

Original Article

(Check for updates

The Impact of Mental Practice on Motor Function in Patients With Stroke: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis

Hyun Seok, Yoon-Hee Choi

Received: Jul 12, 2023 **Revised:** Oct 10, 2023

OPEN ACCESS

Revised: Oct 10, 2023 Accepted: Oct 16, 2023 Published online: Nov 2, 2023

Correspondence to Yoon-Hee Choi

Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Soonchunhyang University Seoul Hospital, Soonchunhyang University College of Medicine, 59 Daesagwan-ro, Yongsan-gu, Seoul 04401, Korea. Email: yoonhee.choi83@gmail.com

HIGHLIGHTS

- Mental practice can facilitate post-stroke upper limb motor recovery.
- Mental practice can improve post-stroke upper limb function.
- Mental practice can enhance post-stroke independence in activities of daily living.



Original Article

(Check for updates

The Impact of Mental Practice on Motor Function in Patients With Stroke: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis

Hyun Seok 💿, Yoon-Hee Choi 💿

Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Soonchunhyang University Seoul Hospital, Soonchunhyang University College of Medicine, Seoul, Korea

ABSTRACT

Mental practice (MP), the cognitive rehearsal of physical activities without overt movements, has recently emerged as a promising rehabilitation method for patients with stroke. This paper presents a systematic review and meta-analysis critically evaluating the existing evidence to offer a comprehensive estimate of the overall effect of MP on motor function in stroke patients. A systematic search of 3 international databases (PubMed, Embase, and the Cochrane Library) was conducted for randomized controlled trials. We finally selected 31 randomized clinical trials and conducted meta-analysis to determine the effectiveness of MP on motor recovery of upper extremity, upper extremity function, activities of daily living, and gait velocity in stroke patients. The results of the systematic reviews showed that MP combined with conventional therapy has a positive impact on improving upper extremity motor function, with a moderate quality of evidence. However, the beneficial effect of MP on gait velocity was not demonstrated. It is recommended to treat with MP in addition to conventional rehabilitation therapy to improve the motor outcome of stroke depending on the patient's condition (Recommendation level: Conditional Recommend Evidence certainty: Moderate).

Keywords: Stroke; Mental Practice; Systematic Review; Meta-analysis

INTRODUCTION

Stroke stands as one of the leading causes of long-term disability worldwide, compelling a continued search for effective rehabilitation strategies. Difficulties in using upper limb is the most common deficit after stroke, and is reported by at least 70% of stroke survivors [1]. This has a significant effect on daily activities, and has been shown to reduce independence, the likelihood of returning to employment and hobbies, and poorer mental health and quality of life [2,3]. Also, it is reported that a significant 70% of survivors experience diminished walking speed, while 20% continue to be reliant on wheelchairs at 3 months after stroke [4,5]. Post-stroke impairments in walking ability also notably hamper an individual's independence, ability to move, participation in daily tasks, and involvement in community activities [6]. Therefore, many rehabilitation strategies have been developed to overcome hemiparetic arm disability and gait disturbance [740].

OPEN ACCESS

Received: Jul 12, 2023 Revised: Oct 10, 2023 Accepted: Oct 16, 2023 Published online: Nov 2, 2023

Correspondence to Yoon-Hee Choi

Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Soonchunhyang University Seoul Hospital, Soonchunhyang University College of Medicine, 59 Daesagwan-ro, Yongsan-gu, Seoul 04401, Korea. Email: yoonhee.choi83@gmail.com

Copyright © 2023. Korean Society for Neurorehabilitation

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (https:// creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0) which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

ORCID iDs

Hyun Seok https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7266-6045 Yoon-Hee Choi https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6651-7908

Funding

None.

Conflict of Interest

The authors have no potential conflicts of interest to disclose.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization: Seok H, Choi YH; Data curation: Choi YH; Formal analysis: Choi YH;

1/12



Methodology: Seok H, Choi YH; Validation: Seok H; Visualization: Choi YH; Writing original draft: Choi YH; Writing - review & editing: Choi YH. Mental practice (MP), which refers to the cognitive rehearsal of a physical activity in the absence of overt physical movements, have started to surface in the arena of stroke rehabilitation. It doesn't require complicate equipment and can be applied to a wide range of patients [11]. Studies suggest that MP can act as an adjuvant to traditional physical therapy, capitalizing on the brain's inherent neuroplasticity, potentially strengthening the neural circuits involved in motor recovery after stroke [11-14].

