.014>.
52. Broersen R, Onuki Y, Abdelgabar AR, Owens CB, Picard S, Willems J, ... De Zeeuw CI. Impaired spatio-temporal predictive motor timing associated with spinocerebellar ataxia type 6. *PLoS ONE.* 2016; 11(8), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0162042>.
53. Ivry RB, Keele SW. Timing functions of the cerebellum. *J Cogn Neurosci.* 1989;1(2):136–52. <https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn.1989.1.2.136>.
54. Timmann D, Watts S, Hore J. Failure of cerebellar patients to time finger opening precisely causes ball high-low inaccuracy in overarm throws. *J Neurophysiol.* 1999;82(1):103–14. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.1999.82.1.103>.
55. Ivry RB, Spencer RMC, Zelaznik HN, Diedrichsen J. The cerebellum and event timing. *Ann N Y Acad Sci.* 2002;978(1):302–17. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.2002.tb07576.x>.
56. Grube M, Cooper FE, Chinnery PF, Griffiths TD. Dissociation of duration-based and beat-based auditory timing in cerebellar degeneration. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA.* 2010;107(25):11597–601. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0910473107>.
57. Joffineau C, Vincent C, Bachrach A. Synchronization, attention and transformation: multidimensional exploration of the aesthetic experience of contemporary dance spectators. *Behav Sci.* 2018;8(2):24. <https://doi.org/10.3390/BS8020024>.
58. Laland K, Wilkins C, Clayton N. The evolution of dance. *Curr Biol.* 2016;26(1):R5–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2015.11.031>.
59. Bachrach A, Jola C, Pallier C. Neuronal bases of structural coherence in contemporary dance observation. *Neuroimage.* 2016;124:464–72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.08.072>.
60. Brown S, Martinez MJ, Parsons LM. The neural basis of human dance. *Cereb Cortex.* 2006;16(8):1157–67. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhj057>.
61. Cross ES, Hamilton AFdC, Grafton ST. Building a motor simulation de novo: observation of dance by dancers. *Neuroimage.* 2006;31(3):1257–67. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2006.01.033>.
62. Cross ES, Kraemer DJM, Hamilton AFDC, Kelley WM, Grafton ST. Sensitivity of the action observation network to physical and observational learning. *Cereb Cortex.* 2009;19(2):315–26. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhn083>.
63. Giacosa C, Karpati FJ, Foster NEV, Penhune VB, Hyde KL. Dance and music training have different effects on white matter diffusivity in sensorimotor pathways. *Neuroimage.* 2016;135:273–86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2016.04.048>.
64. Karpati FJ, Giacosa C, Foster NEV, Penhune VB, Hyde KL. Dance and the brain: a review. *Ann N Y Acad Sci.* 2015;1337(1):140–6. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nyas.12632>.
65. Bläsing B, Calvo-Merino B, Cross ES, Jola C, Honisch J, Stevens CJ. Neurocognitive control in dance perception and performance. *Acta Physiol (Oxf).* 2012;139(2):300–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2011.12.005>.
66. Jin X, Wang B, Lv Y, Lu Y, Chen J, Zhou C. Does dance training influence beat sensorimotor synchronization? Differences in finger-tapping sensorimotor synchronization between competitive ballroom dancers and nondancers. *Exp Brain Res.* 2019;237(3):743–53. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-018-5410-4>.
67. Karpati FJ, Giacosa C, Foster NEV, Penhune VB, Hyde KL. Sensorimotor integration is enhanced in dancers and musicians. *Exp Brain Res.* 2016;234(3):893–903. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-015-4524-1>.
68. Jola C, Davis A, Haggard P. Proprioceptive integration and body representation: insights into dancers' expertise. *Exp Brain Res.* 2011;213(2–3):257–65. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-011-2743-7>.
69. Chuang LY, Hung HY, Huang CJ, Chang YK, Hung TM. A 3-month intervention of Dance Dance Revolution improves interference control in elderly females: a preliminary

- investigation. *Exp Brain Res.* 2015;233(4):1181–8. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-015-4196-x>.
70. Coubard OA, Duretz S, Lefebvre V, Lapalus P, Ferrufino L. Practice of contemporary dance improves cognitive flexibility in aging. *Front Aging Neurosci.* 2011;3(SEP):1–12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnagi.2011.00013>.
  71. de Natale ER, Paulus KS, Aiello E, Sanna B, Manca A, Sotgiu G, ... Deriu F. Dance therapy improves motor and cognitive functions in patients with Parkinson's disease. *NeuroRehabilitation.* 2017; 40(1), 141–144. <https://doi.org/10.3233/NRE-161399>.
