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Based on work done in animal models showing that autism-like symptoms are ameliorated following exposure to an enriched sensorimotor environment, we attempted to develop a comparable therapy for children with autism. In an initial randomized controlled trial, children with autism who received sensorimotor enrichment at home for 6 months had significant improvements in both their cognitive ability and the severity of their autism symptoms (Woo & Leon, 2013). We now report the outcomes of a similar randomized controlled trial in which children with autism, 3 to 6 years old, were randomly assigned to groups that received either daily sensorimotor enrichment, administered by their parents, along with standard care, or they received standard care alone. After 6 months, enriched children showed statistically significant gains in their IQ scores, a decline in their atypical sensory responses, and an improvement in their receptive language performance, compared to controls. Furthermore, after 6 months of enrichment therapy, 21% of the children who initially had been given an autism classification, using the Autism Diagnostic Observation Schedule, improved to the point that, although they remained on the autism spectrum, they no longer met the criteria for classic autism. None of the standard care controls reached an equivalent level of improvement. Finally, the outcome measures for children who received only a subset of sensory stimuli were similar to those receiving the full complement of enrichment exercises. Sensorimotor enrichment therapy therefore appears to be a cost-effective means of treating a range of symptoms for children with autism.
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Autism spectrum disorder (ASD) is characterized by deficits in verbal and nonverbal social communication, along with deficits in social interactions. Individuals with ASD also have repetitive and/or restricted patterns of behavior that include motor stereotypies, repetitive use of language, inflexible routines, and fixated interests. In addition, more than 90% of children with autism have sensory processing abnormalities that include sensory seeking behavior, avoidance of sensory stimuli, diminished responses to sensory stimulation, or enhanced perceptual abilities (Ben-Sasson et al., 2009; Happé & Frith, 2006; Hilton et al., 2010; Kern et al., 2007; Leekam, Nieto, Libby, Wing, & Gould, 2007; Mottron, Dawson, Soulières, Hubert, & Burack, 2006; Rogers & Ozonoff, 2005; Tomchek & Dunn, 2007; Watling, Deitz, & White, 2001). Indeed, abnormal sensory reactivity is included in the current Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (5th ed.; DSM–5; American Psychiatric Association, 2013) diagnostic criteria for ASD.

Individuals with ASD also appear to have problems integrating multisensory information into a single percept (Brandwein et al., 2013, 2015; Foss-Feig et al., 2010; Kwakye, Foss-Feig, Cascio, Stone, & Wallace, 2011). For example, the ability to combine information from concurrent auditory and visual senses is compromised in individuals with ASD (Marco, Hinkle, Hill, & Nagarakaj, 2011; Stevenson et al., 2014). Using diffusion tensor imaging fiber tractography, Chang et al. (2014) evaluated individuals with ASD for the structural connectivity of their parieto-occipital tracts, which are involved in both sensory perception and multisensory integration, and found that they had decreased connectivity relative to controls.

Some of the sensory abnormalities that have been described in ASD also occur early in neural sensory processing pathways and therefore raise the possibility that the core features of ASD may be responses to abnormal sensory input (Behrmann et al., 2006; Caron, Mottron, Berthiaume, & Dawson, 2006; Gabriels et al., 2008; Kujala, Lepistö, & Näätänen, 2013). Alternatively, engaging
in repetitive behaviors and/or insisting on sameness in the environment may ameliorate the anxiety evoked by abnormal sensory responses (Wigham, Rodgers, South, McConachie, & Freeston, 2015). Consistent with these notions is the finding that the severity of ASD symptoms involving temperament, personality, language, and social development are positively associated with the severity of their sensory problems (Brock et al., 2012; Watson et al., 2011).