Despite a growing body of evidence showing promising outcomes of MP in stroke rehabilitation, the results vary across studies [15-21]. The heterogeneity in methodology, including differences in the protocols of MP, the types of outcome measures used, and the characteristics of participants involved, can obscure our understanding of the true effectiveness of this intervention [22,23].

In response, this systematic review aims to conduct a meta-analysis of the existing randomized controlled trials (RCTs), critically evaluating the evidence to quantify the overall effect of MP on motor recovery in stroke patients. This integrative approach will allow us to not only provide a robust estimate of the efficacy of MP, but also explore potential moderators that may influence the outcome. By taking this comprehensive approach, this paper strives to offer valuable insights that can guide future research and clinical applications, fostering more targeted and efficient strategies for stroke rehabilitation. Ultimately, through this exploration, we hope to deepen our understanding of the possibilities inherent in the interplay of cognition and physical rehabilitation, and thus contribute to improving the quality of life and functional independence for stroke patients worldwide.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Electronic searches

The process of literature search was delegated to 6 information retrieval specialists, employing 3 international databases: PubMed (https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/), Embase (http://embase.com), and the Cochrane Library (http://cochranelibrary.com). For a comprehensive literature exploration, no specific commencement date was set, and the search extended up until February 28, 2022.

Search strategy

The search terms identified were used with Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) terms in PubMed and Cochrane Library, and Emtree terms in Embase, all of which were combined with natural language to enhance search sensitivity. If necessary, a manual search strategy was employed to supplement search results. The search terms were (motor imagery OR mental practice OR mental imagery OR mental rehearsal OR mental training OR imagery) AND (stroke OR cerebrovascular disorder OR intracranial hemorrhages OR cerebral vascular accident OR cerebral hemorrhage OR cerebral ischemia OR cerebrovascular accidents). MeSH terms were used in relevant databases: (STROKE [MeSH] OR stroke* OR cerebrovascular* OR cerebral*) AND (Imagery [MeSH] OR mental* OR imagery* OR Practice, Psychological [MeSH]).

Selection

The identified search results were ultimately screened by 2 reviewers, adhering to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) flow



diagram. Selection of the related papers was based on the target population (human stroke patients), research design and methodology (only comparative studies including human-targeted RCTs were included, while case reports, technical reports, and animal studies were excluded), outcome measures, and language (Korean and English). The primary selection involved a review of the titles and abstracts of the literature, followed by a secondary selection that entailed a review of the full text of the papers. In case of differing opinions during the literature selection process, consensus was sought.

Data extraction

Data were extracted by one reviewer and data extraction was checked by a second reviewer. The following data were extracted: citation details; total number of participants; number of groups; number in each group; number lost to attrition in each group; randomization; blinding; intervention characteristics (frequency of MP sessions; duration of each MP session; the length of the entire MP intervention; number of completed sessions; total minutes of completed MP; duration and length of control intervention; baseline, postintervention, and follow-up [when available]) point estimates, outcome measures and results. After that, all the information was analyzed and then summarized (**Supplementary Table 1**).

Risks of bias (quality) assessment

We assessed each potential bias as high risk, low risk, or unclear risk by reviewing each research article. We chose high risk if the specific bias appeared to be present, low risk if bias did not appear to be present, and unclear risk if there was no mention of the bias or if bias was not clear in the article. We used the "risk of bias" tool judgements as described in the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. We assessed random sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding of participants and personnel, blinding of outcome assessment, incomplete outcome data, selective outcome, and any other bias [24]. The evaluations were then reviewed through a consensus process.

Analysis

Given the diversity of instruments used by the selected studies, the meta-analysis was conducted considering the most used instruments among most studies with available results. Outcome measures used in the meta-analysis were upper extremity Fugl-Meyer Assessment (FMA-UE) for motor recovery, action research arm test (ARAT) scores for upper extremity function, Barthel Index (BI) or Modified Barthel Index (MBI) for activities of daily living, and gait velocity. They are widely used tools in poststroke rehabilitation studies, and we intended to make relevant comparisons by mean differences (MDs) of FMA-UE, ARAT, MBI/BI and gait velocity in the analysis. All outcomes produced continuous data. The effect size was calculated by the MD and its respective 95% confidence interval (CI), appropriate when all the analysis studies used the same scale. We used the standardized mean difference (SMD) and the 95% CI for different outcomes that measured the same constructs. Heterogeneity was assessed using the statistical estimates of the χ^2 test and the I² index. The presence of between-trial statistical heterogeneity was assessed using the I² statistic. We planned to examine the presence of publication bias by visual inspection of funnel plot if 10 or more trials were included [24]. We used the Cochrane Review Manager software for all data analyses [25].



Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE)

We applied GRADE to assess the certainty of the evidence. We used the 5 GRADE considerations of study limitations, inconsistency of results, indirectness of evidence, imprecision, and publication bias to assess the quality of the body of evidence for each outcome, considering the studies included in the meta-analyses. We used methods described in the GRADE Handbook [26].

RESULTS

The foundation of this systematic review study was established through the analysis of RCTs that directly compared motor function enhancement via MP to control groups, resulting in a final selection of 31 papers. To analyze the impact of MP, the interventions used in each study were reviewed to confirm the inclusion of this technique. The meta-analysis was then conducted, separating the groups that included this therapeutic technique from those that did not. Given this comparison method, there was potential for overlapping subjects within each outcome indicator. Thus, the overall analysis in the meta-analysis was avoided, and only subgroup analysis was performed. The types of outcome measures included motor recovery, upper extremity function, activities of daily living, and gait velocity. The results were examined immediately before and after the intervention.

Through comprehensive literature searches, a total of 2,972 studies, which had duplicates removed, were independently screened by 2 members following the PRISMA guidelines, ultimately selecting 31 RCT studies [14,18,27-55]. Among these 31 RCTs, 23 studies focused on upper limb motor function, while the remaining 8 studies targeted lower limb motor function. If data extraction for the meta-analysis was not feasible from the final selected studies, those papers were excluded from the analysis [14,34,35,37,39,44-48,50] (**Fig. 1**).

The results of the risk of bias assessment are presented in **Fig. 2**. The figures showed the methodological quality of the included studies. Of the 31 final studies, 21 show the subjects' random sequence; 11 describe the allocation concealment methods. The blinding of participants and professionals was adopted in 6 studies. The 18 studies report blinding outcome evaluators. The 27 studies described the results adequately for each primary outcome, including losses and exclusion from analysis. However, only 5 studies presented sufficient data for inclusion in the meta-analysis. As for the reporting of selective outcomes, 2 studies presented insufficient information to allow judgment. Other types of bias are found in 3 of the studies analyzed: selection, performance, and reporting biases. Besides, it is noteworthy that only 9 studies for motor recovery, 7 studies for upper extremity function, 7 studies for activities of daily living, and 6 studies for gait velocity presented sufficient information for inclusion in the meta-analysis.

Motor recovery of upper extremity

The results of the meta-analysis included 9 RCT studies [27,29,31-33,36,38,42,43] sing outcome measures related to motor recovery of upper extremity (FMA-UE). Regarding motor recovery, the group that underwent MP showed a significant effect compared to the group that did not (MD, 2.40; 95% CI, 0.64–4.15) (**Fig. 2A**)



The Impact of Mental Practice on Motor Function in Stroke Patients



Fig. 1. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) flowchart.

Upper extremity function

In the meta-analysis, 4 RCT studies [18,28,30,41] were included using outcome measures related to the upper extremity function. The group that received MP showed a significant improvement in upper extremity function compared to the group that did not (MD, 4.98; 95% CI, 2.74–7.23) (**Fig. 2B**).

Activities of daily living

In activities of daily living, 7 RCT studies [18,31-33,38,49,55] were incorporated. The group that underwent MP showed a significant improvement in activities of daily living compared to the group that did not (SMD, 0.60; 95% CI, 0.29–0.92), indicating a significant effect. However, the magnitude of the effect on daily living activity performance was not significant (**Fig. 2C**).



Gait velocity

Six RCT studies [49,51-55] were included using outcome measures related to gait velocity. The effect on gait velocity did not show any significant difference between MP group and the control group (SMD, 0.30; 95% CI, -0.04–0.64) (Fig. 2D).

When the certainty of evidence was evaluated using the GRADE approach for key outcome indicators, no serious risk of bias was found in all key outcome indicators, and no inconsistencies, indirectness, or publication bias was observed. However, deductions were made for imprecision due to insufficient number of research subjects, resulting in a moderate level of certainty of evidence. The importance of end points on motor recovery, upper extremity function, and activities of daily living after the intervention period were all determined critical. Conversely, considering clinical significance, walking speed was determined as important, but not critical outcomes for decision making (Table 1).

