

# Non-Invasive Brain Stimulation Improves Paretic Limb Force Production: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis



Nyeonju Kang <sup>a,b</sup>, Jeffery J. Summers <sup>c,d</sup>, James H. Cauraugh <sup>b,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Laboratory for Rehabilitation Neuroscience, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, USA

<sup>b</sup> Motor Behavior Laboratory, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, USA

<sup>c</sup> Human Motor Control Laboratory, University of Tasmania, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia

<sup>d</sup> Research Institute for Sport and Exercise Sciences, Liverpool John Moores University, Liverpool, UK

## ARTICLE INFO

### Article history:

Received 15 March 2016

Received in revised form 28 April 2016

Accepted 15 May 2016

Available online 17 May 2016

### Keywords:

Meta-analysis

Systematic review

Transcranial direct current stimulation

(tDCS)

Repetitive transcranial magnetic

stimulation (rTMS)

Stroke

Force production

## ABSTRACT

**Background:** Non-invasive brain stimulation (NIBS) facilitates motor improvements post stroke. Transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) and repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS) are representative NIBS techniques frequently used in stroke motor rehabilitation. Our primary question is: Do these two techniques improve force production capability in paretic limbs?

**Objective:** The current systematic review and meta-analysis investigated the effects of tDCS and rTMS on paretic limb force production in stroke survivors.

**Methods:** Our comprehensive search identified 23 studies that reported changes in force production following tDCS or rTMS interventions. Each used random assignment and a sham control group. The 23 qualified studies in our meta-analysis generated 29 comparisons: 14 tDCS and 15 rTMS comparisons.

**Results:** Random effects models indicated improvements in paretic limb force after tDCS and rTMS rehabilitation. We found positive effects on force production in the two sets of stimulation protocols: (a) increasing cortical activity in the ipsilesional hemisphere and (b) decreasing cortical activity in the contralesional hemisphere. Moreover, across acute, subacute, and chronic phases, tDCS and rTMS improved force production.

**Conclusion:** Cumulative meta-analytic results revealed that tDCS and rTMS rehabilitation protocols successfully improved paretic limb force production capabilities.

© 2016 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

## Introduction

Hemiparesis is a common motor deficit post stroke. The affected side of the upper and lower extremities interferes with both unilateral and bilateral movements [1,2]. Typically, an inability to generate and modulate force production in paretic limbs causes movement control impairments such as compromised motor coordination, excessive movement variability, and motor dysfunctions evaluated by clinical assessments [3–5]. After experiencing a stroke, patients frequently show less magnitude of force production when executing actions on their paretic limb in comparison to their non-paretic limbs [6,7]. This post stroke weakness may be attributed to impaired muscles (e.g., decreased motor unit firing rate and motor unit recruitment) [8,9] or altered brain activation patterns [10].

Conventional rehabilitation protocols (e.g., bimanual movement training, robotic training, or power training) focusing on the recovery of affected muscles reveal evidence of robust force production improvements [1,11–15]. These rehabilitation protocols facilitate improved muscle properties and motor control [16,17]. Moreover, Harris and colleagues reported that increased paretic limb strength was significantly correlated with improvements in activities of daily living [18]. In line with these findings, stroke researchers continue to search for optimal rehabilitation protocols that effectively improve impaired muscle strength contributing to motor recovery in stroke survivors.

A highly popular avenue of stroke motor rehabilitation focuses on non-invasive brain stimulation (NIBS) techniques. Two common NIBS techniques used as stroke rehabilitation protocols are: (a) tDCS (transcranial direct current stimulation) and (b) rTMS (repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation). Potential mechanisms underlying these NIBS techniques indicate that tDCS or rTMS may modulate cortical excitability in specific areas of the brain by delivering low electrical current to the scalp, and this altered functional activity

\* Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 352 294 1623; fax: +1 352 392 0316.