Increasing sensory stimulation via environmental enrichment for a wide range of animal models of human neurological conditions has been shown to reduce the expression of their symptoms (Nithianantharajah & Hannan, 2006). When mouse models of syndromic forms of autism, such as Rett syndrome, fragile X syndrome, and Potocki–Lupski syndrome, were maintained in an enriched environment, many of their autism-like symptoms were ameliorated, including improved motor coordination, improved learning and memory, decreased repetitive behavior, increased social behavior, and increased exploratory behavior. In addition, environmental enrichment normalized both synaptic densities and long-term potentiation, and increased both BDNF and NGF levels in these mice (Kerr, Silva, Walz, & Young, 2010; Kondo et al., 2008; Lacaria, Spencer, Gu, Paylor, & Lupski, 2012; Lonetti et al., 2010; Nag et al., 2009; Restivo et al., 2005; Turner & Lewis, 2003).

BTBR T+tf/J (BTBR) mice have been bred to express behaviors that resemble the core symptoms of autism. They have impaired social interactions, deficits in communication (as judged by low levels of sniffing other mice), poor social transmission of food preferences, and increased repetitive behaviors (McFarlane et al., 2008; Moy et al., 2007, 2008; Pearson et al., 2011). Environmental enrichment normalizes both the repetitive grooming behaviors and repetitive object exploration in these mice (Reynolds, Urruela, & Devine, 2013).

In rats, environmental enrichment reversed many autism-like symptoms produced by prenatal valproic acid exposure (Schneider & Przewlocki, 2005; Schneider, Turczak, & Przewlocki, 2006). Enrichment normalized the responses to sensory stimuli, induced stronger acoustic prepulse inhibition, decreased locomotor activity, reduced repetitive behavior, increased exploratory behavior, decreased anxiety, and increased social interactions. The authors went on to suggest the use of environmental enrichment to treat autism symptoms in children. Likewise, after reviewing the literature describing the benefits of environmental enrichment for animal models of autism, Reynolds, Lane, and Richards (2010) suggested that environmental enrichment could benefit children with autism, noting that the key aspects of environmental enrichment appear to include novel and diverse sensory experiences. They further proposed that Ayres sensory integration therapy might be a useful means of exposing children with autism to an enriched environment.

Ayres sensory integration therapy engages children with autism through the use of a variety of physical, sensory, and cognitive exercises, focusing on vestibular, tactile, and proprioceptive stimulation (Baranek, 2002). Indeed, two randomized clinical trials showed positive outcomes in response to that therapy (Pfeiffer, Koenig, Kinnealey, Sheppard, & Henderson, 2011; Shaafl et al., 2014), but the conclusions relied on parental reports of improvement, rather than on objective, blinded assessments (Ashburner, Rodger, Ziviani, & Hinder, 2014). On the other hand, many reports have shown a clear lack of effect of such therapy on autism symptoms (American Academy of Pediatrics, 2012; Baranek, 2002; Dawson & Watling, 2000; Goldstein, 2000; National Autism Center, 2009; Parham et al., 2007; Snieczyk & Zane, 2015). Ayres sensory integration therapy therefore may not deliver optimal stimulation for this purpose, either because the exercises do not adequately enrich the sensory world of children with autism, or because it is typically offered in a clinic, only 1 to 3 times a week. At the same time, it seemed possible that a more varied and more frequent sensory enrichment paradigm could be more effective in treating children with autism.

We therefore had parents engage in a wide range of sensorimotor experiences with their child several times each day for 6 months and found that the severity of autism symptoms and cognitive performance improved significantly in the enriched children compared to controls (Woo & Leon, 2013). In addition, parents of children in the enriched group were more than twice as likely as parents of controls to report an improvement in their child’s symptoms at the termination of the study.

In the present study, we sought to replicate the objectively assessed improvement in cognitive abilities that had previously been found following sensorimotor enrichment, using the Leiter International Performance Scale–Revised (Leiter-R). We also sought to extend the conclusions reached in the initial study regarding improvement of autism symptoms in enriched children, using an objective assessment of those symptoms. To that end, we administered the Autism Diagnostic Observation Schedule (ADOS) at both the start of the study and after 6 months of treatment to determine whether sensorimotor enrichment could improve the diagnostic classification of children with autism. In addition, we did an objective assessment of the communication abilities of these children, using the Reynell Developmental Language Scales for both receptive and expressive language. We then used the Short Sensory Profile to determine whether the sensory reactivity of the children improved with enrichment therapy, as assessed by their parents. Finally, we determined whether the complete set of sensorimotor enrichment exercises was needed to obtain beneficial effects for the children.

