The Effect of Task-Specific Training vs. Conventional Therapy on Upper Extremity Function in Stroke Survivors

Mastour, M. Alotaibi[1], Azzam S. Almutairi[2], Naif S. Alsayahi[3], Abdulrahman. I. Alhussain[4], Ali A. Sahari[5]

Physical Therapists
Health affairs at the Ministry of National Guard

Abstract:
Objective :
This study aimed to compare the effects of task-specific training (TST) versus conventional therapy (CT) on upper extremity function in stroke survivors.

Methods:
A randomized controlled trial was conducted with 60 participants randomized into TST (n = 26) and CT (n = 25) groups. Outcome measures included the Fugl-Meyer Upper Extremity Assessment, Action Research Arm Test, Wolf Motor Function Test, Modified Ashworth Scale, Stroke Impact Scale, and Patient-Specific Functional Scale.

Results:
Participants in the TST group demonstrated significantly greater improvements in motor function, spasticity, and quality of life compared to the CT group. These benefits were maintained at a 3-month follow-up.

Conclusion:
Task-specific training was more effective than conventional therapy in enhancing upper extremity function and overall quality of life in stroke survivors. Integrating task-oriented training into rehabilitation programs may optimize recovery outcomes.

Keywords: Stroke, Upper Extremity Function, Task-Specific Training, Conventional Therapy, Rehabilitation, Motor Function, Spasticity, Quality of Life.

Introduction

Background and Significance

Stroke is a leading cause of long-term disability worldwide, significantly impacting upper extremity function among survivors. According to the World Health Organization, strokes affect approximately 15 million people each year, with 5 million remaining permanently disabled (WHO, 2018). Upper extremity impairments, including hemiparesis and decreased coordination, are common, often leading to challenges in performing daily activities and reducing quality of life (Dobkin, 2005).

Rehabilitation is crucial for improving upper extremity function post-stroke. Two primary approaches in stroke rehabilitation include task-specific training and conventional therapy. Task-specific training involves practicing functional tasks that are meaningful to the patient, which may promote neuroplasticity and motor recovery by targeting specific activities (Langhorne, Coupar, & Pollock, 2009). Conventional therapy, on the other hand, often includes a combination of methods such as passive exercises, stretching, and general strength training, aimed at overall functional improvement rather than specific task performance (Veerbeek et al., 2014).

Despite the wide application of both approaches, the comparative effectiveness of task-specific training versus conventional therapy remains under-investigated. Understanding which method leads to greater improvements in upper extremity function can inform clinical practices and optimize rehabilitation strategies for stroke survivors.

Problem Statement

While both task-specific training and conventional therapy are utilized in post-stroke rehabilitation, there is a lack of consensus on which approach yields superior outcomes in upper extremity function. Previous studies have provided mixed results, with some suggesting that task-specific training may be more effective due to its focus on functional tasks (French et al., 2008), while others advocate for the comprehensive nature of conventional therapy (Duncan et al., 2005). This ambiguity necessitates a thorough comparative analysis to determine the most beneficial rehabilitation strategy.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to compare the effects of task-specific training and conventional therapy on upper extremity function in stroke survivors. By investigating these approaches, we aim to identify the rehabilitation method that produces the best outcomes, thereby improving clinical practices and patient quality of life.

Research Questions/Hypotheses

1. What is the effect of task-specific training on upper extremity function in stroke survivors?
2. What is the effect of conventional therapy on upper extremity function in stroke survivors?
3. Which rehabilitation approach demonstrates greater improvement in upper extremity function?

By addressing these questions, this research will contribute to the evidence base guiding stroke rehabilitation and potentially influence treatment protocols for enhancing motor recovery in stroke survivors.

Literature Review

Stroke and Its Impact on Upper Extremity Function

Stroke is among the most prevalent neurological disorders, leading to significant morbidity and long-term disability. An estimated one in four adults over the age of 25 experiences a stroke during their lifetime (Feigin et al., 2017). Upper extremity impairments are particularly common after a stroke, affecting up to 80% of survivors (Nakayama et al., 1994). These impairments, which include muscle weakness, spasticity, and loss of coordination, severely restrict the ability to perform daily tasks, thereby reducing the quality of life (Kwakkel et al., 2019).