E-mail address: [cauraugh@ufl.edu](mailto:cauraugh@ufl.edu) (J.H. Cauraugh).

in targeted regions appears to contribute to motor rehabilitation [19]. For stroke patients, the interhemispheric competition model assumes that the ipsilesional hemisphere may be double-disabled because of ipsilateral damage and/or greater interhemispheric inhibition from the contralesional hemisphere. Moreover, balancing asymmetrical brain activation between M1 (i.e., primary motor cortex) of the two hemispheres contributes to restoring motor functions in paretic limbs [20,21]. Despite the debate surrounding the interhemispheric competition model (e.g., inter-individual variability issue) [22,23], many rehabilitation protocols using tDCS or rTMS are prevalent: (a) anodal tDCS or high frequency rTMS ( $>1$  Hz) on M1 of the ipsilesional hemisphere for increasing cortical excitability, (b) cathodal tDCS or low frequency rTMS ( $\leq 1$  Hz) on M1 of the contralesional hemisphere for decreasing cortical excitability, and (c) bilateral tDCS (anodal tDCS + cathodal tDCS) or rTMS (high frequency rTMS + low frequency rTMS) on M1 of both hemispheres [19,20,24].

Previous meta-analysis studies reported that balanced cortical activity between M1 of the hemispheres following tDCS or rTMS protocols may contribute to motor improvements in paretic limbs (e.g., various clinical assessments or activities of daily living) [25–28]. However, Chhatbar and Feng pointed out that these meta-analytic findings are still susceptible to inconsistency in outcome measures as well as selection criteria [29]. Consequently, the methodological heterogeneity across individual studies may result in overestimated or underestimated standardized effect sizes [23,30,31]. To overcome and minimize these heterogeneity issues in previous meta-analysis studies, we conducted a systematic review and comprehensive meta-analysis by investigating the effects of NIBS on common outcome measures, paretic limb force production in stroke patients. Further, our meta-analysis only included studies that used random assignment and a sham control group – two methodological techniques that increased the quality of our meta-analysis [31,32]. Indeed, integrative findings from tDCS and rTMS interventions would vastly increase our understanding of the NIBS effects on stroke motor recovery and potential recovery mechanisms by including a higher number of qualified comparisons while decreasing publication bias [31].

Thus, the current systematic review and meta-analysis addressed three leading questions: (a) Do tDCS and rTMS interventions improve paretic limb forces in stroke survivors? (b) Do paretic limb forces post stroke increase after one of three sets of stimulation protocols: anodal tDCS or high frequency ( $>1$  Hz) rTMS on the ipsilesional hemisphere; cathodal tDCS stimulation or low frequency ( $\leq 1$  Hz) rTMS on the contralesional hemisphere; or bilateral stimulation? and (c) Do tDCS and rTMS protocols assist in recovering paretic limb forces at each post stroke stage: acute, subacute, or chronic?

## Materials and methods

### Literature search and study selection

Based on suggestions of The PRISMA statement [33], we performed a systematic review and meta-analysis. The computerized literature searches focused on stroke studies that reported the effect of tDCS or rTMS on force produced by paretic limbs (literature search period: June 2015–February 2016). We did not limit the type of publications considered. Our comprehensive search included refereed studies, conference proceedings, and negative result studies. We systematically searched studies using three data bases: (a) PubMed, (b) ISI's Web of Knowledge, and (c) Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. Seven keywords included: (a) stroke, (b) cerebrovascular accident, (c) brain infarct, (d) transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS), (e) repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS), (f) strength, and (g) force.




Figure 1. Flow chart for study selection.

Fig. 1 displays the selection algorithm and numbers of included and excluded studies. All titles, abstracts, and text were dually and independently reviewed by the authors based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria to minimize bias. Inclusion criteria for this meta-analysis included: (a) quantitative evaluation of tDCS or rTMS effects on paretic limb forces, (b) a between-group comparison: active tDCS (i.e., anodal, cathodal, and bilateral) or rTMS (i.e., low frequency:  $\leq 1$  Hz, high frequency:  $> 1$  Hz, and bilateral) stimulation versus sham control stimulation, and (c) a within-group comparison: pretest versus posttest. We excluded studies that failed to report both random assignment and a sham control group. Based on these criteria, 82 potential publications were initially identified. Substantially reviewing these articles revealed 59 studies for exclusion: (a) 18 review articles, (b) 21 studies without force production outcome measures, (c) three case studies, (d) 10 studies that failed to report statistical information, (e) one bimanual force production study, and (f) six no sham control studies. The remaining 23 studies qualified for the meta-analysis [34–56].