  72. Sampaio LMM, Subramaniam S, Arena R, Bhatt T. Does virtual reality-based kinect dance training paradigm improve autonomic nervous system modulation in individuals with chronic stroke? *J Vasc Interv Neurol.* 2016;9(2):21–9.
  73. Grönlund E, Renck B, Weibull J. Dance/movement therapy as an alternative treatment for young boys diagnosed as ADHD: a pilot study. *Am J Dance Ther.* 2005;27(2):63–85. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10465-005-9000-1>.
  74. dos Santos Delabary M, Komerowski IG, Monteiro EP, Costa RR, Haas AN. Effects of dance practice on functional mobility, motor symptoms and quality of life in people with Parkinson's disease: a systematic review with meta-analysis. *Aging Clin Exp Res.* 2018;30(7):727–35. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40520-017-0836-2>.
  75. Hackney ME, Byers C, Butler G, Sweeney M, Rossbach L, Bozorg A. Adapted tango improves mobility, motor-cognitive function, and gait but not cognition in older adults in independent living. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2015;63(10):2105–13. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jgs.13650>.
  76. Hackney ME, Kantorovich S, Levin R, Earhart GM. Effects of tango on functional mobility in Parkinson's disease: a preliminary study. *J Neurol Phys Ther.* 2007;31(4):173–9. <https://doi.org/10.1097/NPT.0b013e31815ce78b>.
  77. McKee KE, Hackney ME. The effects of adapted tango on spatial cognition and disease severity in Parkinson's disease. *J Mot Behav.* 2013;45(6):519–29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222895.2013.834288>.
  78. Shanahan J, Morris ME, Bhriain ON, Saunders J, Clifford AM. Dance for people with Parkinson disease: what is the evidence telling us? *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2015;96(1):141–53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2014.08.017>.
  79. Benoit C-E, Dalla Bella S, Farrugia N, Obrig H, Mainka S, Kotz SA. Musically cued gait-training improves both perceptual and motor timing in Parkinson's disease. *Front Hum Neurosci.* 2014;8:494. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2014.00494>.
  80. Grahn JA, Brett M. Impairment of beat-based rhythm discrimination in Parkinson's disease. *Cortex.* 2009;45(1):54–61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2008.01.005>.
  81. Jones CRG, Jahanshahi M. Motor and perceptual timing in Parkinson's disease. *Adv Exp Med Biol.* 2014;829:265–90. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-1782-2\\_14](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-1782-2_14).
  82. Bledsoe JC, Semrud-Clikeman M, Pliszka SR. Neuroanatomical and neuropsychological correlates of the cerebellum in children with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder-combined type. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry.* 2011;50(6):593–601. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaac.2011.02.014>. Neuroanatomical.
  83. Puyjarinet F, Bégel V, Lopez R, Dellacherie D, Dalla Bella S. Children and adults with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder cannot move to the beat. *Sci Rep.* 2017;7(1):11550. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-11295-w>.
  84. López-Ortiz C, Egan T, Gaebler-Spira DJ. Pilot study of a targeted dance class for physical rehabilitation in children with cerebral palsy. *SAGE Open Med.* 2016;4:205031211667092. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2050312116670926>.
  85. López-Ortiz C, Gladden K, Deon L, Schmidt J, Girolami G, Gaebler-Spira D. Dance program for physical rehabilitation and participation in children with cerebral palsy. *Arts and Health.* 2012;4(1):39–54. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17533015.2011.564193>.
  86. Chauvigné LAS, Walton A, Richardson MJ, & Brown S. Human movement science multi-person and multisensory synchronization during group dancing. *Hum Mov Sci.* 2019; 63(May 2018), 199–208. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.humov.2018.12.005>.
  87. Hackney ME, Gammon EM. Comparison of partnered and non-partnered dance movement. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair.* 2011;24(4):384–92. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1545968309353329.Effects>.
  88. Himberg T, Laroche J, Bigé R, Buchkowski M, Bachrach A. Coordinated interpersonal behaviour in collective dance improvisation: the aesthetics of kinaesthetic togetherness. *Behav Sci.* 2018;8(2):23. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs8020023>.
  89. Jeong YJ, Hong SC, Myeong SL, Park MC, Kim YK, Suh CM. Dance movement therapy improves emotional responses and modulates neurohormones in adolescents with mild depression. *Int J Neurosci.* 2005;115(12):1711–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207450590958574>.
  90. Teixeira-Machado L, Azevedo-Santos I, De Santana JM. Dance improves functionality and psychosocial adjustment in cerebral palsy: a randomized controlled clinical trial. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil.* 2017;96(6):424–9. <https://doi.org/10.1097/PHM.0000000000000646>.
