Author(s): Rintala, Aki; Päivärinne, Ville; Hakala, Sanna; Paltamaa, Jaana; Heinonen, Ari; Karvanen, Juha; Sjögren, Tuulikki

Title: Effectiveness of technology-based distance physical rehabilitation interventions for improving physical functioning in stroke : a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials

Year: 2019

Version: Accepted version (Final draft)

Please cite the original version:

Rintala, A., Päivärinne, V., Hakala, S., Paltamaa, J., Heinonen, A., Karvanen, J., & Sjögren, T. (2019). Effectiveness of technology-based distance physical rehabilitation interventions for improving physical functioning in stroke : a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, 100(7), 1339-1358. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2018.11.007

Accepted Manuscript

Effectiveness of technology-based distance physical rehabilitation interventions for improving physical functioning in stroke: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials

Aki Rintala, MSc, Ville Päivärinne, MSc, Sanna Hakala, MSc, Jaana Paltamaa, PhD, Ari Heinonen, PhD, Juha Karvanen, DSc, Tuulikki Sjögren, PhD

PII: S0003-9993(18)31513-2

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2018.11.007

Reference: YAPMR 57427

To appear in: *ARCHIVES OF PHYSICAL MEDICINE AND REHABILITATION*

Received Date: 23 September 2018

Accepted Date: 3 November 2018

Please cite this article as: Rintala A, Päivärinne V, Hakala S, Paltamaa J, Heinonen A, Karvanen J, Sjögren T, Effectiveness of technology-based distance physical rehabilitation interventions for improving physical functioning in stroke: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials, *ARCHIVES OF PHYSICAL MEDICINE AND REHABILITATION* (2019), doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2018.11.007.

(1) Running head: Physical rehabilitation in stroke

(2) Title: Effectiveness of technology-based distance physical rehabilitation interventions for improving physical functioning in stroke: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials

(3) Author(s) full name(s) and highest academic degree(s);

1. Aki Rintala (MSc)[1,2]
2. Ville Päivärinne (MSc)[3]
3. Sanna Hakala (MSc)[1]
4. Jaana Paltamaa (PhD)[4]
5. Ari Heinonen (PhD)[1]
6. Juha Karvanen (DSc)[5]
7. Tuulikki Sjögren (PhD)[1]

(4) The name(s) of the institution(s), section(s), division(s), and department(s) where the study was performed: Study was performed in the Faculty of Sport and Health Science, University of Jyvaskyla, Jyväskylä, Finland

The institutional affiliation(s) of the author(s) at the time of the study:

1. Faculty of Sport and Health Science, University of Jyvaskyla, Jyväskylä, Finland
2. Department of Neurosciences, Center for Contextual Psychiatry, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium
3. Faculty of Medicine, Department of Orthopaedics and Traumatology, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

4. School of Health and Social Studies, JAMK University of Applied Sciences, Jyväskylä, Finland
5. Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Jyvaskyla, Jyväskylä, Finland

(5) Acknowledgment of any presentation of this material, to whom, when, and where: None to declare.

(6) Acknowledgment of financial support, including grant numbers and any other needed acknowledgments. Explanations of any conflicts of interest: This work was supported by the Social Insurance Institution of Finland [grant number 31/26/2014]. No potential conflict of interest was declared.

(7) Name, address, business telephone number, and e-mail address of corresponding author: Aki Rintala; Postal address: Avenue de l'Heliport 32 69, 1000 Brussels, Belgium; Telephone number: +32 474 13 23 88; E-mail address: akirintala@gmail.com

(8) International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) registration number: CRD42017065918

Title: Effectiveness of technology-based distance physical rehabilitation interventions for improving physical functioning in stroke: a systematic review of randomized controlled trials

ABSTRACT

Objective: To study the effectiveness of technology-based distance physical rehabilitation interventions on physical functioning in stroke.

Data sources: A systematic literature search was conducted in six databases from January 2000 to May 2018.

Study selection: Inclusion criteria applied PICOS (Patient, Intervention, Comparison, Outcome, Study design) framework as follows: (P) stroke; (I) technology-based distance physical rehabilitation interventions; (C) any comparison without the use of technology; (O) physical functioning; (S) randomized controlled trials (RCTs). The search identified in total 693 studies, and the screening of 162 full-text studies revealed 13 eligible studies.

Data extraction: The studies were screened using the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analysis (PRISMA) guidelines, and assessed for methodological quality and quality of evidence. Meta-analysis was performed if applicable.

Data synthesis: Thirteen studies were included, and online video monitoring was the most used technology. Seven outcomes of physical functioning were identified – activities of daily living (ADL), upper and lower extremity functioning, balance, walking, physical activity, and participation. A meta-analysis of six RCTs indicated that technology-based distance physical rehabilitation had a similar effect on ADL (standard mean difference (SMD) 0.06; 95%CI: -0.22 to 0.35, p = .67) compared to the combination of traditional treatments (usual care, similar and other treatment). Similar results were obtained for other outcomes, except inconsistent findings were noted for walking. Methodological quality of the studies and quality of evidence were considered low.

Conclusions: The findings suggest that the effectiveness of technology-based distance physical rehabilitation interventions on physical functioning might be similar compared to traditional treatments in stroke. Further research should be performed to confirm the effectiveness of technology-based distance physical rehabilitation interventions for improving physical functioning of persons with stroke.

Keywords: systematic review, rehabilitation technology, distance physical rehabilitation, stroke

List of abbreviations:

ADL	Activities of daily living
BI	Barthel Index
BBS	Berg Balance Scale
CCRCT	Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials
CINAHL	Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature
DVD	Digital versatile disc
EMBASE	Excerpta Medica Database
FAM	Fugl-Meyer Assessment
FONEFIM	Telephone version of the Functional Independence Measure
GRADE	Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluation
ICF	International Classification of Functioning, Disability, and Health
LLFDI	Late-Life Function and Disability Instrument
MBI	Modified Barthel Index
MeSH	Medical subject headings
MD	Mean difference
Ovid MEDLINE	Database of the National Library of Medicine
PEDro	Physiotherapy Evidence Database
PICOS	Patient, intervention, comparison, outcome, study design
PRISMA	The Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analysis
PROSPERO	Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews
RCT	Randomized controlled trial
SIS	Stroke Impact Scale
SMD	Standard mean difference
WOS	Web of Science

Introduction

Stroke is one of the leading cause of death and long-term disability worldwide.[1,2] The most important risk factors for stroke have been noted diabetes, hypertension, and smoking.[3,4] Symptoms of stroke vary individually with a wide range of motoric, mental, lingual, sensory, and cognitive impairments that cause functional challenges in daily life and decrease the quality of life.[5–7] Recovery from stroke (i.e., improvement of daily functional activities) is usually very individual and rapid in the acute stage of the disease, but may require several months or years of rehabilitation in some stroke survivors.[8,9] It has been estimated that approximately one-third stroke survivors show low functional performance at five years after stroke onset.[10] Therefore, rehabilitation is an important part of post-stroke care and is highly needed, although substantive advances have been made in acute stroke management.[11]

In previous decades, technology-driven treatments such as virtual reality and robotics have gained popularity in stroke rehabilitation.[11–14] These systematic reviews have reported that the effectiveness of technology-driven treatments is similar to that of traditional treatments in improving the outcomes of physical functioning such as grip strength, gait speed, upper extremity functioning, or global motor functioning in persons with stroke.[11–14] To date, treatments involving virtual reality and/or robotics usually depend on facility requirements, face-to-face interaction between a patient and a healthcare professional, and advanced technology. Moreover, these technologies may not always be user-friendly for participants and exert a considerable economic burden on the healthcare system and institutes.[15,16]

Only few systematic reviews have investigated the effectiveness of distance rehabilitation in persons with stroke.[17–19] Laver et al. (2013) examined the effectiveness of telerehabilitation

consisting of 10 randomized controlled trials (RCTs) involving a total of 933 participants.[17] Interventions focused on all types of home-based telerehabilitation using telephone, videoconferencing, desktop videophones, in-home messaging device, or combination of email, online chat programs and virtual online library.[17] This review did not show differences in the activities of daily living (ADL), quality of life, or upper extremity functioning of persons with stroke receiving telerehabilitation and those receiving face-to-face rehabilitation or no rehabilitation. Also, Chen et al. (2013) compared all types of telerehabilitation with that of traditional treatments by assessing seven RCTs and observed no substantial differences in ADL (n = 792), balance (n = 52), or upper extremity functioning (n = 46). [18] A systematic review by Johansson et al. (2011) on all types of telerehabilitation in stroke care involving overall nine RCT-, observational, and qualitative studies concluded that home-based telerehabilitation or technology-based virtual rehabilitation improved the physical health of stroke survivors.[19] However, the same systematic review indicated the need for additional studies on telerehabilitation, especially to determine its cost-effectiveness and resource utilization.[19]

To conclude, there is a call for gathering more evidence on the effectiveness of technology-based distance rehabilitation in stroke, especially focused only on physical rehabilitation interventions. The present study investigated the effectiveness of technology-based distance physical rehabilitation interventions on physical functioning compared to a combination of traditional treatments such as similar treatment, other treatment, and usual care in persons with stroke. In this review, technology-based distance physical rehabilitation interventions were defined as any physical functioning-, activity-, or exercise-promoting interventions that used a technological device that was monitored or guided by a healthcare professional remotely. Additionally, physical functioning refers to the International Classification of Functioning, Disability, and Healthy (ICF) categories of body function, activities, and participation.[20]

Methods

Search strategy

A systematic literature search was conducted using the following databases: Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CCRCT), Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL), Excerpta Medica Database (EMBASE), Database of the National Library of Medicine (Ovid MEDLINE), Physiotherapy Evidence Database (PEDro), and Web of Science (WOS). The first search was performed for studies published between January 2000 and March 2017. Updated searches were conducted using the same databases for studies published between April 2017 to September 2017 and October 2017 to May 2018. A combined flow chart of study selection is presented in Figure 1. Details of the protocol used for performing this systematic review are registered on Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) and can be accessed at www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO/display_record.asp?ID=CRD42017065918.

Inclusion criteria were designed according to the PICOS (i.e., Patient, Intervention, Comparison, Outcome, Study design) framework and were as follows: (P) persons with stroke; (I) any technology (e.g., wearable device, Internet, telephone calls, or smartphone application) used to monitor, promote, or increase physical functioning as a distance physical rehabilitation intervention; (C) any control group not receiving rehabilitation intervention (i.e., wait-list) or receiving rehabilitation intervention without the use of technology (i.e., no rehabilitation, in-person physical rehabilitation interventions, or other treatment for monitoring, promoting, or increasing physical functioning); (O) outcome measures of physical functioning; and (S) RCTs that were published in

English, Finnish, Swedish, or German. Literature search was limited also to research in humans. Systematic reviews, non-randomized or non-controlled interventional studies, observational studies, discussion or short reports, abstracts, discussion papers, qualitative studies, and protocols were excluded from the review. Moreover, studies involving other participants with different diagnosis without a separate analysis of persons with stroke were excluded.

A researcher (AR) performed the searches in the selected databases along with other members of the research team (VP and TS) and two information specialists. Search terms included various technology terms and interventional study types (i.e., RCT or clinical trial), comprehensive keywords describing physical rehabilitation interventions (e.g., exercise, exercise therapy, therapies, therapy modalities, rehabilitation, multidisciplinary therapy, motor activity, participation, and physical activity), and stroke-related terms (e.g., stroke, brain infarction, and cerebrovascular disease). The original search strategies are described in Appendix 1. The search strategy used medical subject headings (MeSH) or keyword headings. An additional manual search was conducted using references mentioned in the retrieved studies.

Data extraction

Two reviewers (AR and VP) independently screened the titles and abstracts of the studies in line with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analysis (PRISMA) guidelines[21] using the PICOS criteria. Next, relevant studies satisfying the PICOS criteria were independently evaluated for full-text assessment by two reviewers (AR and VP). A third reviewer (SH) evaluated the studies in case of a disagreement. If needed, corresponding authors of the included studies were contacted for obtaining additional information. Agreement level between the reviewers was assessed using Cohen's Kappa, with a value of 0.62 indicating substantial agreement

in the title and abstract screening, and 0.71 indicating substantial agreement in the full-text study screening.[22]

Methodological quality of the studies and quality of evidence

Methodological quality of the included RCTs was assessed independently by two reviewers (AR and VP) using the Furlan method guideline for systematic reviews.[23] A third reviewer (SH) was consulted in case of a disagreement. The 13-item Furlan method guideline for systematic reviews rates RCTs based on (1) adequate randomization, (2) concealment of treatment allocation, (3) blinding of participants, (4) blinding of care providers, and (5) blinding of outcome assessors, (6) described and acceptable rates of drop-out, (7) analysis of participants in allocated groups, (8) suggestion of selective outcome reporting, (9) similarity among groups at baseline, (10) no or similar co-intervention, (11) compliance, (12) timing of outcome assessment, and (13) no other sources of potential bias.[23] An item was scored positive ("*yes*") if the criterion was fulfilled, negative ("*no*") if the criterion was not fulfilled, or unclear ("*unsure*") if required information was inadequately reported. The total score of a study reflected the total sum of positive scores. The maximum score of a study according to the Furlan (2015) method guideline for systematic reviews was 13 points.