**Method**

Recruitment for the study was done at the Center for Autism and Neurodevelopmental Disorders in Orange, California. The director sent recruitment letters to all of the parents of current patients who had been given a medical diagnosis of autism (DSM–IV–TR; American Psychiatric Association, 2000), and were between 3 and 6 years old. We also posted a recruitment flyer in the clinic waiting room. We then screened the children to confirm the diagnosis of autism using the ADOS. For inclusion in the study, their combined communication and social interactions scores had to fall within the autism classification, rather than the autism spectrum classification. Children were excluded from the study if they had syndromic forms of autism or childhood disintegrative disorder. No psychotropic medications were administered throughout the study and anticonvulsant medication was only administered if the child had been on a stable dose longer than 3 months. Children could not have initiated a new in-school behavioral therapy within 1 month before the start of the study or 2 months for a private program. Neither Ayres sensory integration therapy, nor therapies that involved physical restraint were permitted during the trial.
To block-assign individuals according to autism severity, we
calculated calibrated severity scores (CSS) based on their ADOS
scores to allow a comparison across the different ADOS modules
(Gotham, Pickles, & Lord, 2009). Individuals with CSS values of
6 to 8 (lower severity) were blocked together, as were individuals
with CSS values of 9 to 10 (higher severity). We then used a
randomization schedule for these blocks to balance assignments
across our experimental and control groups.

All children continued their standard care treatments. The com-
binations of various behavioral therapies that were utilized by the
children are referred to as “standard care” and no statistically
significant differences in the frequency of use of the therapies were
observed between the groups (see Table 1). We randomly assigned
children who met our inclusion criteria to one of three groups. The
first group was composed of standard care controls who received
only their ongoing treatments. The full treatment group continued
to receive their standard treatments, but in addition, they received
the complete set of sensorimotor exercises as reported previously
(Woo & Leon, 2013), which activated different combinations of
senses, including olfactory, tactile, thermal, auditory, visual, and
motor systems (see Table 2). We also wanted to determine whether
a smaller set of exercises that entailed less novelty and somewhat
less time for the parents to complete would be as effective as the
entire set of exercises. Therefore, we included a partial treatment
group, which received a subset of the exercises that excluded the
olfactory, olfactory/tactile exercises, and music (see Table 2).

The parents of the children in both of the treatment groups were
given a kit with the items needed for the sensorimotor exercises,
along with written instructions for their use. After a brief training
session, both groups engaged their child in the morning and in the
evening with four to seven exercises at home. Each session took a
total duration of approximately 15 to 30 min., with some exercises
requiring additional set-up time. Every 2 weeks, the parents were
contacted via e-mail and were assigned a different set of exercises
for their child; the exercises became increasingly challenging over
the course of 6 months.

Of the 97 children that we recruited, six were excluded because
they did not meet our inclusion criterion. Out of the 91 remaining
participants, 55.9% dropped out of the full treatment group, 56.7%
dropped out of the partial treatment group, and 18.5% dropped out
of the control group, often due to time constraints by the parents,
personal issues, or the initiation of new therapies. There were 50
children who completed the 6-month program (43 boys and 7 girls)
and we analyzed their data (see Figure 1).

All testing was conducted at the initiation of the study and after
6 months (see Table 3). The ADOS is an objective test that is
regarded as the standard for autism classification (Falkmer, And-
derson, Falkmer, & Horlin, 2013; Lord, Rutter, DiLavore, & Risi,
1999). The Leiter–R is an objective nonverbal test of cognitive abilities that has been used for testing children with autism
(Grondhuis & Mulick, 2013; Shah & Holmes, 1985; Tsatsanis et
al., 2003). The Reynell Developmental Language Scales is another
objective test designed to evaluate both expressive and receptive
language in young children, including those with autism (Kaahe,
Fagerland, Martinsen, & Smith, 2014; Kjellmer et al., 2012;
Reynell & Gruber, 1990). This test has revealed language compre-
rehension delays, along with a high level of variability in the
development of language comprehension in children with autism
(Kjellmer et al., 2012; Reynell & Gruber, 1990). The Reynell test
sessions were video recorded and we subsequently scored the
performance of the children using both the testing session and the
digitized files. We used raw Reynell scores for statistical analyses.
One experienced, licensed PhD psychologist conducted all of
the ADOS assessments and another experienced, licensed PhD psy-
chologist administered all of the Leiter and Reynell tests. Both
individuals were blind to group assignment of the children.