The mechanisms underlying post-stroke upper extremity dysfunction are multifaceted, involving both central and peripheral changes. Central nervous system damage, primarily in the cortex and descending motor pathways, disrupts motor planning and execution (Murphy & Corbett, 2009). Additionally, peripheral factors such as muscle atrophy and joint stiffness further exacerbate functional limitations (Wist et al., 2016). These complex interactions highlight the need for effective rehabilitation strategies to promote recovery of upper extremity function.

Rehabilitation Approaches

Rehabilitation plays a crucial role in the recovery process following a stroke. Two primary approaches to upper extremity rehabilitation are task-specific training and conventional therapy.

Task-Specific Training:

Task-specific training involves the repetitive practice of functional tasks that are meaningful to the patient. This method is grounded in the principles of neuroplasticity, where repetitive, goal-oriented activities promote reorganization of neural networks and improvement in motor function (Lang & Birkenmeier, 2013). Clinical studies have shown that task-specific training can lead to significant improvements in upper limb function, likely due to its focus on purposeful movement and engagement of the motor cortex (Nudo, 2013).

For instance, a study by Wolf et al. (2006) demonstrated that stroke survivors who participated in task-specific training exhibited greater gains in arm function compared to those who received standard therapy. The repetitive nature of task-specific training is believed to enhance sensorimotor integration, leading to better functional outcomes.

Conventional Therapy:

Conventional therapy often includes a blend of different techniques such as passive range-of-motion exercises, stretching, strength training, and occupational therapy. These methods aim to improve general strength, flexibility, and motor control, without necessarily focusing on specific functional tasks (Chin et al., 2022).

Research indicates that conventional therapy can also be effective in improving upper extremity function, as it addresses the overall physical conditioning of the patient (Pollock et al., 2014). For example, the EXCITE trial demonstrated that both conventional therapy and constraint-induced movement therapy (a form of task-specific training) provided significant improvements in arm function among stroke survivors, although task-specific practices showed superior outcomes (O'Halloran et al., 2014).

Comparative Studies

The efficacy of task-specific training versus conventional therapy has been a topic of interest in recent research, with studies producing mixed results.

A systematic review by French et al. (2008) compared repetitive task-specific training with various conventional therapies among stroke survivors. The review concluded that task-specific training generally led to greater improvements in upper extremity function, possibly due to its emphasis on practicing relevant, daily activities. However, the authors noted that the quality of evidence was moderate and further high-quality studies are needed.

Additionally, Lohse et al. (2014) conducted a meta-analysis comparing task-specific and general rehabilitation interventions. Their findings supported the superiority of task-specific training in improving motor outcomes, particularly in the early stages of rehabilitation. Participants in task-specific training programs showed more pronounced gains in functional independence and motor control compared to those undergoing traditional physical therapy.

Conversely, a study by Veerbeek et al. (2014) found no significant difference in outcomes between the two approaches when equivalent amounts of therapy time were provided. This study highlighted that the intensity and duration of therapy might be crucial factors influencing recovery, regardless of the specific type of intervention used.

These comparative studies underscore the necessity for continued research to delineate the most effective rehabilitation strategies for stroke survivors. Comprehensive investigations that consider various factors such as intervention intensity, duration, and individual patient characteristics are essential for optimizing post-stroke rehabilitation.

Methodology

Study Design

This study utilized a randomized controlled trial (RCT) design to compare the effects of task-specific training (TST) and conventional therapy (CT) on upper extremity function in stroke survivors. Participants were randomly assigned to either the TST group or the CT group, ensuring balanced and unbiased allocation.

Participants

Sample Size:
Based on an a priori power analysis with an expected moderate effect size (Cohen's d = 0.5), a power of 0.8, and an alpha level of 0.05, a total sample size of 60 participants (30 per group) was determined to be sufficient to detect significant differences between groups.

Inclusion Criteria:
1. Adults aged 18-80 years.
2. Diagnosed with a unilateral ischemic or hemorrhagic stroke within the past 6 months.
3. Presence of upper extremity impairment (Fugl-Meyer Upper Extremity Assessment score between 20 and 50).
4. Ability to provide informed consent and follow instructions.

Exclusion Criteria:
1. Severe cognitive impairment (Mini-Mental State Examination score < 24).
2. Severe aphasia or communication barriers.
3. Comorbid conditions that could affect rehabilitation (e.g., severe arthritis, recent orthopedic surgery).
4. Previous history of stroke or other neurological disorders.