Δ

	Exp	eriment	a	Control			Mean Difference		Mean Difference	Risk of Bias
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% Cl	ABCDEFG
Ji 2021	31.24	18.3	17	30.8	17.6	20	2.1%	0.44 [-11.19, 12.07]		$\bullet ? ? ? \bullet ? \bullet$
<im 2015<="" td=""><td>36.08</td><td>9.9</td><td>12</td><td>31</td><td>5.33</td><td>12</td><td>6.3%</td><td>5.08 [-1.28, 11.44]</td><td></td><td>????.</td></im>	36.08	9.9	12	31	5.33	12	6.3%	5.08 [-1.28, 11.44]		????.
Nayeem 2012	63	3.62	15	53	10.35	15	7.8%	10.00 [4.45, 15.55]		?????
Page 2007	39.75	6.86	16	36.75	10.74	16	6.5%	3.00 [-3.24, 9.24]		
Page 2009	46.4	0.89	5	43.8	1.09	5	30.2%	2.60 [1.37, 3.83]	-	
Park 2015	41.6	3.4	13	39.6	2.4	13	22.4%	2.00 [-0.26, 4.26]	+ - -	
Park 2020	30.15	6.87	34	29.29	7.05	34	15.7%	0.86 [-2.45, 4.17]		
Park et al 2015	46.5	8.1	14	50.7	10.1	15	5.8%	-4.20 [-10.84, 2.44]		???????
Timmermans 2013	51	14.07	19	52	14.81	17	3.1%	-1.00 [-10.47, 8.47]		•?•••?•
fotal (95% CI)			145			147	100.0%	2.40 [0.64, 4.15]	◆	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	2.26; CI	ni² = 13.	37, df=	= 8 (P =	0.10); P	= 40%		1993 - 1995 - 1994 - 1995 - 1995 - 1995 - 1995 - 1995 - 1995 - 1995 - 1995 - 1995 - 1995 - 1995 - 1995 - 1995 -		
Test for overall effect:									-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours (control Favours (experiment	tal]

Risk of bias legend

(A) Random sequence generation (selection bias)

(B) Allocation concealment (selection bias)

(C) Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)

(D) Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)

(E) Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)

(F) Selective reporting (reporting bias)

(G) Other bias

	Exp	eriment	tal	Control			Mean Difference		Mean Difference	Risk of Bias
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% Cl	ABCDEFG
letswaart 2011	31.51	20.68	39	30.38	20.53	32	5.4%	1.13 [-8.50, 10.76]	1 55	
Page 2005	43.8	3.09	6	38.7	1.2	5	69.7%	5.10 [2.41, 7.79]		
Thara 2015	37.33	8.04	15	31.47	5.15	15	21.6%	5.86 [1.03, 10.69]		
Welfringer 2011	9.6	18.5	15	6.5	16.2	15	3.3%	3.10 [-9.34, 15.54]	15	
Total (95% CI)			75			67	100.0%	4.98 [2.74, 7.23]	•	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	= 0.00; C	hi ² = 0.8	34, df =	3(P = 0).84); I ² :	= 0%				<u> </u>
Test for overall effect						-10 -5 0 5 1 Favours (control) Favours (exp				

Risk of bias legend

(A) Random sequence generation (selection bias)

(B) Allocation concealment (selection bias)

(C) Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)

(D) Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)

(E) Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)

(F) Selective reporting (reporting bias)

(G) Other bias

Fig. 2. Forest plot and Risk of Bias of mental practice effect. (A) Mental practice effect on motor recovery of upper extremity. (B) Mental practice effect on upper extremity function. (C) Mental practice effect on activities of daily living. (D) Mental practice effect on gait velocity. SD, standard deviation; CI, confidence interval. (continued to the next page)



The Impact of Mental Practice on Motor Function in Stroke Patients

С

	Experimental			(Control			Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference Risk of Bias
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% CI A B C D E F G
Braun 2012	90.67	5.93	15	74.67	15.52	15	10.9%	1.33 [0.52, 2.13]	
letswaart 2011	16.23	4.13	39	14.87	4.79	32	20.4%	0.30 [-0.17, 0.77]	
Ji 2021	82.18	15.13	17	68.55	22.79	20	14.0%	0.68 [0.01, 1.35]	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
Park 2015	83.1	5.3	13	81.5	4.4	13	11.5%	0.32 [-0.46, 1.09]	
Park 2020	70.97	8.03	34	68.47	8.96	34	20.1%	0.29 [-0.19, 0.77]	
Park et al 2015	72.7	12.4	14	66.2	12.6	15	12.2%	0.51 [-0.24, 1.25]	33333
Verma 2011	90.67	5.93	15	74.67	15.52	15	10.9%	1.33 [0.52, 2.13]	
Total (95% CI)			147			144	100.0%	0.60 [0.29, 0.92]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =				6 (P = 0	l.13); l² =	= 39%		•	
Test for overall effect	: Z = 3.75	5 (P = 0.	0002)						Favours (control) Favours (experimental)