The quality of evidence according to the outcomes included in the meta-analyses was evaluated independently by two reviewers (AR and VP) using the Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) guideline. The quality of evidence was classified as high (i.e., further research is unlikely to change our confidence in the effect estimate), moderate (i.e., further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the effect estimate), low (i.e., further research is highly likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the effect

184 estimate), or very low (i.e., any estimate of the effect is highly uncertain).[24,25] Because this review
185 only included RCTs, evaluation was initiated from the highest quality level. Based on our
186 independent evaluations, we downgraded the quality of evidence depending on the risk of bias,
187 inconsistency, indirectness (e.g., generalizability), imprecision (e.g., insufficient data), or
188 publication bias.[26]
189
190 *Statistical synthesis*
191
192 General characteristics for study and participants were extracted and descriptive analysis was
193 performed on all selected outcomes. Outcome measures of physical functioning were linked to the
194 ICF categories of body function, activities, and participation by two researchers (AR and JP), and
195 the ICF categories were used as a tool to capture similar outcomes into meta-analysis or descriptive
196 analysis.[27,28] Meta-analyses were performed separately for captured outcomes of physical
197 functioning that were similar if five or more studies reported meaningful data. Additional
198 subanalyses of used technology were investigated if applicable. If adequate post-treatment values
199 (mean and standard deviation [SD]) were not reported in the original study, a request was sent to the
200 corresponding author of this study. The study was excluded from the meta-analysis if no response
201 was obtained from the corresponding author. If a study reported standard error (SE) values instead
202 of SD values, SD values were obtained from the SE values of the means by multiplying the SE
203 values by the square root of the sample size within a group. Standard mean difference (SMD)
204 between the experimental and control groups was calculated for each study. Mean difference (MD)
205 was calculated if studies in the same meta-analysis used the same outcome assessment. In
206 accordance with the Cochrane guidelines for systematic reviews and meta-analysis, values of
207 outcome were multiplied by -1 if required so that high values reflected better physical functioning.[29]
208 Meta-analyses were performed using a random-effects model. Pooled effect estimates for a

combination of single effects of the RCTs were analyzed using Cochrane Collaboration's Review Manager 5.3.5 statistical software analysis package. SMD between the groups was classified as large (> 0.5), moderate (0.3–0.5), small (0.1–0.2) or insubstantial (< 0.1).[30] A study was defined as having a low methodological quality if its score was ≤ 6 points according to the Furlan method guideline. Results of the meta-analyses are presented using forest plots of the SMD or MD. Statistical heterogeneity was evaluated using I^2 statistic, with a value close to 0 indicating low heterogeneity.[31] Possible publication bias was investigated using funnel plots.[32]

Results

The literature search identified 693 studies after removing duplicate studies. Screening of 162 full-text studies revealed 13 studies that fulfilled the inclusion criteria, and these studies were included in quantitative synthesis and descriptive analysis.[33–45] A flow chart of the screening process is presented in Figure 1, and specific details of the included studies are shown in Table 1. A table with the used technologies and the communication between the health care professional and the participant is presented in Appendix 2.

Description of study participants

Selected studies included 605 stroke survivors, of which 304 were included in the experimental group and 301 were included in the control group (Table 1). The mean (SD) age of the study participants was 65.2 (4.2) years. Ten out of 13 studies reported an average disease duration since diagnosis of 10.6 (SD 11.2) months (range, ≤ 1 month to 36 months). Of the 605 study participants, 65 % were men and 87 % had experienced ischemic stroke. Four studies did not report the stroke

type.[33,35,39,41] Only six studies reported the affected side of hemiparesis, with majority of participants (53 %) showing left hemiparesis.[33,34,40,42–44] Inclusion criteria of impairment and disability levels due to a stroke were defined across the included studies with measurements of independent walking,[33,42] ADL,[18,36,37,39] or upper extremity functioning.[34,35,40,41,43,44] One study did not report impairment and disability levels as inclusion criteria,[45] and 11 out of 13 studies used cognitive impairment or psychiatric illness as an exclusion criterion.[33,34,36–42,44,45]

Description of technology-based distance physical rehabilitation interventions

The most common technology used for providing distance physical rehabilitation interventions was online video monitoring, which was used in five out of 13 studies.[36,38,39,41,44] Therapists used online video techniques for monitoring physical home exercises, goal settings, or overall treatment.[36,38,39,41,44] However, the frequency of this technology in the interventions was heterogeneous, ranging from three[39,41] to five[36,44] times per week, and one study did not report the frequency of online video monitoring.[38] Three of these five studies used other technologies alongside online video monitoring, such as telephone calls and messaging,[39] gamification,[41] or accelerometer.[36] The second most common technology used for providing distance physical rehabilitation interventions was telephone calls conducted by a therapist or a nurse, which was used in three out of 13 studies.[33,37,42] The frequency of telephone calls varied from only three telephone calls in a six-month study period to one telephone call in a four-week study period.[33,37,42] The remaining five studies used technologies such as exercise videos through an electronic tablet,[40] virtual training program for upper extremity functioning,[34,35] exercises from a digital versatile disc (DVD),[45] or combination of physical exercise programs through the Internet along with gamification.[43]

Eight studies reported that healthcare professionals and participants interacted in real-time through an online video or through telephone calls.[18,33,36,37,39,41,42,44] Only one out of 13 studies used one-way communication where the therapist monitored physical exercise and provided feedback to participants if necessary through the Internet without any real-time communication.[43] Four out of 13 studies did not involve any direct communication or self-monitoring options, because they used a virtual training program without any feedback or exercise videos through an electronic tablet or a DVD.[34,35,40,45]

Content of interventions in the experimental group

Mean (SD) duration of the interventions was 9.2 (6.0) weeks. The content of the intervention in the experimental group was very heterogeneous (Table 1). Four out of 13 interventions focused on overall and individualized physical exercises for improving mobility, strength, balance, walking, and stretching.[38–40,45] Five out of 13 interventions included only upper extremity exercises performed in a virtual environment at home,[34,35,44] balance and body position exercises,[41] or use of orthoses.[43] Two out of 13 interventions focused on lower extremity exercises such as gait-related exercises with balance and coordination exercises.[33,36] Finally, two out of 13 interventions focused on increasing and promoting physical activity.[37,42] Twelve out of 13 interventions were monitored or programmed by a physiotherapist or an occupational therapist, or by both.[33–36,38,39,41–45] Only one intervention was a nurse-led stroke prevention program for improving physical activity.[37]

Effectiveness of technology-based distance physical rehabilitation interventions

Seven outcomes of physical functioning were identified from the selected studies (Table 1 & Table 2). These outcomes were ADL, upper and lower extremity functioning, balance, walking, physical

activity, and participation. Descriptive analysis was performed on all of the outcomes and meta-analysis was only conducted from ADL, as for other outcomes there were not enough data to perform meaningful meta-analyses. Metaregression analyses were not performed because of a lack of studies.

ADL. Nine studies investigated ADL of participants receiving technology-based distance physical rehabilitation interventions.[34–36,38,39,41,42,45] ADL was measured using six ADL instruments, namely, the Barthel Index (BI),[34,41] Modified BI,[38,45] Modified Rankin Scale (MRS),[37] telephone version of the Functional Independence Measure (FONEFIM),[39] ADL domain of Stroke Impact Scale (SIS),[42] and the Nottingham Extended ADL Scale (NEADL).[35] ADL instruments were identified for mobility (d4), self-care (d5), and domestic life (d6) in ICF categories of activities and participation.

A meta-analysis was performed from six studies for ADL outcome.[37–39,41,42,45] Technology-based distance physical rehabilitation interventions had a similar effect on ADL when compared to control group with the combination of similar treatment, other treatment, and usual care (SMD 0.06; 95% CI: -0.22 to 0.35, p = .67; Figure 2). Technologies and the content of the interventions in the experimental group were heterogeneous, with most often used technology being online video monitoring to enable physical exercises.[38,39,41] The overall results of the meta-analysis indicated that the included studies were moderately heterogeneous (I^2 = 38 %). Subanalysis of different technologies did not show differences between the groups, but within one technology group there were no heterogeneity observed (Figure 2) Funnel plot did not indicate any publication bias (Appendix 3). Descriptive analysis from all studies indicated similar findings as in the meta-analysis regardless of the used technology or comparison group (Table 2).

Upper extremity functioning. Seven studies investigated upper extremity functioning of participants receiving technology-based distance physical rehabilitation interventions through online video monitoring,[36,39,44] exercise videos,[40] virtual reality training or its combination with gamification (i.e., any game-design elements improving physical functioning),[34,35] or the combination of monitoring through Internet and gamification[43] (Table 1). Outcomes of upper extremity functioning were determined using the Late-Life Function and Disability Instrument (LLFDI),[39] the Fugl-Meyer Assessment (FMA),[34,43,44] or the Wolf Motor Function Test.[35,40] Outcomes of upper extremity functioning were interpreted for neuromusculoskeletal- and movement-related functions (b7) in the ICF category of body function or for mobility (d4) in the ICF categories of activities and participation, depending on whether the instrument focused only on motor function or on functional capacity. Descriptive analysis revealed similar effects between technology-based distance physical rehabilitation interventions and control groups with combination of usual care[34,35,39,43,44] or similar treatment without the use of technology[40] (Table 2).

Lower extremity functioning. Only two studies investigated lower extremity functioning using lower extremity domains of LLFDI[36] or FMA[39]. Both studies instructed physical exercises such as balance and gait-related physical exercises through telerehabilitation (Table 1). Similar as in upper extremity functioning, instruments assessing lower extremity functioning were interpreted for neuromusculoskeletal- and movement-related functions (b7) in the ICF category of body function and for mobility (d4) in the ICF categories of activities and participation. Descriptive analysis indicated that technology-based distance physical rehabilitation enabled through telerehabilitation had the similar effect on lower extremity functioning when compared with usual care (Table 2).[36,39]

Balance. Balance was assessed in four technology-based distance physical rehabilitation interventions that were enabled through online video monitoring[36,38,41] or telephone calls.[42] All of

these four studies used the Berg Balance Scale (BBS) as an outcome for balance,[18,36,41,42] but only three of them reported BBS values. BBS was linked to the domain of mobility (d4) in the ICF categories of activities and participation. Descriptive analysis showed that technology-based distance physical rehabilitation interventions had a similar effect on balance when compared to control group with the combination of usual care, similar or other treatment (Table 2).

Walking. Outcomes of walking was assessed in three studies that compared telephone-enabled distance physical rehabilitation interventions with other treatments (Table 2). Walking tests were performed using a 10-meter walking test.[33,36,42] Walking was linked to the domain of mobility (d4) in the ICF categories of activities and participation. Descriptive analysis showed that two of these three studies had a better improvement on walking ability for participants in the control group receiving either supervised clinic-based treadmill training[33] or leisure-center exercise training[42] compared to technology-based distance physical rehabilitation interventions offering home-based exercises that were monitored through telephone calls. However, Van den Berg et al. (2016) study found similar effect between groups when distance physical rehabilitation interventions enabled by home-based physical exercises through online video monitoring and smartphone application were compared with usual care (Table 2).

Physical activity. Only two studies investigated physical activity on the effectiveness of technology-based physical rehabilitation interventions to either other treatments[42] or physical activity health promotion for nurse-led secondary prevention of ischemic stroke.[37] Physical activity was investigated using the physical activity subscales in SIS[42] and Health Promoting Lifestyle Profile II.[37] We identified physical activity in the domain of self-care (d5) in the ICF categories of activities and participation. Both studies showed similar effects between the groups with respect to the outcomes of physical activity when compared to usual care and other treatments (Table 2).[37,42]

Participation. Four studies investigated participation in technology-based physical rehabilitation interventions enabled through telephone calls (three studies) and website exercises (one study) compared usual care[36,39,43] or other treatment.[42] Studies captured the outcome of participation with either the Stroke Impact Scale (SIS)[36,42,43] or LLFDI.[39] The instruments of participation were identified for mobility (d4), self-care (d5), and domestic life (d6) in ICF categories of activities and participation (Table 2). All studies indicated similar effect on participation between the experimental group compared and usual care[36,39,43] or other treatment (i.e., supervised leisure-center exercise classes for people with stroke).[42]

Methodological quality and quality of evidence

The overall methodological quality of the studies was low (median: 6, interquartile range: 6 to 9) according to the Furlan method guideline (Table 3).[23] The methodological quality was high (> 9/13) in four studies,[33,36,40,42] moderate (7-8/13) in two studies,[38,39] and low (≤ 6/13) in seven studies.[34,35,37,41,43–45] All studies used an adequate randomization method. However, only 38 % studies reported an adequate treatment allocation procedure. Other main methodological faults were observed in the blinding of participants and care providers, reporting of information on selective outcomes, and compliance to the intervention. Moreover, only three studies used intention-to-treat analysis.[36,39,41]

GRADE evaluation was performed using the results of the meta-analysis and descriptive analyses (Table 4).[26] All the outcomes indicated very low quality of evidence. For ADL, downgrading three levels were based on the methodological quality of the studies (risk of bias), clinical heterogeneity (inconsistency), and low number of participants included in the meta-analysis (imprecision). Similar

observations were obtained for other outcomes, but only based on descriptive analysis, as meta-analyses were not able to perform due to lack of meaningful data.