The Short Sensory Profile assesses the atypical sensory behav-
ior commonly observed in children with autism, including tactile
sensitivity, taste/smell sensitivity, movement sensitivity, visual/
auditory sensitivity, underresponsive to sensation, sensation seek-
ing, auditory filtering, and low energy/weakness (Ben-Sasson et
al., 2007, 2009; Dunn, 1999; Hilton et al., 2010; Kern et al., 2007;
Leekam et al., 2007; Mayes & Calhoun, 1999; Tomchek & Dunn,
2007; Watling et al., 2001). Parents completed the Short Sensory
Profile at entry to the study and after 6 months.

The parents of children in the treatment groups also were asked
to complete a daily log of their treatment activities. Finally, the

Table 1
Participant Characteristics and Standard Treatments Received by Children in the Sensorimotor
Enrichment Group and the Standard Care Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics and concurrent interventions</th>
<th>Standard carea</th>
<th>Sensorimotor enrichmen tb</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2/22</td>
<td>5/28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20/22</td>
<td>23/28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age (years) ± SD</td>
<td>4.54 ± 1.10</td>
<td>4.76 ± 1.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech therapy</td>
<td>19/22</td>
<td>23/28</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational therapy</td>
<td>18/22</td>
<td>9/28</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied behavioral analysis (1:1) therapy</td>
<td>11/22</td>
<td>14/28</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied behavioral analysis (classroom) therapy</td>
<td>8/22</td>
<td>9/28</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social skills therapy</td>
<td>6/22</td>
<td>7/28</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapted PE, adapted karate, physical therapy</td>
<td>8/22</td>
<td>12/28</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7/22</td>
<td>11/28</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The p values were based on a two sample test for proportions. PE = physical education; Other = physical exercise, swimming, gymnastics, soccer team, youth choir, parent education, feeding therapy, prekindergarten group, music therapy, neurofeedback, American sign language, reflex integration, or behavior class.