Interventions

Task-Specific Training (TST):
Participants in the TST group engaged in task-specific training sessions tailored to their individual daily activities. The training consisted of repetitive practice of functional tasks such as reaching, grasping, and manipulating objects. Sessions were conducted for 60 minutes, five times a week, over a 12-week period. Tasks were progressively adjusted to match the participant's improving abilities, and participants were encouraged to perform tasks that were meaningful to them.

Conventional Therapy (CT):
Participants in the CT group received conventional therapy, which included a variety of general rehabilitation exercises such as passive range-of-motion exercises, stretching, strengthening exercises, and coordination tasks. Similar to the TST group, therapy sessions were conducted for 60 minutes, five times a week, over a 12-week period. The therapy program was designed to improve overall upper extremity function without focusing on specific task performance.

Outcome Measures

Primary and secondary outcomes were measured at baseline, immediately post-intervention (12 weeks), and at a 3-month follow-up.

Primary Outcome:

- Fugl-Meyer Assessment for Upper Extremity (FMA-UE): A comprehensive and widely used measure of motor function, sensation, balance, joint range of motion, and joint pain.

Secondary Outcomes:
- Action Research Arm Test (ARAT): Assesses the ability to handle objects differing in size, weight, and shape.
- Wolf Motor Function Test (WMFT): Measures motor ability through timed and functional tasks.
- Modified Ashworth Scale (MAS): Measures spasticity.
- Stroke Impact Scale (SIS): A self-reported measure of stroke-related quality of life.
- Patient-Specific Functional Scale (PSFS): Evaluates changes in functional status based on tasks identified by the patient as problematic.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data Collection:
- Baseline assessment: Conducted prior to the start of the intervention.
- Post-intervention assessment: Conducted immediately after the 12-week intervention period.
- Follow-up assessment: Conducted 3 months after the intervention.

Statistical Analysis:
- Descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, frequency) for demographic and clinical characteristics.
- Independent t-tests and chi-square tests to compare baseline characteristics between groups.
- Repeated measures ANOVA to examine within-group and between-group differences over time.
- Post hoc analysis with Bonferroni correction for pairwise comparisons.
- Effect size calculation to quantify the magnitude of intervention effects.

Statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$. Data were analyzed using SPSS software (version 26.0).

Ethical Considerations
The study was approved by the ethics committee. All participants provided written informed consent prior to enrollment.

Findings

Table 1: Participant Flow and Baseline Characteristics

Out of 100 individuals assessed for eligibility, 60 participants met the inclusion criteria and were randomly assigned to the TST group (n = 30) or the CT group (n = 30). Four participants from the TST group and five from the CT group dropped out before completing the study, resulting in final sample sizes of 26 and 25, respectively. Baseline characteristics of the participants, including age, gender, time since stroke, and initial Fugl-Meyer Upper Extremity Assessment (FMA-UE) scores, were comparable between the two groups ($p > 0.05$).

Characteristic	TST Group (n = 26)	CT Group (n = 25)	p-value
Age (years)	64.5 ±8.2	66.1 ±7.9	0.58
Gender (Male/Female)	14/12	13/12	0.89
Time since stroke (months)	3.2 ±1.5	3.4 ±1.6	0.64
FMA-UE score at baseline	32.5 ±6.4	33.1 ±6.8	0.72

Table 2: Primary Outcome

Fugl-Meyer Upper Extremity Assessment (FMA-UE):
- Baseline:There was no significant difference between the TST group (mean = 32.5, SD = 6.4) and the CT group (mean = 33.1, SD = 6.8) at baseline (p = 0.72).
- Post-Intervention (12 weeks):Both groups showed significant improvement, but the TST group (mean = 45.9, SD = 7.2) demonstrated significantly greater improvements compared to the CT group (mean = 40.3, SD = 7.5) (p = 0.01).
- Follow-Up (3 months): The TST group maintained their gains (mean = 46.7, SD = 7.0), while the CT group showed slight regression (mean = 39.8, SD = 7.9), with significant differences favoring the TST group (p = 0.004).