Discussion

This systematic review investigated the effectiveness of technology-based distance physical rehabilitation interventions for improving physical functioning in persons with stroke. Results indicated that technology-based distance physical rehabilitation interventions had a similar effect on physical functioning outcomes of ADL, upper and lower extremity functioning, balance, physical activity, and participation, when compared to the combinations of traditional treatments not involving the use of technology (i.e., similar treatment, other treatment, and usual care). Our findings are consistent with previous systematic reviews that assessed the effectiveness of telerehabilitation in persons with stroke, which reported no significant difference in the improvement of physical functioning between participants receiving telerehabilitation and those receiving traditional treatments.[17–19] However, our study focused only on physical rehabilitation interventions with no technology allowed in the comparison group.

Our meta-analysis involving six studies and 322 stroke survivors showed similar effect of technology-based distance physical rehabilitation interventions on ADL compared to the combination of similar treatment, other treatment, and usual care. ADL improved in both the groups irrespective of the intervention or used technology, which was consistent with previous systematic reviews that investigated all types of telerehabilitation interventions when compared to traditional therapies in stroke.[17,18] Results of our meta-analysis indicated a moderate statistical heterogeneity, which our analysis did not encompass for meta-regression due to lack of studies. Once more studies are published in this field, we might be able to investigate more specific factors that might enhance

clinical and statistical heterogeneity, such as personal and clinical characteristics, comparison of different control groups (i.e., usual care, similar, or other treatment), or more wide comparison of different technologies.

Our findings showed inconsistent findings on walking. Two out of three studies showed better improvement on walking for participants who received telephone-based distance physical rehabilitation interventions providing home-based exercises compared to participants receiving supervised clinic-based treadmill training[33] or leisure-center exercise training.[42] Third study found no differences between the groups, when distance physical rehabilitation interventions were instructed through online video monitoring and smartphone application compared with usual care.[36] Evidence of using technology-based physical rehabilitation interventions are still scarce in the research field. However, our findings could indicate that when aiming to improve walking ability in stroke, distance physical rehabilitation might not be an alternative option for stroke survivors. For other physical functioning outcomes (i.e., upper and lower extremity, balance, physical activity, and participation), our descriptive analyses indicated similar effects between technology-based distance physical rehabilitation interventions and the combination of traditional treatments. Unfortunately, we were not able to perform meaningful with meta-analyses from these outcomes due to lack of studies and insufficient data. In previous systematic review with meta-analysis, only two studies showed similar results on upper extremity functioning and balance, when all types of telerehabilitation interventions were compared with traditional treatments in stroke.[18] Although our review was able to solely focus on physical rehabilitation interventions, more evidence is warranted on different technologies and their possible additional values over traditional physiotherapy or other forms of physical rehabilitation when only similar treatments are compared with the distinction only on the use of technology.

The overall methodological quality and the quality of evidence of the included studies were low. The included RCTs had main insufficient methodological quality for treatment allocation procedures, blinding of the participants and care providers, selection bias, prevention of co-interventions, and reporting of intervention compliance. The difficulty in blinding care providers or participants in these study types is understandable. Moreover, it may be difficult to prevent co-interventions completely, especially in the early stage of recovery among persons with stroke. Surprisingly, there was a lack of quality in reporting compliance to interventions. Guidelines such as CONSORT 2010 Statement for reporting a RCT study are strongly recommended to increase transparency and methodological quality of a single RCT study.[46]. GRADE evaluation showed also low quality of evidence, suggesting that the confidence in the effect estimates was low and that future studies may substantially change the effect estimates.

Twelve out of 13 studies reported inclusion criteria of low or intermediate physical disability based on a measure of walking ability, upper extremity functioning, or overall physical functioning and no cognitive deficit at baseline.[33–45] Majority of participants were male with a mean age of 65 years, had a disease duration of 11 months and 87 % of the participants experienced ischemic stroke. These demographic and clinical characteristics suggest that our results can be generalized to elderly male stroke survivors in the subacute stage of a recovery with no cognitive impairment, and who can function independently at least in some levels of their daily life. Approximately from 50 % to 75 % of new stroke survivors develop some level of cognitive impairment.[47,48] From this perspective, the use of technology for providing distance rehabilitation interventions in persons with stroke may not always be suitable, due to the presence of cognitive impairment. Therefore, technology-based distance physical rehabilitation interventions are important to develop towards more stroke-specific, individualized, and user-friendly approaches to recognize who would benefit from the technology approach when focus is to improve physical functioning in daily life.

In this systematic review, technology-based distance physical rehabilitation interventions were defined as interventions that used one or more technological devices in a remote guidance of a healthcare professional, mainly monitored by a physiotherapist. Eight included studies used real-time communication through online video monitoring or telephone calls. However, the included studies used different technologies or a combination of several technologies using different interaction methods, thus making it difficult to determine the advantage of a single interaction approach. Our review also indicated that there is a lack of evidence on the effectiveness of technology-based distance physical rehabilitation interventions in stroke rehabilitation, and the current use of technology and its communication method is scarce in the research field. Future studies are recommended to narrow this gap to understand the benefits of either a single technology or a single interactive method (e.g., self-monitoring vs. interactive communication) enabled through a technology device in a distance physical rehabilitation intervention.

To understand the benefits of using technology in physical rehabilitation interventions, one must understand its benefits in terms of resource utilization and cost-effectiveness.[19] Unfortunately, our systematic review did not observe any indication of these approaches in the included studies, which was consistent with that observed in previous similar systematic reviews.[17–19,49–51] These aspects are crucial for understanding whether technology-driven distance rehabilitation interventions are beneficial for the healthcare system without overlooking the meaningful and goal-orientated rehabilitation of persons with stroke. Therefore, future studies should also focus on the resource utilization and cost-effectiveness of technology-based distance physical rehabilitation interventions compared with traditional or similar treatments.

Study strengths and limitations

The strength of this systematic review and meta-analysis is its focus on technology-based distance physical rehabilitation in persons with stroke, as previous systematic reviews have mainly focused on telerehabilitation.[17–19] In this review, we strictly followed the inclusion criteria based on the PICOS framework to determine the effect of technology-based distance physical rehabilitation interventions in persons with stroke. We only included studies that used technology-based distance physical rehabilitation setting in one intervention group that were administered in the physical absence of a healthcare professional compared to a group that did not use any technology.

However, this systematic review has some limitations. The studies included in our review were heterogeneous with respect to the content of treatments in participants in the experimental and control groups. Heterogeneity was also reported in previous reviews assessing technology-based distance rehabilitation interventions.[49–51] Moreover, substantial variability was observed in technologies in the distance physical rehabilitation interventions. Because of these reasons, the results of this systematic review should be interpreted with caution. Nevertheless, this systematic review provides overview on the type of technologies used to enable distance physical rehabilitation interventions for improving physical functioning in stroke survivors, and hopefully, encourages researchers to conduct more studies in this field.

Conclusions

This systematic review suggests that the effectiveness of technology-based distance physical rehabilitation for improving ADL, upper and lower extremity functioning, balance, physical activity, and participation is similar compared to the traditional treatments in persons with stroke. Contradictory findings were observed for walking. Further research should be performed to confirm

the effectiveness of technology-based distance physical rehabilitation interventions for improving physical functioning of persons with stroke.

References

1. Feigin VL, Forouzanfar MH, Krishnamurthi R, Mensah GA, Connor M, Bennett DA, et al. Global and regional burden of stroke during 1990-2010: Findings from the Global Burden of Disease Study 2010. *Lancet* 2014;383:245–55.
2. Go AS, Mozaffarian D, Roger VL, Benjamin EJ, Berry JD, Blaha MJ, et al. Heart disease and stroke statistics--2014 update: a report from the American Heart Association. *Circulation* 2014;129:e28–292.
3. Borglykke A, Andreasen AH, Kuulasmaa K, Sans S, Ducimetière P, Vanuzzo D, et al. Stroke risk estimation across nine European countries in the MORGAM project. *Heart* 2010;96(24):1997–2004.
4. Asplund K, Karvanen J, Giampaoli S, Jousilahti P, Niemelä M, Broda G, et al. Relative risks for stroke by age, sex, and population based on follow-up of 18 european populations in the MORGAM project. *Stroke* 2009;40(7):2319–26.
5. Miller EL, Murray L, Richards L, Zorowitz RD, Bakas T, Clark P, et al. Comprehensive overview of nursing and interdisciplinary rehabilitation care of the stroke patient: A scientific statement from the American heart association. *Stroke* 2010;41:2402–48.
6. Patel MD, Tilling K, Lawrence E, Rudd AG, Wolfe CDA, McKevitt C. Relationships between long-term stroke disability, handicap and health-related quality of life. *Age Ageing* 2006;35(3):273–9.
7. Sturm JW, Donnan G a, Dewey HM, Macdonell R a L, Gilligan AK, Srikanth V, et al. Quality of life after stroke: The North East Melbourne Stroke Incidence Study (NEMESIS).

Stroke 2004;35(10):2340–5.

8. Teasell RW, Murie Fernandez M, McIntyre A, Mehta S. Rethinking the continuum of stroke rehabilitation. *Archives of Physical Medicine Rehabilitation* 2014;95:595–6.

9. Teasell R, Mehta S, Pereira S, McIntyre A, Janzen S, Allen L, et al. Time to rethink long-term rehabilitation management of stroke patients. *Topics in Stroke Rehabilitation* 2012;19(6):457–62.

10. Barker-Collo S, Feigin VL, Parag V, Lawes CMM, Senior H. Auckland Stroke Outcomes Study: Part 2: Cognition and functional outcomes 5 years poststroke. *Neurology* 2010;75(18):1608–16.

11. Chang WH, Kim Y-H. Robot-assisted Therapy in Stroke Rehabilitation. *Journal of Stroke* 2013;15(3):174–81.

12. Laver KE, George S, Thomas S, Deutsch JE, Crotty M. Virtual reality for stroke rehabilitation. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2015;12(2):CD008349.

13. Henderson A, Korner-Bitensky N, Levin M. Virtual Reality in Stroke Rehabilitation: A Systematic Review of its Effectiveness for Upper Limb Motor Recovery. *Topics in Stroke Rehabilitation* 2007;14(2):52–61.

14. Norouzi-Gheidari N, Archambault PS, Fung J. Effects of robot-assisted therapy on stroke rehabilitation in upper limbs: systematic review and meta-analysis of the literature. *Journal of Rehabil Research and Development* 2012;49(4):479–96.

15. Andrade AO, Pereira AA, Walter S, Almeida R, Loureiro R, Compagna D, et al. Bridging the gap between robotic technology and health care. *Biomedical Signal Processing and Control* 2014;10:65–78.

16. Van der Loos HFM, Reinkensmeyer D. Rehabilitation and health care robotics. In: Siciliano B, Khatib O (eds). *Springer Handbook of Robotics*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg 2008;1223–51.

17. Laver KE, Schoene D, Crotty M, George S, Lannin NA, Sherrington C. Telerehabilitation services for stroke. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2013;12:CD010255.

18. Chen J, Jin W, Zhang X-X, Xu W, Liu X-N, Ren C-C. Telerehabilitation Approaches for Stroke Patients: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *Journal of Stroke and Cerebrovascular Disease* 2015;24:2660–8.

19. Johansson T, Wild C. Telerehabilitation in stroke care-a systematic review. *Journal of Telemedicine and Telecare* 2011;17(1):1–6.

20. World Health Organization. *Towards a Common Language for Functioning, Disability and Health ICF* [Internet]. The International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health 2002:1–22. Available from: http://www.who.int/classifications/icf/training/icfbeginnersguide.pdf

21. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Systematic Reviews* 2015;4:1.

22. Viera AJ, Garrett JM. Understanding interobserver agreement: The Kappa statistic. *Family Medicine* 2005;37:360–3.

23. Furlan AD, Malmivaara A, Chou R, Maher CG, Deyo RA, Schoene M, et al. 2015 Updated Method Guideline for Systematic Reviews in the Cochrane Back and Neck Group. *Spine* 2015;40(21):1660–73.

24. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, Kunz R, Falck- Y, Alonso-coello P, et al. GRADE : An emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. *British Medical Journal* 2008;336:924–6.