Risk of bias legend

(A) Random sequence generation (selection bias)

(B) Allocation concealment (selection bias)

(C) Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)

(D) Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)

(E) Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)

(F) Selective reporting (reporting bias)

(G) Other bias

D

	Expe	riment	al	C	ontrol	Std. Mean Difference		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference	Risk of Bias
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total N	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% Cl	ABCDEFG
Braun 2012	-16.25	6.3	12	-14.08	6.3	13	14.6%	-0.33 [-1.12, 0.46]		
Cho 2013	-16	2.7	15	-17.4	4.6	13	15.0%	0.37 [-0.38, 1.12]		
Kumar 2016	0.63	0.07	20	0.6	0.08	20	20.7%	0.39 [-0.24, 1.02]		
Lee 2011	55.68	17.72	1.3	51.5	10.73	11	14.2%	0.22 [-0.50, 1.02]		. 🖲 ち 🕒 🕒 🕒 🕒
Lee 2015	-27.06	0.28	18	-27.08	7.68	18	10.5%	0.11 [-0.55, 0.76]		
Verma 2011	0.58	0.14	15	0.43	0.14	15	15.2%	1.04 [0.27, 1.81]		
Total (95% Cl)			93			90	100.0%	0.30 [-0.04, 0.64]	-	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.04; Chi	° = 6.53	. df = 5	(P = 0.2	26); 12 =	2.3%		÷		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.74	(P = 0.0	18)						-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [control] Favours [experir	mental]

Risk of bias legend

(A) Random sequence generation (selection bias)

(B) Allocation concealment (selection bias)

(C) Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)

(D) Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)

(E) Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)

(F) Selective reporting (reporting bias)

(G) Other bias

Fig. 2. (Continued) Forest plot and Risk of Bias of mental practice effect. (A) Mental practice effect on motor recovery of upper extremity. (B) Mental practice effect on upper extremity function. (C) Mental practice effect on activities of daily living. (D) Mental practice effect on gait velocity. SD, standard deviation; CI, confidence interval.

Table 1. Summary of findings

Outcomes	Importance I	No. of participants (studies)	Certainty of evidence (GRADE)	Statistical method	Effect size
1. Motor recovery	9	292 (9)	Moderate	MD (IV, Random, 95% CI)	2.40 (0.64-4.15)
2. Upper extremity function	9	142 (4)	Moderate	MD (IV, Random, 95% CI)	4.98 (2.74-7.23)
3. Activities of daily living	9	291 (7)	Moderate	SMD (IV, Random, 95% CI)	0.60 (0.29-0.92)
4. Gait velocity	6	183 (6)	Moderate	SMD (IV, Random, 95% CI)	0.30 (-0.04-0.64)

GRADE, Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation; MD, mean difference; SMD, standardized mean difference; CI, confidence interval.

DISCUSSION

This systematic review aimed to synthesize available evidence from studies of the effectiveness of MP on the motor function after stroke. The overall result of this study supports beneficial effect of MP on upper extremity motor recovery, upper extremity function and activities of daily living when given with other therapies. However, the effect of MP on



gait velocity was not demonstrated in the current meta-analysis. The main results of this review were largely based on moderate quality trials and heterogeneity was relatively low in the meta-analyses (40% for motor recovery, 0% for upper extremity function, 39% for activities of daily living, and 23% for gait velocity), supporting the validity of these results. Out of 31 RCT studies, 13 studies included in the meta-analysis directly compared MP and conventional therapy. The remaining studies were about MP in conjunction with conventional therapy (task-specific training, gait training, contralateral upper limb restriction therapy, neuromuscular electrical stimulation therapy, etc.) versus conventional therapy alone (16 studies controlled total treatment time, 2 studies did not). Therefore, it is suggested to incorporate MP in addition to conventional rehabilitation therapy rather than implementing MP alone.

MP is a proven safe and effective treatment technique that offers benefits such as improved daily living activities and enhanced upper limb motor function for stroke patients. The MP does not require special equipment and it can be repeated many times without great physical effort. If carried out by skilled professionals, there are no expected risks associated with MP. Also, research conducted by Page et al. [40] reported high treatment compliance and patient satisfaction when MP was applied to acute stroke patients. Furthermore, according to a study by Page et al. [44], patients can perform MP at home without the guidance of medical staff. As of 2022, under South Korea's healthcare system, only prescribed methods must be used to provide exercise therapy for motor function improvement. Currently, there is no separate medical billing in South Korea for MP alone, and policy is structured to claim it along with other rehabilitation therapy prescriptions implemented concurrently. To ensure patients receive sufficient MP from skilled experts according to their needs in the current South Korean medical system, a policy expansion of medical billing is needed for each rehabilitation therapy prescriptions.