a n = 22.  b n = 28.
Table 2

Exercises for the Sensorimotor Treatment Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exercises for the full and partial treatment groups</th>
<th>Additional exercises for the full treatment group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The child places his/her hands or feet in water of different temperatures.</td>
<td>The child is given a scented bath and a massage with scented oil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The child squeezes objects of different shapes and textures.</td>
<td>The parent touches areas on the child’s arms and legs with a cooled or warmed spoon while the parent speaks or sings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The parent draws lines on the child’s hand with objects of different texture while the child watches.</td>
<td>The child walks either on a sheet of foam or on large pillows, eventually blindfolded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The blindfolded child walks on a pathway of different textures.</td>
<td>The child’s finger is placed on a cool object and then a warm object.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The parent draws lines on the child’s face, arms, and legs with objects having different textures while music plays.</td>
<td>The child pokes a hole in Play-Doh and then places grains of rice in it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The child selects the twin of objects in a pillowcase after seeing it on the table.</td>
<td>The child selects a texture square that matches the texture of an object in a photo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines are drawn on the child’s arms and legs with a cooled or warmed spoon, or a neutral object.</td>
<td>Different objects are used to draw circles on the child’s face.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The child is shown a picture of an object and picks out the real object on a table among other objects.</td>
<td>The child places cold straws filled with ice in Play-Doh using each hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The child is asked to walk on a 2&quot; × 8&quot; × 5’ board, then he/she is asked to do that task blindfolded.</td>
<td>The child walks on a 2&quot; × 8&quot; × 5’ board while holding a cooled tray.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The child picks out a colored bead among a plate full of ice cubes.</td>
<td>The parent rubs each of the child’s fingers and toes in turn, while the child watches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The child is shown a photo and his/her attention is drawn away from the photo using an auditory cue.</td>
<td>The child places coins in a piggy bank using only his/her reflection in a mirror.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The child lifts an object out of a cool bowl of water and then a warm bowl of water.</td>
<td>The child uses a magnet on the end of a small fishing line to pick up paper clips.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The child pulls a button from between the parent’s fingers.</td>
<td>The child tracks a red object that is moved around a photo of a painting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The child points to objects in a book and says the name of the object.</td>
<td>The child walks up and down stairs while holding a big ball or pillow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The child matches the color of objects in a photo with colored beads.</td>
<td>The child draws shapes using pen and paper while the parent draws shapes on the child’s back with a toy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The child is asked to do that task blindfolded.</td>
<td>The child draws lines using both hands simultaneously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The child is shown a photo of an object and picks out the real object on a table among other objects.</td>
<td>The child blows a small piece of aluminum foil on the floor as far as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The child lifts an object out of a cool bowl of water and then a warm bowl of water.</td>
<td>The child views a picture moving first behind and then in front of another picture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The child pulls a button from between the parent’s fingers.</td>
<td>The child views a photo with music associated with that scene.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The child points to objects in a book and says the name of the object.</td>
<td>Daily classical music for 10 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The child matches the color of objects in a photo with colored beads.</td>
<td>Daily multiple pairings of fragrances (lemon, lavender, vanilla, anise, orange, apple, and hyacinth) with gentle massage on the child’s back 4 times/day for 1 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The child is shown a photo of an object and picks out the real object on a table among other objects.</td>
<td>Nightly scented pillow.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Essential Oils, Portland, Oregon.*

parents of the children in the control group were offered the complete therapy after the end of the trial.

Results

Baseline values for age, ADOS calibrated severity scores, Leiter–R scores, or Reynell scores were not statistically significantly different for the children who received sensorimotor enrichment and those who were in the standard care group (*t* tests, *p* > .05). In addition, there were no statistically significant differences in the outcomes between the two sensorimotor treatment groups (full treatment and partial treatment; *t* test, *p* > .05); we therefore combined the data from the two treatment groups to compare with the standard care controls. Differences between baseline and final test scores then were compared between the combined enriched groups and the standard care group using *t* tests adjusting for unequal variance (Satterthwaite; JMP software) or an analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) to control for baseline values. Statistical significance between enrichment and standard care groups was defined as a one-tailed *p* value ≤ .05. All assessment scores are reported as mean ± standard error of the mean.

After 6 months, the children who received sensorimotor enrichment had a greater improvement in their average Leiter–R raw scores than did the children in the standard care group. The enriched children gained an average of 13.34 ± 2.14 points and the standard care children gained an average of 7.43 ± 1.94 points, *t*(43) = 2.05, *p* = .024; mean Leiter–R test score, sensorimotor enrichment: 35.85 ± 4.76 (baseline) and 49.19 ± 5.48 (6 months); standard care: 32.63 ± 6.07 (baseline) and 40.05 ± 6.25 (6 months).

In turn, we observed a greater increase for the enrichment group compared to the standard care group in average IQ score, which was generated from the Leiter raw score. The enrichment group gained an average of 8.42 ± 2.65 IQ points and the standard care group gained an average of 1.53 ± 2.66 IQ points (*Figure 2*), *t*(43) = 1.84, *p* = .037; mean IQ score, sensorimotor enrichment: 82.96 ± 5.17 (baseline) and 91.38 ± 5.58 (6 months); standard care: 76.63 ± 4.96 (baseline) and 78.16 ± 4.49 (6 months).