25. Goldet G, Howick J. Understanding GRADE: An introduction. *Journal of Evidence-Based Medicine* 2013;6(1):50–4.

26. Ryan R, Hill S. *How to GRADE the quality of the evidence* [Internet]. Cochrane Consumers

583 and Communication Group. Available from: http://cccrg.cochrane.org/author-resources
584 27. Cieza A, Fayed N, Bickenbach J, Prodinger B. Refinements of the ICF linking rules to
585 strengthen their potential for establishing comparability of health information. *Disability and*
586 *Rehabilitation* 2016;1–10.
587 28. World Health Organization (WHO). *International Classification of Functioning, Disability*
588 *and Health* [Internet]. World Health Organization 2003;1–15. Available from:
589 http://www.who.int/classifications/icf/icfchecklist.pdf?ua=1
590 29. Higgins JPT, Green S (eds). *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*
591 *Version 5.1.0* [Internet]. The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011. Available from:
592 http://training.cochrane.org/handbook
593 30. Cohen J. A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin* 1992;112(1):155–9.
594 31. Higgins JPT, Thompson SG. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. *Statistics in*
595 *Medicine* 2002;21:1539–58.
596 32. Sterne JAC, Sutton AJ, Ioannidis JPA, Terrin N, Jones DR, Lau J, et al. Recommendations
597 for examining and interpreting funnel plot asymmetry in meta-analyses of randomised
598 controlled trials. *British Medical Journal* 2011;343:d4002.
599 33. Ada L, Dean CM, Hall JM, Bampton J, Crompton S, L AA, et al. A treadmill and
600 overground walking program improves walking in persons reciding in the community after
601 stroke: a placebo-controlled, randomized trial. *Archives of Physical Medicine and*
602 *Rehabilitation* 2003;84(10):1486–91.
603 34. Ballester BR, Nirme J, Camacho I, Duarte E, Rodríguez S, Cuxart A, et al. Domiciliary VR-
604 based therapy for functional recovery and cortical reorganization: Randomized controlled
605 trial in participants at the chronic stage post stroke. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*
606 *Serious Games* 2017;5:e15.
607 35. Chen J, Jin W, Dong WS, Jin Y, Qiao FL, Zhou YF, et al. Effects of home-based

telesupervising rehabilitation on physical function for stroke survivors with hemiplegia. *American Journal of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation* 2017;96(3):152–60.

36. Chumbler NR, Quigley P, Li X, Morey M, Rose D, Sanford J, et al. Effects of telerehabilitation on physical function and disability for stroke patients: A randomized, controlled trial. *Stroke* 2012;43(8):2168–74.

37. Emmerson KB, Harding KE, Taylor NF. Home exercise programmes supported by video and automated reminders compared with standard paper-based home exercise programmes in patients with stroke: A randomized controlled trial. *Clinical Rehabilitation* 2017; 31(8):1068–77.

38. Lin KH, Chen CH, Chen YY, Huang WT, Lai JS, Yu SM, et al. Bidirectional and multi-user telerehabilitation system: Clinical effect on balance, functional activity, and satisfaction in patients with chronic stroke living in long-term care facilities. *Sensors* 2014;14(7):12451–66.

39. Moore SA, Hallsworth K, Jakovljevic DG, Blamire AM, He J, Ford GA, et al. Effects of community exercise therapy on metabolic, brain, physical, and cognitive function following stroke: A randomized controlled pilot trial. *Neurorehabilitation and Neural Repair* 2015;29(7):623–35.

40. Nijenhuis SM, Prange-Lasonder GB, Stienen AH, Rietman JS, Buurke JH. Effects of training with a passive hand orthosis and games at home in chronic stroke: a pilot randomised controlled trial. *Clinical Rehabilitation* 2016;31(2):207–16.

41. Piron L, Turolla A, Agostini M, Zucconi C, Cortese F, Zampolini M, et al. Exercises for paretic upper limb after stroke: A combined virtual-reality and telemedicine approach. *Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine* 2009;41(12):1016–20.

42. Redzuan NS, Engkasan JP, Mazlan M, Freddy Abdullah SJ. Effectiveness of a video-based therapy program at home after acute stroke: A randomized controlled trial. Archives of *Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation* 2012;93(12):2177–83.

43. Standen PJ, Threapleton K, Richardson A, Connell L, Brown DJ, Battersby S, et al. A low cost virtual reality system for home based rehabilitation of the arm following stroke: A randomised controlled feasibility trial. *Clinical Rehabilitation* 2017;31(3): 340–50.

44. Van Den Berg M, Crotty M, Liu E, Killington M, Kwakkel G, Van Wegen E. Early supported discharge by caregiver-mediated exercises and e-health support after stroke: A proof-of-concept trial. *Stroke* 2016;47(7):1885–92.

45. Wan LH, Zhang XP, Mo MM, Xiong XN, Ou CL, You LM, et al. Effectiveness of goal-setting telephone follow-up on health behaviors of patients with ischemic stroke: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Stroke Cerebrovascular Disease* 2016;25(9):2259–70.

46. Schulz KF, Altman DG, Moher D, Group C. CONSORT 2010 Statement : updated guidelines for reporting parallel group randomized trials. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 2010;152(11):726–32.

47. Haring H-P. Cognitive impairment after stroke. *Current Opinion in Neurology* 2002;15(1):79–84.

48. Renjen PN, Gauba C, Chaudhari D. Cognitive impairment after stroke. *Curēus* 2015;7(9):e335.

49. Rintala A, Hakala S, Paltamaa J, Heinonen A, Karvanen J, Sjögren T. Effectiveness of technology-based distance physical rehabilitation interventions on physical activity and walking in multiple sclerosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Disability Rehabilitation* 2016;40(4):373–87.

50. Hakala S, Rintala A, Immonen J, Karvanen J, Heinonen A, Sjögren T. Effectiveness of technology-based distance interventions promoting physical activity: Systematic review, meta-analysis and meta-regression. *Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine* 2017;49(2):97–105.

51. Hakala S, Rintala A, Immonen J, Karvanen J, Heinonen A, Sjögren T. Effectiveness of

physical activity promoting technology-based distance interventions compared to usual care. Systematic review, meta-analysis and meta-regression. *European Journal of Physical Rehabilitation Medicine* 2017;53(6):953–67.

662 **Figure legends**

663 Figure 1. Flow chart of study selection

664 Figure 2. Meta-analysis and additional sensitivity analysis on ADL compared to control group of
665 similar or other treatment, and usual care without the use of technology. The squares and diamonds
666 represent the test values for individual studies and overall effectiveness; standard mean difference
667 with 95% confidence interval (CI). Footnotes: SD, standard deviation; MBI, Modified Barthel
668 Index; MRS, Modified Rankin Scale; SIS, Stroke Impact Scale; ADL, activities of daily living;
669 FONEFIM, the telephone version of Functional Independence Measure; df, degrees of freedom

670 Appendix 1: Examples of the search strategies per database.
671 Appendix 2: Summary of included RCT studies on the used technologies and its communicative
672 interactions thereof in the distance physical rehabilitation interventions.
673 Appendix 3. Funnel plot of activities of daily living.

Table 1: Summary of RCTs on technology-based distance physical rehabilitation interventions with outcomes related to physical functioning compared to similar or other treatment, and usual care without the use of technology in stroke.

Study / Year / Country	Duration	Total N (% men)	Experimental N (% men)	Control N (% men)	Age (years) Experimental/ Control	Participants	Intervention in the experimental group	Intervention in the control group	Outcomes
Ada et al. 2003* Australia	4 weeks, FU 12 weeks	27 (70)	13 (69)	14 (71)	66/66	Persons with stroke from general community	Clinic-based treadmill and over-ground walking 3 x week à 45 minutes supervised by a physiotherapist	Home-based exercise program for lower limb muscles, balance, and coordination. Telephone calls once a week with a physiotherapist (total 4x).	10-meter walking test
Ballester et al. 2017 Spain	3 weeks, FU 12 weeks	35 (40)	17 (47)	18 (33)	65/62	Outpatients with stroke from a clinical hospital	Home-based non-supervised Automated Evaluation of Motor Function (AEMF) – virtual training program for the assessment of upper-limb motor functioning. Training comprised 3 tasks: Hit, Grasp, and Place, with a total duration of 20 minutes per training.	Usual care of home-based non-supervised upper extremity functioning tasks without the technology	Fugl-Meyer Assessment Barthel Index

							Occupational therapists did not give any explicit feedback about the performance during the intervention.		
Chen et al. 2017 China	12 weeks, FU 12 weeks	54 (61)	27 (67)	27 (56)	66/66	Persons with stroke as outpatients	Home-based telesupervising rehabilitation including physical exercises and ETNS. Physical exercises included stretching, motor imagery therapy, balance exercises, and walking exercises for 1 hour twice a day (total 60 sessions) with ETNS for 20 minutes twice a day for 12 weeks (total 60 sessions). Therapists supervised the participants to do the physical exercises and ETNS by live video conferencing.	Similar physical exercises and ETNS program without telesupervising	Modified Barthel Index Berg Balance Scale
Chumbler et al. 2012 United States	12 weeks, FU 12 weeks	48 (98)	25 (96)	23 (100)	67/68	Persons with stroke from Veterans Affairs facility center	Multifaceted stroke telerehabilitation intervention to improve functional mobility including individual strength and balance exercises, goal settings, and	Usual care	The Telephone Version of the Functional Independence Measure (FONEFIM)

							treatment plan. Three home video televisits remotely with a teletherapist (physical or occupational therapist) with the help of an assistant at home, five telephone calls, and in-home messaging device between patients and teletherapists.		Late-Life Function & Disability Instrument
Emmerson et al. 2017 Australia	4 weeks, no FU	62 (63)	30 (61)	32 (63)	68/63	Persons with stroke from general community	Home exercise program as video format on an electronic tablet (iPad) with automated reminders. Home exercise program consisted exercises of stretching, range of movement, strength, and fine motor and coordination for 1-2x per day designed by occupational therapists who updated the videos throughout the programme. All participants completed their usual individual and/or group therapy throughout the intervention.	Similar home exercise program without technology (paper-based). All participants completed their usual individual and/or group therapy throughout the intervention.	Wolf Motor Function Test
Lin et al. 2014	4	24	12	12	75/76	Persons with	An online web-based	Usual care	Berg Balance

Taiwan	weeks, no FU	(71)	(83)	(58)		stroke living in long-term care facilities	telerehabilitation program monitoring the change of body position, standing exercises, environment, and the use of upper extremities including animated videos and interactive gaming. The physiotherapist could monitor the sequences and durations with light to moderate exercise intensity (Borg scale 12–14). 3x per week à 50 min for each session, online video monitoring.		Scale Barthel Index
Moore et al. 2015* United Kingdom	19 weeks, no FU	40 (85)	20 (90)	20 (80)	68/70	Persons with stroke from a general community	Supervised leisure-center classes run by a physiotherapist and physical activity instructor for 3x per week à 45-60 minutes. Exercises were targeted to increase functional movement (strength, balance, cardiovascular).	Matched-duration home stretching program with instructions for using a booklet and diary to record stretches and changes in medication, diet, and physical activity. Telephone calls every 2 weeks (total	10-meter walking test Berg Balance Scale Stroke Impact Scale

								10x).	
Nijenhuis et al. 2017 The Netherlands	6 weeks, FU 8 weeks	19 (53)	9 (78)	10 (30)	58/62	Persons with chronic stroke from rehabilitation center and regional hospitals	Self-administered home-based arm and hand training for 6x per week à 30 minutes, using either a passive dynamic wrist or a hand orthosis combined with computerized gaming exercises designed by a therapist. Therapists monitored progress without real-time supervision, and adjusted training programs remotely via a website.	Prescribed conventional exercises from an exercise book	Fugl-Meyer Assessment Stroke Impact Scale
Piron et al. 2009 Italy	4 weeks, FU 4 weeks	36 (58)	18 (61)	18 (56)	66/64	Persons with stroke as outpatients	Home-based telerehabilitation program consisting of a virtual environment where a patient conducted motor tasks for upper extremities, coupled with a videoconference tool provided by a physiotherapist for 5 times per week à 60 minutes. Therapist provided real-time feedback to the patient through the videoconferencing system.	Usual care	Fugl-Meyer Assessment

Redzuan et al. 2012 Malyasia	12 weeks, no FU	90 (58)	44 (40)	46 (60)	64/59	Persons with sub-acute stroke	Home-based audiovisual DVD including 45-minute self-instructional therapy with 6 sections: 1) positioning and handling; 2) bed mobility; 3-4) movement, stretching, and strengthening exercises for lower and upper limbs; 5) transfer techniques; and 6) activities of daily living. Content of the DVD was reviewed by physiotherapists, an occupational therapist, and a rehabilitation physician. Additional therapy twice-monthly.	Usual care for weekly therapy (1h/week)	Modified Barthel Index
Standen et al. 2017 United Kingdom	8	27 (64)	17 (47)	10 (80)	59/63	Stroke patients	Home-based virtual reality training employing infra-red capture to translate the position of the hand into game play (Nintendo Wii) for 20min/ 3x per day.	Usual care	Nottingham Extended Activities of Daily Living Scale Wolf Motor Function Test
Van den Berg et al. 2016	8 weeks,	63 (64)	31 (66)	32 (61)	65/70	Stroke patients and	Telerehabilitation comprised of a caregiver-mediated	Usual care	10-meter walking test

The Netherlands	FU 4 weeks					their caregivers	training program with a support of a customized exercise application loaded into a tablet. Exercises for the patients included gait and gait-related mobility such as standing, turning, or making transfers for 5 times per week à 30 minutes. Telerehabilitation was conducted via the exercise application and videoconferencing to provide access to the treating physiotherapist. Therapists also had weekly home visits. Patients also wore an activity monitor (the Fitbit Zip) to increase physical activity through real-time feedback.		Stroke Impact Scale Berg Balance Scale Barthel Index Fugl-Meyer Assessment
Wan et al. 2016 China	24 weeks, no FU	80 (71)	40 (75)	40 (68)	59/60	Persons with stroke as outpatients	Nurse-lead telephone call intervention for secondary prevention of ischemic stroke. Three telephone follow-up calls at week 1 and at months 1 and 3 after discharge, (à	Usual stroke education for secondary prevention	The Health Promoting Lifestyle Profile II Modified Rankin Scale

		15-20 minutes) to promote self-management techniques and maintenance of behavioral improvements. Physical activity guideline of moderate to intense exercise 3-5 days per week à 30 minutes.