There are some limitations in this study. Most of the studies have small samples that cannot be representative of the population. Also, the lack of standardization between the protocols may be responsible for generating conflicting information between the trials. Some questions about this area of study still exist and are challenging. Unanswered questions are adherence, exercise variability, target patients (age range, location of the stroke lesion, stroke subgroups, chronicity), timing of therapy, dosage, frequency, and duration of MP [18]. In this study, we intended to investigate the chronicity of the participants in the included papers and analyze whether the time interval from stroke onset to the study period influenced the effects of the intervention. However, we were unable to analyze the effects of the time interval as many papers either did not specify the time interval or enrolled participants with a mix of subacute and chronic conditions. Therefore, in future study, RCTs with high quality are needed to clarify the clinical effects of MP as a rehabilitation method for motor function in stroke patients.

For the motor recovery, improvement of upper extremity function, and functional independence following a stroke, it is recommended to consider incorporating MP in addition to conventional rehabilitation therapy. However, it is advised to use it selectively depending on the patient's condition (Recommendation level: Conditional Recommend Evidence certainty: Moderate) However, the benefit of MP for improving walking speed after a stroke is not distinctly evident based on current research, and additional research results are anticipated.



SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Supplementary Table 1

Characteristics of included studies

Click here to view

REFERENCES

- Broeks JG, Lankhorst GJ, Rumping K, Prevo AJ. The long-term outcome of arm function after stroke: results of a follow-up study. Disabil Rehabil1999;21:357-364.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Chen CM, Tsai CC, Chung CY, Chen CL, Wu KP, Chen HC. Potential predictors for health-related quality of life in stroke patients undergoing inpatient rehabilitation. Health Qual Life Outcomes2015;13:118.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Lieshout EC, van de Port IG, Dijkhuizen RM, Visser-Meily JM. Does upper limb strength play a prominent role in health-related quality of life in stroke patients discharged from inpatient rehabilitation?Top Stroke Rehabil2020;27:525-533.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Dujović SD, Malešević J, Malešević N, Vidaković AS, Bijelić G, Keller T, Konstantinović L. Novel multi-pad functional electrical stimulation in stroke patients: a single-blind randomized study. NeuroRehabilitation2017;41:791-800.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Sakuma K, Ohata K, Izumi K, Shiotsuka Y, Yasui T, Ibuki S, Ichihashi N. Relation between abnormal synergy and gait in patients after stroke. J Neuroeng Rehabil2014;11:141.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Mikołajewska E. Bobath and traditional approaches in post-stroke gait rehabilitation in adults. Biomed Hum Kinetics2017;9:27-33.
- Nascimento LR, Michaelsen SM, Ada L, Polese JC, Teixeira-Salmela LF. Cyclical electrical stimulation increases strength and improves activity after stroke: a systematic review. J Physiother2014;60:22-30.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Coupar F, Pollock A, van Wijck F, Morris J, Langhorne P. Simultaneous bilateral training for improving arm function after stroke. Cochrane Database Syst Rev2010;2010:CD006432.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Kwakkel G, Veerbeek JM, van Wegen EE, Wolf SL. Constraint-induced movement therapy after stroke. Lancet Neurol2015;14:224-234.
 PURMED L CROSSREE
- French B, Thomas LH, Coupe J, McMahon NE, Connell L, Harrison J, Sutton CJ, Tishkovskaya S, Watkins CL. Repetitive task training for improving functional ability after stroke. Cochrane Database Syst Rev2016;11:CD006073.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Butler AJ, Page SJ. Mental practice with motor imagery: evidence for motor recovery and cortical reorganization after stroke. Arch Phys Med Rehabil2006;87:S2-S11.
- Jeannerod M, Decety J. Mental motor imagery: a window into the representational stages of action. Curr Opin Neurobiol1995;5:727-732.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Sharma N, Pomeroy VM, Baron JC. Motor imagery: a backdoor to the motor system after stroke?Stro ke2006;37:1941-1952.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Li F, Zhang T, Li BJ, Zhang W, Zhao J, Song LP. Motor imagery training induces changes in brain neural networks in stroke patients. Neural Regen Res2018;13:1771-1781.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Lamontagne A, Fung J. Faster is better: implications for speed-intensive gait training after stroke. Stroke2004;35:2543-2548.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF



- Hwang S, Jeon HS, Yi CH, Kwon OY, Cho SH, You SH. Locomotor imagery training improves gait performance in people with chronic hemiparetic stroke: a controlled clinical trial. Clin Rehabil2010;24:514-522.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Dickstein R, Dunsky A, Marcovitz E. Motor imagery for gait rehabilitation in post-stroke hemiparesis. Phys Ther2004;84:1167-1177.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Ietswaart M, Johnston M, Dijkerman HC, Joice S, Scott CL, MacWalter RS, Hamilton SJ. Mental practice with motor imagery in stroke recovery: randomized controlled trial of efficacy. Brain2011;134:1373-1386.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Braun S, Kleynen M, van Heel T, Kruithof N, Wade D, Beurskens A. The effects of mental practice in neurological rehabilitation; a systematic review and meta-analysis. Front Hum Neurosci2013;7:390.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Barclay RE, Stevenson TJ, Poluha W, Semenko B, Schubert J. Mental practice for treating upper extremity deficits in individuals with hemiparesis after stroke. Cochrane Database Syst Rev2020;5:CD005950.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Zimmermann-Schlatter A, Schuster C, Puhan MA, Siekierka E, Steurer J. Efficacy of motor imagery in post-stroke rehabilitation: a systematic review. J Neuroeng Rehabil2008;5:8.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Hoffmann TC, Glasziou PP, Boutron I, Milne R, Perera R, Moher D, Altman DG, Barbour V, Macdonald H, Johnston M, Lamb SE, Dixon-Woods M, McCulloch P, Wyatt JC, Chan AW, Michie S. Better reporting of interventions: template for intervention description and replication (TIDieR) checklist and guide. BMJ2014;348:g1687.
- Pollock A, St George B, Fenton M, Firkins L. Top 10 research priorities relating to life after stroke--consensus from stroke survivors, caregivers, and health professionals. Int J Stroke2014;9:313-320.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- 24. Higgins JPT, Green S. Handbook for systematic reviews of interventions version 5.1.0 [updated March 2011]. Available at https://training.cochrane.org/handbook [accessed on 2021 December 8].
- 25. Nordic Cochrane Centre, The Cochrane Collaboration. Review Manager 5 (RevMan 5). Version 5.3. London: Cochrane Collaboration; 2014.
- 26. Schünemann H, Brożek J, Guyatt G, Oxman A. GRADE handbook. London: Cochrane Collaboration; 2013.
- 27. Nayeem Z, Majumi MM, Fuzail A. Effect of mental imagery on upper extremity function in stroke patients. Indian J Physiother Occup Ther2012;6:88-90.
- Welfringer A, Leifert-Fiebach G, Babinsky R, Brandt T. Visuomotor imagery as a new tool in the rehabilitation of neglect: a randomised controlled study of feasibility and efficacy. Disabil Rehabil2011;33:2033-2043.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- 29. Timmermans AA, Verbunt JA, van Woerden R, Moennekens M, Pernot DH, Seelen HA. Effect of mental practice on the improvement of function and daily activity performance of the upper extremity in patients with subacute stroke: a randomized clinical trial. J Am Med Dir Assoc2013;14:204-212.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Thara N, Kumar SN, Babu VK, Akalwadi A. Comparative study between task specific motor imagery with mental practice versus task specific mirror therapy on upper limb functions for Sub Acute Hemiplegia. Int J Physiother2015;2:824-833.
 CROSSREF
- Park JH. Effects of mental imagery training combined electromyogram-triggered neuromuscular electrical stimulation on upper limb function and activities of daily living in patients with chronic stroke: a randomized controlled trial. Disabil Rehabil2020;42:2876-2881.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Park JH. The effects of modified constraint-induced therapy combined with mental practice on patients with chronic stroke. J Phys Ther Sci2015;27:1585-1588.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- 33. Park J, Lee N, Cho M, Kim D, Yang Y. Effects of mental practice on stroke patients' upper extremity function and daily activity performance. J Phys Ther Sci2015;27:1075-1077.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- 34. Oh HS, Kim EJ, Kim DY, Kim SJ. Effects of adjuvant mental practice on affected upper limb function following a stroke: results of three-dimensional motion analysis, Fugl-Meyer Assessment of the upper extremity and motor activity logs. Ann Rehabil Med2016;40:401-411.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF



- Nilsen DM, Gillen G, DiRusso T, Gordon AM. Effect of imagery perspective on occupational performance after stroke: a randomized controlled trial. Am J Occup Ther2012;66:320-329.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- 36. Kim SS, Lee BH. Motor imagery training improves upper extremity performance in stroke patients. J Phys Ther Sci2015;27:2289-2291.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- 37. Kim H, Yoo EY, Jung MY, Kim J, Park JH, Kang DH. The effects of mental practice combined with modified constraint-induced therapy on corticospinal excitability, movement quality, function, and activities of daily living in persons with stroke. Disabil Rehabil2018;40:2449-2457. PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Ji EK, Wang HH, Jung SJ, Lee KB, Kim JS, Jo L, Hong BY, Lim SH. Graded motor imagery training as a home exercise program for upper limb motor function in patients with chronic stroke: a randomized controlled trial. Medicine (Baltimore)2021;100:e24351.
- Alves SS, Ocamoto GN, de Camargo PS, Santos AT, Terra AM. Effects of virtual reality and motor imagery techniques using Fugl Meyer Assessment scale in post-stroke patients. Int J Ther Rehabil2018;25:587-596.
 CROSSREF
- Page SJ, Levine P, Sisto S, Johnston MV. A randomized efficacy and feasibility study of imagery in acute stroke. Clin Rehabil2001;15:233-240.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Page SJ, Levine P, Leonard AC. Effects of mental practice on affected limb use and function in chronic stroke. Arch Phys Med Rehabil2005;86:399-402.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Page SJ, Levine P, Leonard A. Mental practice in chronic stroke: results of a randomized, placebocontrolled trial. Stroke2007;38:1293-1297.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Page SJ, Levine P, Khoury JC. Modified constraint-induced therapy combined with mental practice: thinking through better motor outcomes. Stroke2009;40:551-554.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Page SJ, Dunning K, Hermann V, Leonard A, Levine P. Longer versus shorter mental practice sessions for affected upper extremity movement after stroke: a randomized controlled trial. Clin Rehabil2011;25:627-637.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Müller K, Bütefisch CM, Seitz RJ, Hömberg V. Mental practice improves hand function after hemiparetic stroke. Restor Neurol Neurosci2007;25:501-511.
- Liu KP. Use of mental imagery to improve task generalisation after a stroke. Hong Kong Med J2009;15:37-41.
 PUBMED
- 47. Kanwar S, Kashoo FZ. Comparing the immediate effect of auditory and visual mental imagery on reaching and grasping task among sub acute stroke patients. Indian J Physiother Occup Ther2011;5:155-159.
- De S, Chopra C, Mehta DD, Mehndiratta MM. Comparison between mirror therapy and mental imagery in improving ankle motor recovery in sub acute stroke patients. Indian J Physiother Occup Ther2017;11:169-172.
 CROSSREF
- 49. Verma R, Arya KN, Garg RK, Singh T. Task-oriented circuit class training program with motor imagery for gait rehabilitation in poststroke patients: a randomized controlled trial. Top Stroke Rehabil2011;18Suppl 1:620-632.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Oostra KM, Oomen A, Vanderstraeten G, Vingerhoets G. Influence of motor imagery training on gait rehabilitation in sub-acute stroke: a randomized controlled trial. J Rehabil Med2015;47:204-209.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Lee H, Kim H, Ahn M, You Y. Effects of proprioception training with exercise imagery on balance ability of stroke patients. J Phys Ther Sci2015;27:1-4.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Lee G, Song C, Lee Y, Cho H, Lee S. Effects of motor imagery training on gait ability of patients with chronic stroke. J Phys Ther Sci2011;23:197-200.
- 53. Kumar VK, Chakrapani M, Kedambadi R. Motor imagery training on muscle strength and gait performance in ambulant stroke subjects-a randomized clinical trial. J Clin Diagn Res2016;10:YC01-YC04. PUBMED | CROSSREF



- 54. Cho HY, Kim JS, Lee GC. Effects of motor imagery training on balance and gait abilities in post-stroke patients: a randomized controlled trial. Clin Rehabil2013;27:675-680.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- 55. Braun SM, Beurskens AJ, Kleynen M, Oudelaar B, Schols JM, Wade DT. A multicenter randomized controlled trial to compare subacute 'treatment as usual' with and without mental practice among persons with stroke in Dutch nursing homes. J Am Med Dir Assoc2012;13:85.e1-85.e7. PUBMED | CROSSREF