Outcome Measure	Time Point	TST Group (Mean ±SD)	CT Group (Mean ±SD)	p-value
Fugl-Meyer Upper Extremity Assessment (FMA-UE)	Baseline	32.5 ±6.4	33.1 ±6.8	0.72
	Post-Intervention	45.9 ±7.2	40.3 ±7.5	0.01
	Follow-Up	46.7 ±7.0	39.8 ±7.9	0.004

Table 3: Secondary Outcomes

Action Research Arm Test (ARAT):
- Baseline: No significant differences between the TST group (mean = 25.4, SD = 4.8) and the CT group (mean = 24.8, SD = 5.1) (p = 0.65).
- Post-Intervention: The TST group (mean = 36.1, SD = 6.0) showed greater improvement compared to the CT group (mean = 31.7, SD = 5.8) (p = 0.02).
- Follow-Up: The TST group (mean = 36.5, SD = 6.2) continued to perform better than the CT group (mean = 30.9, SD = 6.5) (p = 0.01).

Wolf Motor Function Test (WMFT):
- Baseline: Pre-intervention scores were similar between TST (mean = 29.7, SD = 9.1) and CT (mean = 28.9, SD = 9.4) (p = 0.75).
- Post-Intervention: The TST group showed a more substantial decrease in time required to complete tasks (mean = 22.4s, SD = 8.7) compared to CT (mean = 25.6s, SD = 9.0) (p = 0.03).
- Follow-Up: The trends persisted with the TST group (mean = 21.9s, SD = 8.4) outperforming the CT group (mean = 26.1s, SD = 9.2) (p = 0.02).

Modified Ashworth Scale (MAS):
- Baseline: Scores reflecting spasticity levels were similar in both groups (TST mean = 1.6, SD = 0.5; CT mean = 1.5, SD = 0.6) (p = 0.81).
- Post-Intervention: The TST group demonstrated a greater reduction in spasticity (mean = 1.2, SD = 0.4) compared to the CT group (mean = 1.4, SD = 0.5) (p = 0.04).
- Follow-Up: Improvements were sustained in the TST group (mean = 1.1, SD = 0.5) while the CT group showed a slight increase in spasticity (mean = 1.5, SD = 0.6) (p = 0.02).

Stroke Impact Scale (SIS):
- Baseline: Quality of life measures were comparable between the TST and CT groups (p = 0.69).
- Post-Intervention: The TST group reported significantly greater improvements in overall quality of life (mean increase = 15.5, SD = 3.2) compared to the CT group (mean increase = 10.7, SD = 2.9) (p = 0.01).
- Follow-Up: The TST group maintained higher SIS scores (mean = 70.4, SD = 12.1) than the CT group (mean = 62.3, SD = 13.4) (p = 0.03).

Patient-Specific Functional Scale (PSFS):

- Baseline: Both groups identified a similar number of challenging tasks (TST mean = 3.2, SD = 1.1; CT mean = 3.3, SD = 1.2) (p = 0.84).
- Post-Intervention: The TST group reported a greater reduction in the difficulty of these tasks (mean reduction = 5.1, SD = 1.4) compared to the CT group (mean reduction = 4.0, SD = 1.5) (p = 0.02).
- Follow-Up: The TST group maintained these gains (mean PSFS score = 8.3, SD = 1.3) compared to the CT group (mean PSFS score = 6.8, SD = 1.5) (p = 0.01).

Outcome Measure	Time Point	TST Group (Mean ±SD)	CT Group (Mean ±SD)	p-value
Action Research Arm Test (ARAT)	Baseline	25.4 ±4.8	24.8 ±5.1	0.65
	Post-Intervention	36.1 ±6.0	31.7 ±5.8	0.02
	Follow-Up	36.5 ±6.2	30.9 ±6.5	0.01
Wolf Motor Function Test (WMFT)	Baseline	29.7 ±9.1	28.9 ±9.4	0.75
	Post-Intervention	22.4 ±8.7	25.6 ±9.0	0.03
	Follow-Up	21.9 ±8.4	26.1 ±9.2	0.02
Modified Ashworth Scale (MAS)	Baseline	1.6 ±0.5	1.5 ±0.6	0.81
	Post-Intervention	1.2 ±0.4	1.4 ±0.5	0.04
	Follow-Up	1.1 ±0.5	1.5 ±0.6	0.02
Stroke Impact Scale (SIS	Baseline	Comparable	Comparable	0.69
	Post-Intervention	15.5 ±3.2 (increase)	10.7 ±2.9 (increase)	0.01
	Follow-Up	70.4 ±12.1	62.3 ±13.4	0.03
Patient-Specific Functional Scale (PSFS)	Baseline	3.2 ±1.1	3.3 ±1.2	0.84
	Post-Intervention	5.1 ±1.4 (reduction)	4.0 ±1.5 (reduction)	0.02
	Follow-Up	8.3 ±1.3	6.8 ±1.5	0.01

Discussion

Summary of Findings

This study aimed to compare the effects of task-specific training (TST) and conventional therapy (CT) on upper extremity function in stroke survivors. Our results demonstrated that TST led to significantly greater improvements in motor function, spasticity, and overall quality of life compared to CT, with these benefits being maintained at a 3-month follow-up.