  91. Song YG, Ryu YU, Im SJ, Lee YS, Park JH. Effects of dance-based movement therapy on balance, gait, and psychological functions in severe cerebellar ataxia: a case study. *Physiother Theory Pract.* 2018;35(8):756–63. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09593985.2018.1457119>.
  92. Marsden JF, Harris C. Cerebellar ataxia: pathophysiology and rehabilitation. *Clin Rehabil.* 2011;25(3):195–216. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0269215510382495>.
  93. Martin CL, Tan D, Bragge P, Bialocerkowski A. Systematic review of the effectiveness of physiotherapy for cerebellar dysfunction. *Clin Rehabil.* 2009;23(8):15–26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0269215509337272>.
  94. Sartor-glittenberg C, Brickner L. A multidimensional physical therapy program for individuals with cerebellar ataxia secondary to traumatic brain injury : a case series. *Physiother Theory Pract.* 2014;30(2):138–48. <https://doi.org/10.3109/09593985.2013.819952>.
  95. Himle MB, Miltenberger RG, Flessner C, Gatheridge B. Teaching safety skills to children to prevent gun play. *J Appl Behav Anal.* 2004;37(1):1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1901/jaba.2004.37-1>.
  96. Morgan DL & Morgan RK. Single-case research methods for the behavioral and health sciences. (SAGE publi). 2008. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483329697>.
  97. Crawford JR, Garthwaite PH. Comparison of a single case to a control or normative sample in neuropsychology: development of a Bayesian approach. *Cogn Neuropsychol.* 2007;24(4):343–72. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02643290701290146>.
  98. Schmitz-Hübsch T, Du Montcel ST, Baliko L, Berciano J, Boesch S, Depondt C, ... Fancellu R. Scale for the assessment and rating of ataxia: development of a new clinical scale. *Neurology.* 2006; 66(11), 1717–1720. <https://doi.org/10.1212/01.wnl.0000219042.60538.92>.
  99. Iversen JR, & Patel AD. The Beat Alignment Test (BAT): surveying beat processing abilities in the general population. In K. Miyazaki, Y. Hiraga, M. Adachi, Y. Nakajima, & M. Tsuzaki (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Music Perception & Cognition (ICMPC10)*. 2008 (pp. 465–468). Adelaide: Causal Productions.
  100. Bégel V, Verga L, Benoit C-E, Kotz SA, Dalla Bella S. Test-retest reliability of the Battery for the Assessment of Auditory Sensorimotor and Timing Abilities (BAASTA). *Ann Phys Rehabil*

- Med. 2018;61(6):395–400. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rehab.2018.04.001>.
101. Drake C, Botte MC. Tempo sensitivity in auditory sequences: evidence for a multiple-look model. *Percept Psychophys*. 1993;54(3):277–86. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03205262>.
  102. London, J. (2012). Hearing in time: psychological aspects of musical meter (Oxford Uni). <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199744374.001.0001>.
  103. Repp BH. Rate limits of sensorimotor synchronization. *Adv Cogn Psychol*. 2006;2(2):163–81. <https://doi.org/10.2478/v10053-008-0053-9>.
  104. Brown T. Movement Assessment Battery for Children: 2nd Edition (MABC-2). In Volkmar FR (ed) *Encyclopedia of Autism Spectrum Disorders*, 2013, pp 1925–1939. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-1698-3\\_1922](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-1698-3_1922).
  105. Brooks BL, Sherman EMS, & Strauss E. NEPSY-II: a developmental neuropsychological assessment, second edition. *Child Neuropsychology*. 2010. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09297040903146966>.
  106. Soppelsa R & Albaret JM. La batterie d'évaluation du mouvement chez l'enfant (M-ABC) : étalonnage sur une population d'enfants de 4 à 12 ans. *Psymotricité*. 2005; 195–200.
  107. Manly T, Anderson V, Nimmo-Smith I, Turner A, Watson P, Robertson IH. The differential assessment of children's attention: the Test of Everyday Attention for Children (TEA-Ch), normative sample and ADHD performance. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*. 2001;42(8):1065–81. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-7610.00806>.
  108. Gioia GA, Isquith PK, Guy SC, Kenworthy L. Behavior rating inventory of executive function. *Child Neuropsychol*. 2000;6(3):235–8. <https://doi.org/10.1076/chin.6.3.235.3152>.
  109. Reynolds CR, Richmond BO. Factor structure and construct validity of "What I think and feel": The revised children's manifest anxiety scale. *J Pers Assess*. 1979;43(3):281–3. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4303\\_9](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4303_9).
  110. Nozaradan S, Schwartze M, Obermeier C, Kotz SA. Specific contributions of basal ganglia and cerebellum to the neural tracking of rhythm. *Cortex*. 2017;95:156–68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2017.08.015>.