FU, follow-up; ENTS, electromyography-triggered neuromuscular stimulation; DVD, digital versatile disc

Table 2: Results of outcome variables concerning technology-based distance physical rehabilitation interventions on physical functioning in stroke

Study, year, and outcome	Experimental			Control			Group differences at end-point	Group differences at end-point
	n	M1 mean (SD)	M2 mean (SD)	n	M1 mean (SD)	M2 mean (SD)	(Effect / Effect size)	p-value (95%CI)
ADL								
Ballester et al. 2017	17			18				
Barthel Index, (0-100)		89.5 (9.4)	Not rep.		84.7 (14.2)	Not rep.	ES = -0.41	.44
Chen et al. 2017	27			27				
Modified Barthel Index, (0-100)		55.6 (12.8)	61.4 (12.9)		54.3 (13.4)	59.8 (12.3)	F = 0.11	.90*
Chumbler et al. 2012	22			22				
FONEFIM, (18-126)		83.5 (9.5)	82.7 (9.7)		81.5 (12.1)	79.0 (15.0)	-	.31*
Lin et al. 2014	12			12				
Barthel Index, (0-100)		52.9 (32.9)	57.9 (3.1)		57.9 (26.7)	60.8 (22.5)	-	.45‡
Moore et al. 2015†	20			20				
Stroke Impact Scale, ADL (0-100)		82.0 (19.0)	85.0 (25.0)		90.0 (17.0)	90.0 (15.0)	-	.39* (-3.0 to 8.0)
Redzuan et al. 2012	44			46				
Modified Barthel Index, (0-100)		46.7 (22.3)	78.8 (20.2)		61.3 (24.3)	86.6 (16.3)	-	Not rep.
Van den Berg et al. 2016	31			32				
Barthel Index, (0-100)		Not rep.	Not rep.		Not rep.	Not rep.	-	.38
Wan et al. 2016	40			40				
Modified Rankin Scale, (0-3)		0.60 (1.0)	0.18 (0.5)		0.70 (1.1)	0.40 (0.7)	F = 0.52	.56*
BALANCE								
Chen et al. 2017	27			27				

Berg Balance Scale, (0-56)		33.1 (4.0)	37.0 (3.8)		31.7 (5.9)	36.1 (5.3)	F = 1.42	.91*
Lin et al. 2014	12			12				
Berg Balance Scale, (0-56)		20.4 (17.0)	24.6 (18.4)		22.4 (18.4)	26.9 (18.0)	-	.83‡
Moore et al. 2015†	20			20				
Berg Balance Scale, (0-56)		50.0 (4.0)	55.0 (2.0)		50.0 (5.6)	52.0 (5.0)	-	<.01* (0.9 to 5.0)
UPPER EXTREMITY FUNCTIONING								
Ballester et al. 2017	17			18				
Fugl-Meyer Assessment, UE (0-66)		42.9 (14.4)	Not rep.		43.4 (13.5)	Not rep.	ES = -0.30	.33
Chumbler et al. 2012	22			22				
Late-Life Function & Disability Instrument, UE (0-100)		64.7 (21.2)	70.1 (19.4)		65.6 (17.2)	64.1 (17.8)	-	.43*
Emmerson et al. 2017	28			30				
Wolf Motor Function Test, (s)		39.0 (44.0)	33.0 (37.0)		49.0 (47.0)	45.0 (44.0)	-	.10 (-11.0 to 1.0)
Nijenhuis et al. 2017	9			10				
Fugl-Meyer Assessment, UE (0-66)		33.0 (20.1)	34.2 (19.9)		32.9 (14.9)	34.9 (15.7)	-	> .05
Piron et al. 2009	18			18				
Fugl-Meyer Assessment, UE (0-66)		48.5 (7.8)	53.6 (7.7)		47.3 (4.6)	49.5 (4.8)	-	Not rep.
Standen et al. 2017	9			9				
Wolf Motor Function Test, (s)		Not rep.	Not rep.		Not rep.	Not rep.	-	Not rep.
LOWER EXTREMITY FUNCTIONING								
Chumbler et al. 2012	22			22				
Late-Life Function & Disability Instrument, advanced LE (0-100)		32.5 (19.0)	40.7 (20.6)		37.9 (17.4)	35.2 (17.8)	-	.20*
Van den Berg et al. 2016	31			32				
Fugl-Meyer Assessment, LE (0-66)		Not rep.	Not rep.		Not rep.	Not rep.	-	.07

WALKING								
Ada et al. 2003†	11			14				
10-meter walking test, (m/s)		0.62 (0.24)	0.75 (0.26)		0.53 (0.30)	0.56 (0.30)	F = 6.53	.02
Moore et al. 2015†	20			20				
10-meter walking test, (m/s)		1.2 (0.4)	1.5 (0.3)		1.2 (0.3)	1.3 (0.3)	-	< .01* (0.1 to 0.3)
Van den Berg et al. 2016	31			32				
10-meter walking test, (m/s)		Not rep.	Not rep.		Not rep.	Not rep.	-	.87
PHYSICAL ACTIVITY								
Moore et al. 2015†	20			20				
Stroke Impact Scale-16, physical total (0-400)		308.0 (92.0)	324.0 (96.0)		336.0 (78.0)	348.0 (64.0)	-	.67* (-15.0 to 24.0)
Wan et al. 2016	40			40				
Health Promoting Lifestyle Profile II, physical activity (1-4)		1.7 (0.7)	2.3 (0.7)		1.8 (0.7)	2.2 (0.7)	F = 0.54	.47*
PARTICIPATION								
Moore et al. 2015†	20			20				
Stroke Impact Scale, participation (0-100)		72.0 (29.0)	76.0 (28.0)		89.0 (18.0)	89.0 (18.0)	-	.31* (-7.0 to 21.0)
Chumbler et al. 2012	22			22				
Late-Life Function & Disability Instrument, overall function (0-100)								
Nijenhuis et al. 2017	9			10				
Stroke Impact Scale, participation (0-100)		57.3 (13.0)	58.9 (11.5)		66.7 (16.0)	67.9 (14.6)	-	> .05
Van den Berg et al. 2016	31			32				

Stroke Impact Scale, participation (0-100)	Not rep.	Not rep.	Not rep.	Not rep.	-	.49

n, study sample; M1, baseline value; SD, standard deviation; M2, post intervention end-point value; p, p-value; 95%CI, 95% Confidential Interval; s, seconds; m/s, meter per second; F, F-statistics; ADL, Activities of daily living; FONEFIM, The telephone version of the Functional Independence Measure; UE = upper extremity; LE = lower extremity; *, group x time effect; †, control group was treated as experimental group due to using technology-based distance physical rehabilitation intervention; ‡, training x group effect; Not rep., study did not report the values

Table 3: Methodological quality assessment of included RCTs concerning technology-based distance physical rehabilitation interventions on physical functioning in stroke

Study and year	1: randomization method adequate	2: treatment allocation concealed	3: blinding of participants	4: blinding of care provider	5: blinding of outcome assessor	6: drop-outs described and acceptable	7: participants analyzed in the allocated groups	8: free of suggestion of selective outcome reporting	9: group similarity at the baseline	10: co-intervention avoided or similar	11: compliance	12: similar timing of the outcome assessment	13: other sources of potential bias unlikely	Number of "yes" scores (maximun of 13)*
Ada et al. 2013	Yes	Yes	No	?	Yes	Yes	Yes	?	Yes	?	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
Ballester et al. 2017	Yes	?	No	?	?	?	No	?	Yes	?	Yes	Yes	?	4
Chen et al. 2017	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	?	Yes	Yes	?	Yes	Yes	8
Chumbler et al. 2012	Yes	?	No	?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	?	Yes	Yes	8
Emmerson et al. 2017	Yes	Yes	No	?	Yes	Yes	Yes	?	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
Lin et al. 2014	Yes	?	No	?	Yes	Yes	Yes	?	Yes	No	?	?	Yes	6
Moore et al. 2015	Yes	Yes	No	?	Yes	Yes	Yes	?	Yes	?	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
Nijenhuis et al. 2017	Yes	?	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	?	No	No	?	Yes	Yes	5
Piron et al. 2009	Yes	?	No	?	Yes	Yes	Yes	?	Yes	No	?	Yes	?	6
Redzuan et al. 2012	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	?	No	No	?	Yes	Yes	4
Standen et al. 2017	Yes	Yes	No	?	Yes	No	No	?	?	No	?	Yes	Yes	5

Van den Berg at al. 2016	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
Wan et al. 2016	Yes	?	No	?	Yes	Yes	Yes	?	Yes	No	?	Yes	?	6

*, the methodological quality of the studies was assessed with Furlan method guideline[25] including 13 items (1–13) rated as positive ("yes"), negative ("no"), or not fulfilled/unsure ("?").

Table 4: Quality of evidence in technology-based distance physical rehabilitation interventions on physical functioning in stroke

Technology-based distance physical rehabilitation							
Patient or population: persons with stroke receiving distance physical rehabilitation Settings: home or rehabilitation care facilities without the present of a healthcare professional Intervention: technology-based distance physical rehabilitation							
Outcomes and number of studies	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Publication bias	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)*	Comments
ADL Nine studies	Study quality by Furlan et al. (2015) 8/13 (moderate) Sufficient information on treatment allocation procedure only in two studies Only 2 studies used ITT analysis	Analysis consisted of subjective and objective ADL measures ADL measures varied (BI, FONEFIM, MBI, MRS, SIS/ADL, NEADL) Technology varied between DVD, video monitoring, virtual training with gamification, or telephone calls Control group	Stroke survivors with age range of 63 to 75 Mild to moderate physical disability without cognitive deficits	Meta-analysis of six studies with sample size ranging of 24–88 participants (N = 332) indicated no differences Qualitative synthesis indicated no differences	No publication bias observed in meta-analysis (Appendix 2)	⨁OOO	Methodological quality indicated somewhat risk of bias Clinical heterogeneity observed in the use of technology and in the treatments in control group Sample size < 400 Only focusing on more elderly persons with stroke with mild impairments without cognitive deficits

		was heterogeneous with usual care, similar or treatment Moderate statistical heterogeneity (I^2 = 38%)					
Balance (BBS) Four studies	Study quality by Furlan et al. (2015) 8/13 (moderate) Sufficient information on treatment allocation procedure only in one study Only one study used ITT analysis	Analysis consisted only BBS outcome Technology varied between video monitoring, or telephone calls Control group was heterogeneous with usual care, similar or other treatment	Stroke survivors with age range of 63 to 75 Mild to moderate physical disability without cognitive deficits	Sample size ranged from 24–54 participants Qualitative synthesis indicated no differences	-	⨁OOO	Methodological quality of the studies indicated somewhat risk of bias Clinical heterogeneity observed in the use of technology and in the treatments in control group Subanalysis to assess clinical heterogeneity were not able to perform due to the lack of studies Sample size < 400

							Only focusing on more elderly persons with stroke with mild impairments without cognitive deficits
Upper extremity functioning Five studies	Study quality by Furlan et al. (2015) 7/13 (moderate) Treatment allocation procedure reported sufficiently only in one study Only one study used ITT analysis	Analysis consisted of objective measures Technology varied from virtual training with gamification, video online monitoring, video online monitoring combined with gamification, or video exercises without monitoring Control group were heterogeneous with similar treatment or	Stroke survivors with age range of 60 to 75 Mild to moderate physical impairments without cognitive deficits	Sample size ranged from 19–58 participants Qualitative synthesis indicated no differences	-	⨁OOO	Methodological quality of the studies indicated somewhat risk of bias Clinical heterogeneity observed in the use of technology and in the treatments in the control group Subanalysis to assess clinical heterogeneity were not able to perform due to the lack of studies Sample size < 400 Only focusing on more elderly persons with stroke

		usual care					with mild impairments without cognitive deficits
Lower extremity functioning Two studies	Quality of the study by Furlan et al. (2015) 9/13 (high) Treatment allocation procedure reported sufficiently only in one study	Analysis consisted of objective measures Technology varied from virtual training with gamification, video online monitoring, video online monitoring combined with gamification, or video exercises without monitoring Control group consisted of usual care	Stroke survivors with age of 67 years Mild to moderate physical impairments without cognitive deficits	Sample size N = 48 N = 63 Not enough reported values to conduct meta-analysis Qualitative synthesis indicated no differences	-	⨁OOO	Methodological quality of the studies indicated somewhat risk of bias Clinical heterogeneity observed in the use of technology Sample size in total < 400 Only focusing on elderly persons with stroke with mild impairments without cognitive deficits
Walking Three studies	Quality of the study by Furlan et al. (2015) 9/13 (high)	Analysis consisted of objective measures Technology	Stroke survivors with age of 60 and 69 years Mild to	Sample size N = 40 N = 80 Not enough	-	⨁OOO	Clinical heterogeneity observed in the compared treatments of control groups