Sensory reactivity, as measured by the Short Sensory Profile, improved more in the enrichment group compared with the standard care group. The enriched children improved by an average of 11.36 ± 3.55 points, whereas the standard care children improved by an average of 2.85 ± 3.01 points (*Figure 3*), *t*(46) = 1.83, *p* = .037; mean Short Sensory Profile score, sensorimotor enrichment: 113.75 ± 4.76 (baseline), and 125.11 ± 5.42 (6 months); standard care: 129.3 ± 4.29 (baseline) and 132.15 ± 4.09 (6 months).
The scores for the receptive language subsection of the Reynell Developmental Language Scales showed that the enrichment group had an average increase of 7.42 ± 1.86 points, whereas the standard care group had an average increase of 3.63 ± 1.51 points (see Figure 4). An ANCOVA revealed a statistically significant increase in the mean score for the children in the enrichment group relative to the standard care group, \( t(42) = -1.70, p = .048 \); mean Reynell receptive language score, sensorimotor enrichment: 36.19 ± 4.64 (baseline) and 43.62 ± 4.14 (6 months); standard care: 33.37 ± 4.79 (baseline) and 37.0 ± 4.95 (6 months).

We found no difference between the enriched and standard care groups on the expressive language subsection of the Reynell Developmental Language Scales, with both groups showing improvement on this measure, sensorimotor enrichment: \( t(25) = 5.16, p < .001 \); standard care: \( t(18) = 3.37, p < .002 \). The enrichment group had an average increase of 7.19 ± 1.39 points and the standard care group had an average increase of 5.69 ± 1.69 points, \( t(43) = 0.68, p = .248 \); mean Reynell expressive language score, sensorimotor enrichment: 31.46 ± 4.14 (baseline) and 38.65 ± 4.16 (6 months); standard care: 31.47 ± 4.82 (baseline) and 37.16 ± 4.94 (6 months).

On the ADOS assessment, 21% of the children in the enriched environment group were no longer in the autism diagnostic classification after 6 months of therapy, although they all remained on the autism spectrum. No child in the standard care group changed their diagnostic classification on this assessment (Figure 5, two-sample test for proportions, \( p = .01 \)). Within the sensorimotor enrichment group, there was no significant difference in age among those who changed classification compared to those who did not change their ADOS classification (mean \( SD \); changed diagnosis: 5.29 ± 1.07 years; no change to diagnosis: 4.61 ± 1.09 years), \( t(24) = 1.36, p = .209 \). Correlations between any of the outcome measures that were used and the age at the initiation of treatment were not statistically significant (see Figure 6).

Standardized treatment effects based on Cohen’s \( d \) for the standardized mean difference for the within-subject change on the Leiter, Short Sensory Profile, and Reynell Receptive Language assessments were .54, .51 and .45, respectively; therefore these

### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessments</th>
<th>Outcome measures</th>
<th>Assessors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autism Diagnostic Observation Schedule (ADOS)</td>
<td>An objective diagnostic test for autism spectrum disorder</td>
<td>Licensed PhD psychologist “A” completed all ADOS assessments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynell Developmental Language Scales</td>
<td>An objective test of receptive and expressive language</td>
<td>Licensed PhD psychologist “B” completed all Reynell assessments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leiter International Performance Scale-Revised</td>
<td>An objective nonverbal test of cognitive abilities</td>
<td>Licensed PhD psychologist “B” completed all Leiter assessments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Sensory Profile</td>
<td>A parental assessment of atypical sensory responses</td>
<td>Parents completed all Short Sensory Profiles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All ADOS, Reynell, and Leiter assessments were conducted by individuals who were unaware of group assignments.
outcomes should be regarded as showing a medium-size effect (Cohen, 1988). Because falling below the autism cutoff on the ADOS is a dichotomous variable, we calculated that five participants need to be treated for 6 months for one to fall below the autism cutoff. The therapy therefore should be characterized as effective (McQuay & Moore, 1997).

The average percentage compliance for the environmental enrichment group was 77% (range: 36–100%), according to the information contained in the daily diaries. The entries in the daily treatment diary did not reveal a significant correlation between the number of at-home therapy treatments and any of the outcomes for the study.