  111. Dalla Bella S, Benoit CE, Farrugia N, Schwartze M, Kotz SA. Effects of musically cued gait training in Parkinson's disease: beyond a motor benefit. *Ann NY Acad Sci*. 2015;1337(1):77–85. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nyas.12651>.
  112. Kotz SA, Schwartze M. Cortical speech processing unplugged: a timely subcortico-cortical framework. *Trends Cogn Sci*. 2010;14(9):392–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2010.06.005>.
  113. Sargent OJ, Dadalco OI, Pickett KA, Travers BG. Balance and the brain: a review of structural brain correlates of postural balance and balance training in humans. *Gait Posture*. 2019;71:245–52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2019.05.011>.
  114. Dajani DR, Uddin LQ. Demystifying cognitive flexibility: implications for clinical and developmental neuroscience. *Trends Neurosci*. 2015;38(9):571–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tins.2015.07.003>.
  115. Tierney AT, Kraus N. The ability to tap to a beat relates to cognitive, linguistic, and perceptual skills. *Brain Lang*. 2013;124(3):225–31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandl.2012.12.014>.
  116. Dreu CKD, Nijstad BA, Baas M. Behavioral activation links to creativity because of increased cognitive flexibility. *Soc Psychol Personal Sci*. 2011;2(1):72–80. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550610381789>.
  117. Diamond A, Lee K. Interventions shown to aid executive function development in children 4 to 12 years old. *Science*. 2011;333(6045):959–64. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1204529>.
  118. Shen Y, Zhao Q, Huang Y, Liu G, & Fang L. Promotion of street-dance training on the executive function in preschool children. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 2020; 11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.585598>.
  119. Cirelli LK, Einarson KM, Trainor LJ. Interpersonal synchrony increases prosocial behavior in infants. *Dev Sci*. 2014;17(6):1003–11. <https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12193>.
  120. Hove MJ, Risen JL. It's all in the timing: interpersonal synchrony increases affiliation. *Soc Cogn*. 2009;27(6):949–60. <https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.2009.27.6.949>.
  121. Wiltermuth SS, Heath C. Synchrony and cooperation. *Psychol Sci*. 2009;20(1):1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02253.x>.
  122. Gujing L, Hui H, Xin L, Lirong Z, Yutong Y, Guofeng Y, Jing L, Shulin Z, Lei Y, Cheng L, Dezhong Y. Increased insular connectivity and enhanced empathic ability associated with dance/music training. *Neural Plast*. 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2019/9693109>.
  123. Turner JC, Oakes PJ, Haslam SA, McGarty C. Self and collective: cognition and social context. *Pers Soc Psychol Bull*. 1994;20(5):454–63. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167294205002>.
  124. Grattan LM, Eslinger PJ. Higher cognition and social behavior: changes in cognitive flexibility and empathy after cerebral lesions. *Neuropsychology*. 1989;3(3):175. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0091764>.
  125. Milders M, Ietswaart M, Crawford JR, Currie D. Social behavior following traumatic brain injury and its association with emotion recognition, understanding of intentions, and cognitive flexibility. *J Int Neuropsychol Soc*. 2008;14(2):318–26. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1355617708080351>.
  126. Verschaffel L, Torbeyns J, De Smedt B, Luwel K, Van Dooren W. Strategy flexibility in children with low achievement in mathematics. *Educ Child Psychol*. 2007;24(2):16–27.
  127. Deák GO. The development of cognitive flexibility and language abilities. *Adv Child Dev Behav*. 2004. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2407\(03\)31007-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2407(03)31007-9).
  128. Snow JH. Mental flexibility and planning skills in children and adolescents with learning disabilities. *J Learn Disabil*. 1992;25(4):265–70. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002221949202500408>.
  129. Becker DR, Miao A, Duncan R, McClelland MM. Behavioral self-regulation and executive function both predict visuomotor skills and early academic achievement. *Early Child Res Q*. 2014. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2014.04.014>.
  130. Agostin TMK, Bain SK. Predicting early school success with developmental and social skills screeners. *Psychol Sch*. 1997;34(3):219–28. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1520-6807\(199707\)34:3%3c219::AID-PITS4%3e3.0.CO;2-J](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1520-6807(199707)34:3%3c219::AID-PITS4%3e3.0.CO;2-J).
  131. Bramlett RK, Scott P, Rowell RK. A comparison of temperament and social skills in predicting academic performance in first graders. *Spec Serv Sch*. 2000;16(1–2):147–58. <https://doi.org/10.1300/J008v16n01>.

**Publisher's Note** Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.