Interpretation of Results

The significant improvement in Fugl-Meyer Upper Extremity (FMA-UE) scores in the TST group suggests that task-specific training is more effective in enhancing motor recovery. This finding aligns with the principles of neuroplasticity, wherein repetitive, goal-oriented movements promote neural reorganization and functional gains (Lang et al., 2013). The superior performance of the TST group on the Action Research Arm

Test (ARAT) and Wolf Motor Function Test (WMFT) further corroborates the effectiveness of TST in fostering task-oriented skills and motor dexterity, which are essential for daily activities.

In contrast, the CT group, while showing some improvements, exhibited less pronounced gains. This might be attributed to the generalized nature of conventional therapy, which typically lacks the specificity needed to drive targeted neuroplastic changes compared to functional tasks practiced in TST (French et al., 2008). The slight regression observed in the CT group's follow-up assessments may be indicative of the transient effects of conventional therapy, suggesting that more focused and engaging rehabilitation methods are necessary for sustained outcomes.

The Modified Ashworth Scale (MAS) scores indicate a greater reduction in spasticity in the TST group. This reduction is likely due to the active use of the affected limb in functional tasks, which can help mitigate spasticity by promoting normal movement patterns and reducing maladaptive muscle co-contractions (Nudo, 2013).

Quality of Life and Functional Assessment

The Stroke Impact Scale (SIS) and Patient-Specific Functional Scale (PSFS) scores suggest that TST not only improves physical function but also positively impacts overall quality of life. This holistic benefit underscores the significance of engaging patients in meaningful, everyday activities that enhance both physical and psychological well-being (Kwakkel et al., 2019). The maintenance of these benefits at follow-up emphasizes the importance of task-specific rehabilitation in achieving long-term success.

Comparison with Previous Research

Our findings are consistent with previous studies that have highlighted the benefits of task-specific interventions. For example, the EXCITE trial demonstrated that constraint-induced movement therapy, a form of task-specific training, resulted in superior motor outcomes compared to traditional rehabilitation methods (Wolf et al., 2006). Similarly, French et al. (2008) reported that repetitive task-specific training led to greater functional improvements in stroke survivors than conventional therapies, supporting the premise that specificity and repetition are key to effective rehabilitation.

However, it is worth noting that some studies have reported no significant differences between task-specific training and conventional therapy, particularly when equivalent therapy intensity is provided (Veerbeek et al., 2014). These discrepancies might be attributed to variations in study designs, intervention protocols, and participant characteristics. Future research should aim to standardize these variables to draw more definitive conclusions.

Strengths and Limitations

Strengths:
- The randomized controlled trial design minimized bias and enhanced the reliability of findings.
- The use of a comprehensive set of outcome measures provided a holistic assessment of upper extremity function and quality of life.
- Our study included a follow-up period, allowing for the assessment of long-term effects of the interventions.

Limitations:
- The sample size, though adequate for detecting moderate effects, limits the generalizability of findings to a broader stroke population.
- The study did not control for the intensity and duration of home-based exercises, which might have influenced the results.
- Participant adherence was not objectively monitored, potentially affecting the consistency of the intervention.

Future Research

Future studies should aim to include larger sample sizes and diverse populations to enhance generalizability. Investigating the underlying neural mechanisms through neuroimaging techniques could provide further insights into how TST promotes recovery. Additionally, exploring the impact of hybrid interventions that combine elements of both task-specific training and conventional therapy may yield innovative rehabilitation strategies.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this study provides robust evidence that task-specific training is more effective than conventional therapy in improving upper extremity function and overall quality of life in stroke survivors. These findings highlight the importance of incorporating task-oriented rehabilitation approaches in clinical practice to optimize recovery and promote sustained functional independence.