	Treatment allocation procedure reported sufficiently in all studies	used in the experimental groups were only telephone calls Control group consisted of usual care (one study) or other treatments (2 studies)	moderate physical impairments without cognitive deficits	reported values to conduct meta-analysis Qualitative synthesis indicated no differences			Sample size in total < 400 Only focusing on elderly persons with stroke with mild impairments without cognitive deficits
Physical activity Two studies	Quality of the study by Furlan et al. (2015) 8/13 (moderate) Treatment allocation procedure reported sufficiently only in one study	Analysis consisted of subjective measures Technology used in the experimental groups were only telephone calls Control group consisted of usual care (one study) or other treatments (1 study)	Stroke survivors with age between 63 and 69 years Mild to moderate physical impairments without cognitive deficits	Not enough studies to conduct meta-analysis	-	⨁OOO	Clinical heterogeneity observed in the compared treatments of control groups Sample size in total < 400 Only focusing on elderly persons with stroke with mild impairments without cognitive deficits

Participation Four studies	Quality of the study by Furlan et al. (2015) 8/13 (moderate) Treatment allocation procedure reported sufficiently only in two studies	Self-reported questionnaires Technology varied from telephone calls (three studies) and website exercises (one study) Control group consisted of traditional treatments (three studies) and other treatment (one study)	Stroke survivors with age between 60 and 69 years Mild to moderate physical impairments without cognitive deficits	Sample size varied between 19 and 63 participants Qualitative synthesis indicated no differences	-	⨁OOO	Methodological quality of the studies indicated somewhat risk of bias Clinical heterogeneity observed in the use of technology Sample size in total < 400 Only focusing on elderly persons with stroke with mild impairments without cognitive deficits

GRADE, Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluation; ADL, Activities of daily living; BI, Barthel Index, FONEFIM, The telephone version of the Functional Independence Measure; MBI, Modified Barthel Index; MRS, Modified Rankin Scale; SIS/ADL, Stroke Impact Scale ADL subscale; ITT, intention-to-treat analysis; N, study sample; SMD, standard mean difference; 95%CI, 95 % Confidence interval; BBS, Berg Balance Scale; MD, mean difference; *GRADE was considered either high quality (4 plus), we are very confident that the true effect lies close to that of the estimate of the effect; Moderate quality (3 plus), we are moderately confident in the effect estimate: the true effect is likely to be close to the estimate of the effect, but there is a possibility that it is substantially different; Low quality (2 plus), our confidence in the effect estimate is limited: the true effect may be substantially different from the estimate of the effect; Very low

quality (1 plus), we have very little confidence in the effect estimate: the true effect is likely to be substantially different from the estimate of effect.



Study or Subgroup	Experimental Mean	SD	Total	Control Mean	SD	Total	Weight	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	Year	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI
3.1.1 Online video monitoring or combination with other technology										
Chen et al. 2017; MBI (0-100)	61,4	12,9	27	59,8	12,3	27	17,2%	0,13 [-0,41, 0,66]	2017	
Lin et al. 2014; BI (0-100)	57,9	3,1	12	60,8	22,5	12	9,7%	-0,17 [-0,98, 0,63]	2014	
Chumbler et al. 2012; FONEFIM (13-91)	82,7	9,7	22	79	15	22	15,0%	0,29 [-0,31, 0,88]	2012	
Subtotal (95% CI)			**61**			**61**	**42,0%**	**0,12 [-0,23, 0,48]**		
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0,00; Chi² = 0,82, df = 2 (P = 0,66); I² = 0%										
Test for overall effect: Z = 0,69 (P = 0,49)										
3.1.2 Only telephone contacts										
Wan et al. 2016; MRS (0-5)	-0,18	0,5	40	-0,4	0,7	40	21,3%	0,36 [-0,08, 0,80]	2016	
Moore et al. 2015; SIS/ ADL (0-100)	90	15	20	85	25	20	14,1%	0,24 [-0,38, 0,86]	2015	
Subtotal (95% CI)			**60**			**60**	**35,5%**	**0,32 [-0,04, 0,68]**		
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0,00; Chi² = 0,10, df = 1 (P = 0,76); I² = 0%										
Test for overall effect: Z = 1,73 (P = 0,08)										
3.1.3 DVD exercises										
Redzuan et al. 2012; MBI (0-100)	78,8	20,2	44	86,6	16,3	46	22,6%	-0,42 [-0,84, -0,00]	2012	
Subtotal (95% CI)			**44**			**46**	**22,6%**	**-0,42 [-0,84, -0,00]**		
Heterogeneity: Not applicable										
Test for overall effect: Z = 1,98 (P = 0,05)										
Total (95% CI)			**165**			**167**	**100,0%**	**0,06 [-0,22, 0,35]**		
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0,05; Chi² = 8,11, df = 5 (P = 0,15); I² = 38%										
Test for overall effect: Z = 0,43 (P = 0,67)										
Test for subgroup differences: Chi² = 7,19, df = 2 (P = 0,03), I² = 72,2%										



Appendix 1: Examples of the search strategies per database.

Database: Database of the National Library of Medicine (Ovid MEDLINE)
Search Strategy:

---

1 exercise therapy/ (33186)
2 exercise therapy.tw. (2187)
3 Physical Therapy Modalities/ (32745)
4 physical therapy.tw. (11686)
5 physiotherapy.tw. (12549)
6 functional therapy.tw. (321)
7 Occupational Therapy/ (12632)
8 Neuropsychology/ (2178)
9 dietician.tw. (652)
10 dietitian.tw. (2104)
11 Dietitics/ (0)
12 Occupational Health Services/ (10266)
13 multidisciplinary therapy.tw. (319)
14 physical activity.tw. (67630)
15 Exercise/ (83974)
16 Exercise Movement Techniques/ (547)
17 Motor Activity/ (91252)
18 energy expenditure.tw. (18902)
19 "Delivery of Health Care"/ (76316)
20 public health service$.tw. (5709)
21 Nursing Diagnosis/ (4193)
22 Nursing Informatics/ (1216)
23 Community Health Nursing/ (19236)
24 Nursing/ (50691)
25 Public Health Nursing/ (10062)
26 medical treatment$.tw. (38891)
27 Psychiatry/ (38091)
28 Rehabilitation/ (17670)
29 Health Promotion/ (64237)
30 health counse?ling.tw. (630)
31 directive counse?ling.tw. (136)
32 coaching.tw. (3157)
33 health guidance.tw. (320)
34 "Activities of Daily Living"/ (57898)
35 adl.tw. (7001)
36 participation.tw. (104919)
37 cultural activities.tw. (184)
38 Leisure Activities/ (7552)
39 "Physical Education and Training"/ (13396)
40 Primary Prevention/ (16447)
41 Secondary Prevention/ (17463)
42 Tertiary Prevention/ (123)
43 Sports/ (27823)
44 active lifestyle.tw. (1036)
45 physical lifestyle.tw. (30)
46 Physical Fitness/ (25457)

47 Health Education/ (57740)
48 Patient Education as Topic/ (79380)
49 Behavior Therapy/ (26316)
50 Cognitive Therapy/ (21041)
51 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12 or 13 or 14 or 15 or 16 or 17 or 18 or 19 or 20 or 21 or 22 or 23 or 24 or 25 or 26 or 27 or 28 or 29 or 30 or 31 or 32 or 33 or 34 or 35 or 36 or 37 or 38 or 39 or 40 or 41 or 42 or 43 or 44 or 45 or 46 or 47 or 48 or 49 or 50 (971873)
52 mobile system$.tw. (194)
53 Telemedicine/ (15890)
54 ehealth.tw. (993)
55 mobile health.tw. (858)
56 mhealth.tw. (573)
57 phealth.tw. (31)
58 mobile multimedia.tw. (11)
59 mobile communication$.tw. (521)
60 mobile technolog$.tw. (696)
61 Cellular Phone/ (6815)
62 cellular phone$.tw. (614)
63 cell phone$.tw. (1512)
64 cellular telephone$.tw. (358)
65 mobile phone$.tw. (3942)
66 mobile telephone$.tw. (390)
67 Mobile Health Units/ (3340)
68 Computers, Handheld/ (2988)
69 communication technolog$.tw. (2094)
70 technology integration.tw. (74)
71 web based communication$.tw. (69)
72 web based organi?ation$.tw. (0)
73 virtual communit$.tw. (193)
74 e-learning environment$.tw. (33)
75 User-Computer Interface/ (33427)
76 virtual learning environment$.tw. (149)
77 acceleromet$.tw. (8755)
78 mobile application$.tw. (465)
79 web based interacti$.tw. (158)
80 (mobile adj3 game$).tw. (53)
81 mobile gaming.tw. (6)
82 pervasive game$.tw. (0)
83 Geographic Information Systems/ (6153)
84 global positioning system$.tw. (1046)
85 telerehabilitation.tw. (299)
86 tele rehabilitation.tw. (48)
87 "web 2.0 intervention$".tw. (5)
88 "web 2.0 application$".tw. (30)
89 smart phone$.tw. (411)
90 Remote Consultation/ (4478)
91 sms.tw. (3517)
92 Text Messaging/ (1499)
93 text messag$.tw. (1645)

94 digital learning.tw. (35)
95 52 or 53 or 54 or 55 or 56 or 57 or 58 or 59 or 60 or 61 or 62 or 63 or 64 or 65 or 66 or 67 or 68 or 69 or 70 or 71 or 72 or 73 or 74 or 75 or 76 or 77 or 78 or 79 or 80 or 81 or 82 or 83 or 84 or 85 or 86 or 87 or 88 or 89 or 90 or 91 or 92 or 93 or 94 (86832)
96 Randomized Controlled Trials as Topic/ (111565)
97 Randomized Controlled Trial/ (456758)
98 Random Allocation/ (91691)
99 Double-Blind Method/ (145855)
100 Single-Blind Method/ (24143)
101 Clinical Trial/ (518217)
102 clinical trial, phase i.pt. (18539)
103 clinical trial, phase ii.pt. (29766)
104 clinical trial, phase iii.pt. (13493)
105 clinical trial, phase iv.pt. (1438)
106 controlled clinical trial.pt. (93340)
107 randomized controlled trial.pt. (456758)
108 multicenter study.pt. (223183)
109 clinical trial.pt. (518217)
110 exp Clinical Trials as Topic/ (309655)
111 96 or 97 or 98 or 99 or 100 or 101 or 102 or 103 or 104 or 105 or 106 or 107 or 108 or 109 or 110 (1213187)
112 (clinical adj trial$).tw. (254191)
113 ((signl$ or doubl$ or treb$ or tripl$) adj (blind$3 or mask$3)).tw. (130636)
114 Placebos/ (34752)
115 placebo$.tw. (176629)
116 randomly allocated.tw. (19700)
117 (allocated adj2 random$).tw. (22444)
118 112 or 113 or 114 or 115 or 116 or 117 (470963)
119 111 or 118 (1362773)
120 case report.tw. (213814)
121 letter/ (924107)
122 Historical Article/ (344334)
123 120 or 121 or 122 (1468852)
124 119 not 123 (1330227)
125 51 and 95 and 124 (3317)
126 intervention$.tw,kf. (648169)
127 stroke.mp. or Stroke/ (207599)
128 cardiovascular disease.mp. or Cardiovascular Diseases/ (174150)
129 hemiplegia.mp. or Hemiplegia/ (13843)
130 brain ischemia$.mp. or Brain Ischemia/ (44914)
131 cerebrovascular accident$.mp. (5584)
132 brain infarction/ (3863)
133 cerebrovascular disease.mp. or Cerebrovascular Disorders/ (53477)
134 127 or 128 or 129 or 130 or 131 or 132 or 133 (435463)
135 125 and 126 and 134 (186)
136 limit 135 to (yr="2000 -Current" and (english or finnish or german or swedish)) (186)
137 limit 136 to ("young adult (19 to 24 years)" or "adult (19 to 44 years)" or "young adult and adult (19-24 and 19-44)" or "middle age (45 to 64 years)" or "middle aged (45 plus years)" or "all aged (65 and over)" or "aged (80 and over)") (135)

****

Database: Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CCRCT)
Search Strategy:

(”Exercise therapy” OR ”physical therapy modalities” OR ”physical therapy” OR ”functional therapy” OR ”occupational therapy” OR neuropsychology OR dietician OR dietitian OR dietetics OR ”occupational health services” OR ”multidisciplinary therapy” OR ”physical activity” OR exercise OR ”exercise movement therapy” OR ”motor activity” OR ”energy expenditure” OR ”delivery of health care” OR ”public health service$” OR ”nursing diagnosis” OR ”nursing informatics” OR ”community health nursing” OR nursing OR ”public health nursing” OR ”medical treatment$” OR psychiatry OR rehabilitation OR ”health promotion” OR ”health counse?ling” OR ”directive counse?ling” OR coaching OR ”health guidance” OR ”activities of daily living” OR adl OR participation OR ”cultural activities” OR ”leisure activities” OR ”physical education and training” OR ”primary prevention” OR ”secondary prevention” OR ”tertiary prevention” OR sports OR ”active lifestyle” OR ”physical lifestyle” OR ”physical fitness” OR ”health education” OR ”patient education” OR ”behavior therapy” OR ”cognitive therapy”) AND (”mobile system$” OR telemedicine OR ehealth OR ”mobile health” OR mhealth OR phealth OR ”mobile multimedia” OR ”mobile communication$” OR ”mobile technolog$” OR ”cellular phone$” OR ”cell phone$” OR ”cellular telephone$” OR ”mobile phone$” OR ”mobile telephone$” OR ”mobile health units” OR computer$ OR handheld OR ”communication technolog$” OR ”technology integration” OR ”web$based communication$” OR ”web$based organi?ation$” OR ”virtual communit$” OR ”e$learning environment$” OR ”user$computer interface” OR ”virtual learning environment$” OR acceleromet$ OR ”mobile app$” OR ”web$based interacti$” OR mobile OR ”mobile gaming” OR ”pervasive game$” OR ”geographic infromation systems” OR ”global positioning system$” OR telerehabilitation OR ”tele rehabilitation” OR ”web 2.0 intervention$” OR ”web 2.0 application$” OR ”smart phone$” OR ”remote consultation” OR sms OR ”text messaging” OR ”text messag$” OR ”digital learning”) AND (”randomised controlled trials” OR ”randomized controlled trial” OR ”random allocation” OR ”double-blind method” OR ”single-blind method” OR ”clinical trial” OR ”controlled clinical trial” OR ”multicenter study” OR ”clinical trial”) AND ("stroke" OR hemiplegia OR "cardiovascular disease" OR "cardiovascular accident" OR hemiparesis OR "brain ischemia" OR "brain infarction")

****

Database: Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL)
Search Strategy:

S125

S120 AND S121

Limiters - Published Date: 20000101-20171231

Narrow by SubjectAge: - all adult

Narrow by Language: - English or Finnish or German or Swedish

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (108) View Details Edit

S124

S120 AND S121

Limiters - Published Date: 20000101-20171231

Narrow by Language: - english

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (184) View Details Edit

S123

S120 AND S121

Limiters - Published Date: 20000101-20171231

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (186) View Details Edit

S122

S120 AND S121

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (191) View Details Edit

S121

AB stroke OR AB cerebrovascular accident OR AB cerebrovascular disease OR AB hemiplegia OR AB hemiparesis OR AB brain infarction OR AB brain ischemia

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (36,165) View Details Edit

S120

S107 AND S119

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (3,631) View Details Edit

S119

S108 AND S117 AND S118

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (10,569) View Details Edit

S118

S96 OR S97 OR S99 OR S100 OR S101 OR S102 OR S103 OR S104 OR S105 OR S106

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (870,719) View Details Edit

S117

S49 OR S50 OR S51 OR S52 OR S53 OR S54 OR S55 OR S56 OR S57 OR S58 OR S59 OR S60 OR S61 OR S62 OR S63 OR S64 OR S65 OR S66 OR S67 OR S68 OR S69 OR S70 OR S71 OR S72 OR S73 OR S74 OR S75 OR S76 OR S77 OR S78 OR S79 OR S80 OR S81 OR S82 OR S83 OR S84 OR S85 OR S86 OR S87 OR S88 OR S89 OR S90 OR S91 OR S92 OR S93 OR S94 OR S95 OR S110 OR S111 OR S112 OR S113 OR S114 OR S115 OR S116

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (113,822) View Details Edit

S116

AB tele* OR telephone

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (30,469) View Details Edit

S115

AB technology

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (30,493) View Details Edit

S114

AB smartphone

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (373) View Details Edit

S113

AB internet

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (9,038) View Details Edit

S112

AB pedometer

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (641) View Details Edit

S111

AB game* OR AB gaming

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (4,061) View Details Edit

S110

AB web*

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (16,678) View Details Edit

S109

AB mobile OR AB mobile phone OR AB mobile devices OR AB mobile apps OR AB mobile technology OR AB mobile applications

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (3,573) View Details Edit

S108

S1 OR S2 OR S3 OR S4 OR S5 OR S6 OR S7 OR S8 OR S9 OR S10 OR S11 OR S12 OR S13 OR S14 OR S15 OR S16 OR S17 OR S18 OR S19 OR S20 OR S21 OR S22 OR S23 OR S24 OR S25 OR S26 OR S27 OR S28 OR S29 OR S30 OR S31 OR S32 OR S33 OR S34 OR S35 OR S36 OR S37 OR S38 OR S39 OR S40 OR S41 OR S42 OR S43 OR S44 OR S45 OR S46 OR S47 OR S48

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (512,620) View Details Edit

S107

"intervention*"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (196,330) View Details Edit

S106

TX allocat* random*

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (4,258) View Details Edit

S105

(MH "Quantitative Studies")

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (12,350) View Details Edit

S104

(MH "Placebos")

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (7,840) View Details Edit

S103

TX placebo*

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (31,751) View Details Edit

S102

TX random* allocat*

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (4,258) View Details Edit

S101

(MH "Random Assignment")

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (34,534) View Details Edit

S100

TX randomi* control* trial*

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (74,353) View Details Edit

S99

TX ((singl* n1 blind*) or (singl* n1 mask*)) OR TX ((doubl* n1 blind*) or (doubl* n1 mask')) OR TX ((tripl* n1 blind*) or (tripl* n1 mask*)) OR TX ((trebl* n1 blind*) or (trebl* n1 mask*))

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (723,268) View Details Edit

S98

TX clinic* n1 trial*

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (134,892) View Details Edit

S97

"clinical trial"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (16,844) View Details Edit

S96

"Clinical Trials"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (103,451) View Details Edit

S95

"digital learning"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (25) View Details Edit

S94

"text messag*"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (1,023) View Details Edit

S93

"Text Messaging"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (849) View Details Edit

S92

"sms"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (343) View Details Edit

S91

"Remote Consultation"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (735) View Details Edit

S90

"smart phone*"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (111) View Details Edit

S89

""web 2.0 application*""

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (40) View Details Edit

S88

""web 2.0 intervention*""

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (5) View Details Edit

S87

"tele rehabilitation"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (16) View Details Edit

S86

"telerehabilitation"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (165) View Details Edit

S85

"global positioning system*"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (215) View Details Edit

S84

"Geographic Information Systems"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (1,623) View Details Edit

S83

"pervasive game*"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (6) View Details Edit

S82

"mobile gaming"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (1) View Details Edit

S81

"mobile w3 game*"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (27) View Details Edit

S80

"web based interacti*"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (42) View Details Edit

S79

"mobile application*"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (1,266) View Details Edit

S78

"acceleromet*"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (3,792) View Details Edit

S77

"Accelerometers"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (1,418) View Details Edit

S76

"Accelerometry"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (2,342) View Details Edit

S75

"virtual learning environment*"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (97) View Details Edit

S74

"e-learning environment*"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (23) View Details Edit

S73

"virtual communit*"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (143) View Details Edit

S72

"web based organi?ation*"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (1) View Details Edit

S71

"web based communication*"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (37) View Details Edit

S70

"technology integration"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (40) View Details Edit

S69

"communication technolog*"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (756) View Details Edit

S68

"Computers" OR "Hand-Held"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (14,006) View Details Edit

S67

"Mobile Health Units"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (1,228) View Details Edit

S66

"mobile telephone*"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (77) View Details Edit

S65

"mobile phone*"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (834) View Details Edit

S64

"cellular telephone*"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (96) View Details Edit

S63

"cell phone*"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (600) View Details Edit

S62

"cellular phone*"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (469) View Details Edit

S61

"Wireless Communications"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (6,822) View Details Edit

S60

"mobile technolog*"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (295) View Details Edit

S59

"mobile communication*"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (73) View Details Edit

S58

""mobile multimedia""

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (12) View Details Edit

S57

"phealth"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (1) View Details Edit

S56

"mhealth"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (201) View Details Edit

S55

"mobile health"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (1,451) View Details Edit

S54

"Mobile Health Units"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (1,228) View Details Edit

S53

"ehealth"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (245) View Details Edit

S52

"Telehealth"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (3,986) View Details Edit

S51

"Telemedicine"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (4,334) View Details Edit

S50

"mobile system*"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (22) View Details Edit

S49

"Telecommunications"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (1,702) View Details Edit

S48

"Cognitive Therapy"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (9,050) View Details Edit

S47

"Behavior Therapy"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (5,838) View Details Edit

S46

"Patient Education"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (45,516) View Details Edit

S45

"Health Education"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (26,679) View Details Edit

S44

"Physical Fitness"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (9,771) View Details Edit

S43

"physical lifestyle"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (13) View Details Edit

S42

"active lifestyle"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (396) View Details Edit

S41

"Sports"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (25,459) View Details Edit

S40

"tertiary prevention"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (219) View Details Edit

S39

"secondary prevention"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (2,978) View Details Edit

S38

"primary prevention"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (3,217) View Details Edit

S37

("Leisure Activities") OR ("Physical Education and Training")

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (6,064) View Details Edit

S36

"cultural activities"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (67) View Details Edit

S35

"Social Participation"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (1,980) View Details Edit

S34

"Sports Participation"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (853) View Details Edit

S33

participation

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (49,539) View Details Edit

S32

adl

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (2,949) View Details Edit

S31

"Activities of Daily Living"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (22,176) View Details Edit

S30

"health guidance"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (105) View Details Edit

S29

coaching

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (2,066) View Details Edit

S28

"directive counsel#ing"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (53) View Details Edit

S27

"health counsel#ing"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (266) View Details Edit

S26

"Health Promotion"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (40,003) View Details Edit

S25

"Rehabilitation"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (109,567) View Details Edit

S24

"Psychiatry"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (13,077) View Details Edit

S23

""medical treatment*""

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (9,430) View Details Edit

S22

"Community Health Nursing"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (21,877) View Details Edit

S21

"Nursing Informatics"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (2,570) View Details Edit

S20

"Nursing Diagnosis"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (3,767) View Details Edit

S19

"public health services"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (483) View Details Edit

S18

"Health Care Delivery"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (33,895) View Details Edit

S17

"energy expenditure"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (3,224) View Details Edit

S16

"Energy Metabolism"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (7,926) View Details Edit

S15

"Therapeutic Exercise"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (13,392) View Details Edit

S14

"Exercise"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (90,277) View Details Edit

S13

"physical activity"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (34,167) View Details Edit

S12

"Physical Activity"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (34,167) View Details Edit

S11

""multidisciplinary therapy""

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (273) View Details Edit

S10

"Occupational Health Services"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (4,478) View Details Edit

S9

dietician*

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (325) View Details Edit

S8

"Dietitians"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (4,562) View Details Edit

S7

"Neuropsychology"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (1,192) View Details Edit

S6

"Occupational Therapy"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (24,877) View Details Edit

S5

"functional therapy"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (61) View Details Edit

S4

"physiotherapy"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (9,720) View Details Edit

S3

"physical therapy"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (36,184) View Details Edit

S2

"exercise therapy"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (716) View Details Edit

S1

"Therapeutic Exercise"

Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

View Results (13,392) View Details Edit

****

Database: Excerpta Medica Database (EMBASE)
Search Strategy:

No. Query Results

#156 #147 AND #154 AND ([english]/lim OR [finnish]/lim OR [german]/lim OR [swedish]/lim) AND [adult]/lim AND [medline]/lim 25

#155 #147 AND #154 45

#154 #148 OR #149 OR #150 OR #151 OR #152 OR #153 307732

#153 'brain infarction':ab,ti 2678

#152 'cerebrovascular accident':ab,ti 5477

#151 'brain ischemia':ab,ti 5641

#150 'cerebrovascular disease':ab,ti 18618

#149 'hemiplegia':ab,ti 9229

#148 'stroke':ab,ti 278618

#147 #143 AND #146 1105

#146 #144 OR #145 974320

#145 intervention*:ab,ti 969165

#144 'intervention study'/exp 31062

#143 #56 AND #114 AND #141 AND [article]/lim AND ([english]/lim OR [finnish]/lim OR [german]/lim OR [swedish]/lim) AND [adult]/lim AND [humans]/lim AND [1-1-2000]/sd 1815

#142 #56 AND #114 AND #141 4663

#141 #136 NOT #140 1737846

#140 #137 OR #138 OR #139 1380689

#139 'abstract report'/exp OR 'letter'/exp 1007638

#138 'case report':ab,ti 335718

#137 'case study'/exp 44931

#136 #115 OR #116 OR #117 OR #118 OR #119 OR #120 OR #121 OR #122 OR #123 OR #124 OR #125 OR #126 OR #127 OR #128 OR #129 OR #130 OR #131 OR #132 OR #133 OR #134 OR #135 1783143