In an effort to predict who might benefit from therapy, the probability of falling below the ADOS autism score in the treatment group was modeled using principle components analysis with the baseline Leiter, Short Sensory Profile, and Reynell receptive language assessments. Correlations with scores on principle components 1 (PC1) and principle components 2 (PC2) for treatment and controls were quite weak. However, because the Short Sensory Profile scores appeared to contribute more noise than signal to the analysis, we performed principal components analysis for just the baseline Leiter and Reynell receptive language scores. The results of a reduced model based on the first principal component of baseline Leiter and Reynell receptive language scores showed that PC1 accounted for about 87% of the total variation among participants and it was an equally weighted average of Leiter and Reynell scores, indicating that PC1 was directly related to baseline scores on these assessments. Indeed, each one-unit difference in the PC1 score (effectively, the average baseline Leiter and Reynell receptive language scores) was associated with an approximate 11% increase in the odds of falling below the ADOS autism cutoff score after 6 months (estimated odds $= 1.11$, 95% CI [0.99, 1.25], $p = .07$).

**Discussion**

This randomized controlled trial replicated the findings that sensorimotor enrichment can improve outcomes in children with autism. We again found that the gains in cognitive performance of enriched children with autism significantly exceeded that of controls (Woo & Leon, 2013). Standardized treatment effects analysis using Cohen’s $d$ revealed that these improvements were medium-size effects. These gains could be due to improved cognitive functioning, improved attention, improved social skills, or a combination of such gains. It also is possible that the improvement in their reactions to sensory stimuli and/or improvements in language skills allowed children in the enriched group to be more attentive and interactive during the testing situation, thereby allowing their true cognitive abilities to be revealed. Indeed, sensory reactivity was shown to improve following sensorimotor enrichment, as revealed by the Short Sensory Profile. It should be noted that Pfeiffer et al. (2011) observed no significant improvement in sensory responses following Ayres sensory integration therapy for children with ASD, although Schaaf et al. (2014) did.

Both the Woo and Leon (2013) study on sensorimotor enrichment and the present study used the Leiter test to reveal a greater improvement in cognitive scores in the enriched group. The increase in raw Leiter scores in the Woo and Leon (2013) study was 8.77 points and the increase in the present study was 13.34 points, whereas controls fell by 2.50 points in the Woo and Leon (2013) study and rose by 7.42 points in this study. Although the change in Leiter scores was significantly larger in the enriched group than the control group in both studies, the higher scores in both groups in the present study may be due to the younger age of participants.
At the same time, a potential advantage of this therapy is that it does not require initiation at a very young age, which necessitates an early diagnosis of autism; it appears to be beneficial for both older children and younger children (Woo & Leon, 2013). Indeed, the present study showed no correlation between age and assessment outcomes.

Some of the children improved to the point that they no longer reached the autism cut-off on the ADOS, although they remained on the autism spectrum, whereas none of the children in the standard care group changed their diagnostic classification. High initial scores on the Leiter and Reynell assessments together predicted these beneficial outcomes for the children in the study.

Similar symptom improvements, as measured by the ADOS, were found for 24- to 48-month-old children who were given applied behavioral analysis with a socialization program over the course of 6 months (Muratori, Narzisi, & the IDIA Group, 2014). Although there was no control group in that study, Dawson et al. (2010) found comparable levels of improvement in children with autism, 24 to 30 months, after 2 years of intensive therapy in a randomized controlled trial. Given that the typical developmental trajectory of the symptoms for children with autism, as assessed by the ADOS, is stable over the course of 6 months (Szatmari et al., 2015), the finding of a change in diagnostic classification within that period should be considered to be clinically significant, and points to the potential of environmental enrichment therapy to induce clinically significant improvements in children with autism.

We did not find a difference in outcomes between enriched and control groups for expressive language abilities as measured using the Reynell Developmental Language Scales, with both groups showing statistically significant improvements on this measure. Likewise, Woo and Leon (2013) reported no outcome differences when comparing the enriched group to the controls on the Expressive One-Word Picture Vocabulary Test (Brownell, 2000), because both groups also showed comparable improvement on that test. At the same time, the present study showed a statistically significant difference in improvement in receptive language in the enriched group compared to the control group.