References

1. Chin, L. F., Rosbergen, I. C., Hayward, K. S., & Brauer, S. G. (2022). A self-directed upper limb program during early post-stroke rehabilitation: A qualitative study of the perspective of nurses, therapists and stroke survivors. PloS one, 17(2), e0263413.

2. Dobkin, B. H. (2005). Clinical practice. Rehabilitation after stroke. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 352(16), 1677–1684.

3. Duncan, P. W., Zorowitz, R., Bates, B., Choi, J. Y., Glasberg, J. J., Graham, G. D., Katz, R. C., Lamberty, K., & Reker, D. (2005). Management of Adult Stroke Rehabilitation Care: a clinical practice guideline. Stroke, 36(9), e100–e143.

4. Feigin, V. L., Norrving, B., & Mensah, G. A. (2017). Global Burden of Stroke. Circulation research, 120(3), 439–448.

5. French, B., Leathley, M., Sutton, C., McAdam, J., Thomas, L., Forster, A., Langhorne, P., Price, C., Walker, A., & Watkins, C. (2008). A systematic review of repetitive functional task practice with modelling of resource use, costs and effectiveness. Health technology assessment (Winchester, England), 12(30), iii–117.

6. Kwakkel, G., Van Wegen, E., Burridge, J. H., Winstein, C. J., van Dokkum, L., Alt Murphy, M., Levin, M. F., & Krakauer, J. W. (2019). Standardized measurement of quality of upper limb movement after stroke: Consensus-based core recommendations from the Second Stroke Recovery and Rehabilitation Roundtable. International journal of stroke : official journal of the International Stroke Society, 14(8), 783–791.

7. Lang, C. E., & Birkenmeier, R. L. (2013). Upper-extremity task-specific training after stroke or disability. Bethesda: AOTA Pr.

8. Langhorne, P., Coupar, F., & Pollock, A. (2009). Motor recovery after stroke: A systematic review of the role of physiotherapy and occupational therapy. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, Issue 3. Art. No.: CD001920.

9. Lohse, K. R., Lang, C. E., & Boyd, L. A. (2014). Is more better? Using metadata to explore dose-response relationships in stroke rehabilitation. Stroke, 45(7), 2053–2058.

10. Murphy, T. H., & Corbett, D. (2009). Plasticity during stroke recovery: from synapse to behaviour. Nature reviews. Neuroscience, 10(12), 861–872.

11. Nakayma, H., Jørgensen, H. S., Raaschou, H. O., & Olsen, T. S. (1994). Compensation in recovery of upper extremity function after stroke: the Copenhagen Stroke Study. Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation, 75(8), 852-857.

12. Nudo R. J. (2013). Recovery after brain injury: mechanisms and principles. Frontiers in human neuroscience, 7, 887.

13. O'Halloran, P. D., Blackstock, F., Shields, N., Holland, A., Iles, R., Kingsley, M., Bernhardt, J., Lannin, N., Morris, M. E., & Taylor, N. F. (2014). Motivational interviewing to increase physical activity in people with chronic health conditions: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Clinical rehabilitation, 28(12), 1159–1171.

14. Pollock, A., Baer, G., Campbell, P., Choo, P. L., Forster, A., Morris, J., Pomeroy, V. M., & Langhorne, P. (2014). Physical rehabilitation approaches for the recovery of function and mobility following stroke. The Cochrane database of systematic reviews, 2014(4), CD001920.

15. Veerbeek, J. M., van Wegen, E., van Peppen, R., van der Wees, P. J., Hendriks, E., Rietberg, M., & Kwakkel, G. (2014). What is the evidence for physical therapy poststroke? A systematic review and meta-analysis. PloS one, 9(2), e87987.

16. Wist, S., Clivaz, J., & Sattelmayer, M. (2016). Muscle strengthening for hemiparesis after stroke: A meta-analysis. Annals of physical and rehabilitation medicine, 59(2), 114–124.

17. Wolf, S. L., Winstein, C. J., Miller, J. P., Taub, E., Uswatte, G., Morris, D., Giuliani, C., Light, K. E., Nichols-Larsen, D., & EXCITE Investigators (2006). Effect of constraint-induced movement therapy on upper extremity function 3 to 9 months after stroke: the EXCITE randomized clinical trial. JAMA, 296(17), 2095–2104.

18. World Health Organization. (2018). World Health Organization Stroke Fact Sheet. Retrieved from https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/stroke