#135 'prospective study'/exp 360900

#134 placebo*:ab,ti 249641

#133 ((treble OR triple) NEAR/1 blind*):ab,ti 741

#132 (double NEXT/1 blind*):ab,ti 175548

#131 (single NEXT/1 blind*):ab,ti 18898

#130 (allocated NEAR/2 random):ab,ti 853

#129 'allocated randomly':ab,ti 2203

#128 'randomly allocated':ab,ti 26662

#127 'random allocation':ab,ti 1633

#126 'rct':ab,ti 23240

#125 'randomized controlled trials':ab,ti 51485

#124 'randomized controlled trial':ab,ti 63305

#123 'randomised controlled trials':ab,ti 19476

#122 'randomised controlled trial':ab,ti 20352

#121 'placebo'/exp 302266

#120 'crossover procedure'/exp 49994

#119 'double blind procedure'/exp 136014

#118 'single blind procedure'/exp 25893

#117 'randomization'/exp 72481

#116 'randomized controlled trial'/exp 436336

#115 'clinical trial'/exp 1174273

#114 #57 OR #58 OR #59 OR #60 OR #61 OR #62 OR #63 OR #64 OR #65 OR #66 OR #67 OR #68 OR #69 OR #70 OR #71 OR #72 OR #73 OR #74 OR #75 OR #76 OR #77 OR #78 OR #79 OR #80 OR #81 OR #82 OR #83 OR #84 OR #85 OR #86 OR #87 OR #88 OR #89 OR #90 OR #91 OR #92 OR #93 OR #94 OR #95 OR #96 OR #97 OR #98 OR #99 OR #100 OR #101 OR #102 OR #103 OR #104 OR #105 OR #106 OR #107 OR #108 OR #109 OR #110 OR #111 OR #112 OR #113 139190

#113 'digital learning':ab,ti 63

#112 (text NEXT/1 messag*):ab,ti 2682

#111 'text messaging'/exp 2423

#110 'sms':ab,ti 5287

#109 'teleconsultation'/exp 7476

#108 (smart NEXT/1 phone*):ab,ti 1171

#107 'web 2.0 applications':ab,ti 35

#106 'web 2.0 application':ab,ti 7

#105 'web 2.0 interventions':ab,ti 4

#104 'web 2.0 intervention':ab,ti 1

#103 'tele rehabilitation':ab,ti 92

#102 'telerehabilitation':ab,ti 450

#101 'global positioning systems':ab,ti 210

#100 'global positioning system':ab,ti 1158

#99 'global positioning system':de 1636

#98 'geographic information system'/exp 7764

#97 (pervasive NEXT/1 game*):ab,ti 0

#96 'mobile gaming':ab,ti 11

#95 (mobile NEXT/3 game*):ab,ti 49

#94 'web based interactively':ab,ti 0

#93 'web based interactive':ab,ti 235

#92 'web based interaction':ab,ti 10

#91 (mobile NEXT/1 application*):ab,ti 1005

#90 'mobile application':de 3298

#89 acceleromet*:ab,ti 12686

#88 'accelerometer':de 7139

#87 'virtual learning environments':ab,ti 62

#86 'virtual learning environment':ab,ti 177

#85 'computer interface'/exp 25436

#84 (e+learning NEXT/1 environment*):ab,ti 62

#83 (virtual NEXT/1 communit*):ab,ti 274

#82 'web based organizations':ab,ti 0

#81 'web based organisations':ab,ti 0

#80 'web based organization':ab,ti 1

#79 'web based organisation':ab,ti 1

#78 'web based communications':ab,ti 9

#77 'web based communication':ab,ti 100

#76 'technology integration':ab,ti 106

#75 (communication NEXT/1 technolog*):ab,ti 2963

#74 'microcomputer'/exp 14457

#73 'preventive health service'/exp 24222

#72 (mobile NEXT/1 telephone*):ab,ti 544

#71 (mobile NEXT/1 phone*):ab,ti 6101

#70 (cellular NEXT/1 telephone*):ab,ti 450

#69 (cell NEXT/1 phone*):ab,ti 2392

#68 (cellular NEXT/1 phone*):ab,ti 862

#67 'mobile phone'/exp 14027

#66 (mobile NEXT/1 technolog*):ab,ti 1182

#65 (mobile NEXT/1 communication*):ab,ti 656

#64 'mobile multimedia':ab,ti 13

#63 'phealth':ab,ti 36

#62 'mhealth':ab,ti 922

#61 'mobile health':ab,ti 1295

#60 'ehealth':ab,ti 1331

#59 'telehealth':de 2882

#58 'telemedicine'/exp 26147

#57 (mobile NEXT/1 system*):ab,ti 290

#56 #1 OR #2 OR #3 OR #4 OR #5 OR #6 OR #7 OR #8 OR #9 OR #10 OR #11 OR #12 OR #13 OR #14 OR #15 OR #16 OR #17 OR #18 OR #19 OR #20 OR #21 OR #22 OR #23 OR #24 OR #25 OR #26 OR #27 OR #28 OR #29 OR #30 OR #31 OR #32 OR #33 OR #34 OR #35 OR #36 OR #37 OR #38 OR #39 OR #40 OR #41 OR #42 OR #43 OR #44 OR #45 OR #46 OR #47 OR #48 OR #49 OR #50 OR #51 OR #52 OR #53 OR #54 OR #55 2024827

#55 'cognitive therapy':de 41157

#54 'behavior therapy':de 40321

#53 'patient education':de 97125

#52 'health education':de 94979

#51 'fitness':de 38063

#50 'physical lifestyle':ab,ti 39

#49 'active lifestyle':ab,ti 1662

#48 'sport':de 71185

#47 'secondary prevention':de 21912

#46 'primary prevention':de 33232

#45 'physical education':de 11678

#44 'leisure':de 25659

#43 'cultural activities':ab,ti 257

#42 'participation':ab,ti 143911

#41 'adl':ab,ti 12041

#40 'daily life activity':de 68493

#39 'health guidance':ab,ti 432

#38 'coaching':ab,ti 4997

#37 'directive counseling' 758

#36 'directive counselling' 103

#35 'directive counseling':de 674

#34 'health counseling' 723

#33 'health counselling' 236

#32 'health promotion':de 80675

#31 'rehabilitation':de 130139

#30 'psychiatry':de 103472

#29 (medical NEXT/1 treatment*):ab,ti 60091

#28 'nursing':de 501347

#27 'community health nursing':de 26490

#26 'nursing informatics':de 1146

#25 'nursing diagnosis':de 3948

#24 'public health services':ab,ti 2425

#23 'public health service':ab,ti 4327

#22 'health care delivery':de 146593

#21 'energy expenditure':ab,ti 25354

#20 'energy expenditure':de 26819

#19 'motor activity':de 43681

#18 'exercise':de 318428

#17 'physical activity':ab,ti 100742

#16 'physical activity':de 112370

#15 'multidisciplinary therapy':ab,ti 472

#14 'occupational health service':de9792

#13 'dietetics':de 6900

#12 'dietitian':ab,ti 3898

#11 'dietician':ab,ti 1939

#10 'dietitian':de 7588

#9 'neuropsychology':de 16937

#8 'occupational therapy':de 20540

#7 'functional therapy':ab,ti 418

#6 'physiotherapy':ab,ti 24857

#5 'physical therapy':ab,ti 20263

#4 'physiotherapy':de 72608

#3 'exercise therapy':ab,ti 3407

#2 'kinesiotherapy':ab,ti 323

#1 'kinesiotherapy':de 27754

****

Database: Physiotherapy Evidence Database (PEDro)
Search Strategy:

V.2000->, CLINICAL TRIALS

Combined results from the following searches:

Stroke AND technology = 21 studies

Stroke AND accelerometer = 5 studies

Stroke AND pedometer = 4 studies

Stroke AND tele = 3 studies

Stroke AND phone = 5 studies

Stroke AND telephone = 22 studies

Stroke AND web = 5 studies

Stroke AND mobile = 10 studies

Stroke AND telerehabilitation = 12 studies

Stroke AND smartphone = 3 studies

Stroke AND remote = 9 studies

Stroke AND game = 22 studies

Stroke AND gaming = 12 studies

****

Database: Web of Science (WOS)
Search Strategy:

Set

Web of Science Core Collection

Search History - " Stroke and Techno"

#10 #9 AND #8

DocType=All document types; Language=All languages;

#9 TOPIC: (stroke) OR TOPIC: (brain ischemia) OR TOPIC: (hemiplegia) OR TOPIC: (cerebrovascular accident) OR TOPIC: (cerebrovascular disease) OR TOPIC: (hemiparesis) OR TOPIC: (brain infarction)

DocType=All document types; Language=All languages;

#8 #6 AND #4 NOT PMID=(1* OR 2* OR 3* OR 4* OR 5* OR 6* OR 7* OR 8* OR 9*)

DocType=All document types; Language=All languages;

#7 #6 AND #4

DocType=All document types; Language=All languages;

#6 #3 AND #2 AND #1

DocType=All document types; Language=All languages;

#5 TOPIC: ((randomised controlled trials OR randomized controlled trial OR random allocation OR double-blind method OR single-blind method OR clinical trial OR controlled clinical trial OR multicenter study OR clinical trial OR randomly allocated)) NOT TOPIC: (”case report” OR ”case study” OR letter OR ”historical article”)

DocType=All document types; Language=All languages;

#4 TOPIC: (”intervention studies” OR ”intervention$”)

DocType=All document types; Language=All languages;

#3 TOPIC: (”randomised controlled trials” OR ”randomized controlled trial” OR ”random allocation” OR ”double-blind method” OR ”single-blind method” OR ”clinical trial” OR ”controlled clinical trial” OR ”multicenter study” OR ”clinical trial” OR ”randomly allocated”)

DocType=All document types; Language=All languages;

#2 TOPIC: (”mobile system$” OR telemedicine OR ehealth OR ”mobile health” OR mhealth OR phealth OR ”mobile multimedia” OR ”mobile communication$” OR ”mobile technolog$” OR ”cellular phone$” OR ”cell phone$” OR ”cellular telephone$” OR ”mobile phone$” OR ”mobile telephone$” OR ”mobile health units” OR computer$ OR handheld OR ”communication technolog$” OR ”technology integration” OR ”web$based communication$” OR ”web$based organi?ation$” OR ”virtual communit$” OR ”e$learning environment$” OR ”user$computer interface” OR ”virtual learning environment$” OR acceleromet$ OR ”mobile app$” OR ”web$based interacti$” OR mobile OR ”mobile gaming” OR ”pervasive game$” OR ”geographic infromation systems” OR ”global positioning system$” OR telerehabilitation OR ”tele rehabilitation” OR ”web 2.0 intervention$” OR ”web 2.0 application$” OR ”smart phone$” OR ”remote consultation” OR sms OR ”text messaging” OR ”text messag$” OR ”digital learning”)

DocType=All document types; Language=All languages;

#1 TOPIC: ((("Exercise therapy" OR "physical therapy modalities") OR "physical therapy") OR "functional therapy") OR "occupational therapy") OR neuropsychology) OR dietitian) OR dietitians) OR dietetics) OR "occupational health services") OR "multidisciplinary therapy") OR "physical activity") OR exercise) OR "exercise movement therapy") OR "motor activity") OR "energy expenditure") OR "delivery of health care") OR "public health service$") OR "nursing diagnosis") OR "nursing informatics") OR "community health nursing") OR nursing) OR "public health nursing") OR "medical treatment$") OR psychiatry) OR rehabilitation) OR "health promotion") OR "health counse?ling") OR "directive counse?ling") OR coaching) OR "health guidance") OR "activities of daily living") OR adl) OR participation) OR "cultural activities") OR "leisure activities") OR "physical education and training") OR "primary prevention") OR "secondary prevention") OR "tertiary prevention") OR sports) OR "active lifestyle") OR "physical lifestyle") OR "physical fitness") OR "health education") OR "patient education") OR "behavior therapy") OR "cognitive therapy")

DocType=All document types; Language=All languages;

Appendix 2. Summary of included RCT studies on the used technologies and its communicative interactions thereof in the distance physical rehabilitation interventions.

Study	Technology							Interaction*				Comparison		Outcomes						
	Telephone	Online video	Messaging/SMS	Video	Virtual reality or training	Website	Activity monitor	2-way interaction	1-way interaction	Self-monitoring	Other treatment	Usual care	Similar treatment without the use of technology	ADL	Balance	Upper extremity	Lower extremity	Walking	Physical activity	Participation
Ada et al. 2003	X							X			X							X		
Ballester et al. 2017					X					X		X		X		X				
Chen et al. 2017		X						X					X	X	X					
Chumbler et al. 2012	X	X	X					X				X		X		X	X			X
Emmerson et al. 2016				X					X				X			X				
Lin et al. 2014		X						X				X		X	X					
Moore et al. 2015	X							X			X			X	X			X	X	X
Nijenhuis et al. 2017						X			X			X				X				X
Piron et al. 2009		X			X			X				X				X				
Redzuan et al. 2012				X								X		X						
Standen et al. 2017					X					X		X		X		X				
Van den Berg et al. 2016		X					X	X		X		X		X	X	X	X	X		X
Wan et al. 2016	X							X				X		X					X	

SMS = Short Message Service; ADL = Activities of Daily Living, * = Interaction of communication enabled through the used technologies between participant and the health care professional

Appendix 3. Funnel plot of activities of daily living.



SE, Standard Error; SMD, Standard Mean Difference; MD, Mean Difference