In Woo and Leon’s (2013) study, they reported clinically significant improvements in the severity of autism symptoms, as measured with the Childhood Autism Rating Scale (Schopler, Reichler, DeVellis, & Daly, 1980), with 42% of the enriched children experiencing a clinically significant improvement of at least five points on that scale, compared to 7% in the standard care group. In the present study, the severity of autism symptoms also was reduced in a significant proportion of children in the enriched group as evaluated with the ADOS. In both studies, enriched children had a greater increase in their Leiter cognitive scores than did standard care children. Improved sensory responsiveness and enhanced receptive language skills in enriched children are novel findings in the present study. This treatment therefore can impact symptoms associated with autism in addition to the core symptoms of autism.

Although we consider it likely that it was the enriched sensory environment that promoted the improvements in their social, language, cognitive, and sensory status, it is also possible that the sensory exercises increased positive interactions between the child and their parents, and it was those interactions that mediated the improvements that we observed.

The outcome measures for children who received only a subset of sensory stimuli were similar to those receiving the full comple-
ment of stimuli, suggesting that the benefits of sensorimotor enrichment may not depend on the regular activation of all the senses. It may also be the case that olfactory, tactile, and music stimulation evoke transient comfort (Grandin, 1992) and may therefore have had less influence on the outcome measures reported in our study. It should be noted, however, that the parents in the full treatment group typically reported that the scents calmed their child during the day and allowed their child to sleep better at night. Indeed, many of the parents who were using the scents in their therapy said that it was the one exercise that they would continue to use after the termination of the trial.

Although parents typically did not indicate that they would continue with the music experiences, they did note that their child enjoyed the music exposure. Other researchers have shown some improvements with music therapy for children with autism (Boso, Emanuele, Minazzi, Abbamonte, & Politi, 2007; Edgerton, 1994; Kim, Wigram, & Gold, 2008). Music exposure, however, was not a crucial aspect for the outcomes that we measured in the present study.

A clear limitation of this study was the high proportion of families that did not complete the treatment, often due to the time difficulties involved with doing the exercises in the morning and evening. Although each set of exercises took 15 to 30 min, setting up the exercises often took additional time, and the impact on the ability of working parents to complete the exercises was significant. For the parents who finished the study, this issue could underlie the variability observed with the daily logs that were completed by the parents, with some parents at 100% compliance and with others at only 36% compliance. In addition, some of the children had recently been diagnosed at the start of the trial and parents continued to search for new therapies for their child after enrolling in our study. We were then forced to terminate their participation in the study. It may be that a higher level of communication (weekly phone calls rather than e-mail on alternate days)

---

**Figure 6.** Correlation scatterplots of outcome measures as a function of age at initiation of the study. Leiter International Performance Scale–Revised (IQ), Short Sensory Profile, and Reynell Receptive Language scores for the children are shown relative to the children’s age at the initiation of the study. Closed markers denote male participants and open markers denote female participants.
weeks) would have fostered a higher rate of continuing participation.

It will be important to determine whether there is an effective level of sensorimotor enrichment that can have beneficial outcomes with significantly less effort expected from the parents. We also hope to determine whether having children treated by professionals in their special-needs classrooms will allow a greater proportion of children to benefit from this treatment by obviating the need for parental provision of the therapy. Another issue that should be addressed in future studies is whether sensorimotor enrichment can be effective as a monotherapy. If that is the case, then there would be significant financial savings in the treatment of autism. On the other hand, if this approach is effective only as a concurrent therapy, it could enhance current standard care outcomes. Additional research will be able to determine whether these effects are long lasting, and whether continued therapy can continue to improve outcomes for treated children. Other critical questions include whether it can be effective for older or younger children, whether it can be effective for medicated children, whether we can characterize the changes in the brain, and whether children across the autism spectrum can benefit from this treatment. It will be critical to conduct a large, multicenter randomized controlled trial to determine whether this approach can be clinically useful. With a sufficient number of participants, it may be possible to describe more differences among individuals that may reveal which children are likely to see improvement in their autism symptoms from this treatment. Finally, we would like to determine whether this approach to treatment can impact other developmental disorders, as would be predicted by the effects of environmental enrichment on animal models of human neurological disorders. At this time, these data support the conclusion that parents can initiate an autism therapy for their children at home at minimal cost, a therapy that has no known side effects, and that improves both the core and associated symptoms of autism.
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