The 23 qualified studies involved 11 tDCS studies and 12 rTMS studies. For the 11 tDCS studies, eight reported one comparison out of three tDCS protocols (i.e., anodal, cathodal, or bilateral stimulation;  $8 \times 1 = 8$  comparisons), whereas three studies reported both anodal and cathodal stimulation comparisons ( $3 \times 2 = 6$  comparisons). Thus, 14 comparisons in the tDCS studies were included in our meta-analyses: (a) anodal stimulation on M1 of ipsilesional hemisphere: nine comparisons, (b) cathodal stimulation on M1 of contralesional hemisphere: three comparisons, and (c) bilateral (anodal + cathodal) stimulation: two comparisons.

The 12 rTMS studies involved nine studies that reported one comparison out of two rTMS protocols (i.e., low or high frequency;

**Table 1**  
Participant characteristics.

Study	Total N	Age	Gender	TSO (month)	Stroke type	Affected hemisphere	Pre-treatment impairment level	Recovery stage
Au-Yeung et al. [34]	10	62.6 ± 5.7	10 M	99.6 ± 38.4	8 I, 2 H	5 L, 5 R	UE-FMA = 58.3 / 66	Chronic
Avenanti et al. [44]	30	63.2 ± 9.5	14 F, 16 M	31.5 ± 22.7	20 I, 10 H	14 L, 16 R	MRC = 72–76 / 100	Chronic
Bolognini et al. [56]	14	46.7 ± 14.1	9 F, 5 M	35.2 ± 26.4	12 I, 2 H	8 L, 6 R	UE-FMA = 26.0 / 66	Chronic
Cha et al. [35]	20	58.8 ± 10.7	NR	14.2 ± 4.1	NR	11 L, 9 R	UE-FMA = 21.6 / 66	Chronic
Cha and Kim [55]	30	63.7 ± 12.1	14 F, 16 M	4.0 ± 1.0	18 I, 12 H	NR	NR	Subacute
Chang et al. [45]	28	56.6 ± 12.2	11 F, 17 M	1.0 ± 0.2	28 I	15 L, 13 R	UE-FMA = 26.2 / 66	Subacute
Conforto et al. [46]	30	55.8 ± 13.3	12 F, 18 M	1.0 ± 0.3	30 I	15 L, 15 R	NIHSS = 5.0 / 42	Subacute
Di Lazzaro et al. [38]	20	64.8 ± 14.3	7 F, 13 M	0.1 ± 0.05	20 I	12 L, 8 R	NIHSS = 5.9 / 42	Acute
Hummel et al. [36]	11	57.0 ± 16.0	5 F, 6 M	41.8 ± 26.4	11 I	NR	ASS = 1.1 / 4	Chronic
Khedr et al. [47]	36	57.9 ± 11.0	17 F, 19 M	0.6 ± 0.1	36 I	13 L, 23 R	NIHSS = 13.4 / 42	Acute
Khedr et al. [48]	26	57.3 ± 12.5	16 F, 10 M	0.2–0.3	NR	12 L, 14 R	BI = 25.2 / 100	Acute
Khedr et al. [54]	48	59.5 ± 13.1	24 F, 24 M	0.2 ± 0.1	48 I	27 L, 21 R	NIHSS = 9.6 / 42	Acute
Khedr et al. [37]	40	38–75	14 F, 26 M	0.2–0.8	40 I	18 L, 22 R	NIHSS = 10.7 / 42	Acute
Pomeroy et al. [49]	27	74.8 ± 12.7	18 F, 9 M	1.0 ± 0.6	27 I	14 L, 13 R	ARAT = 17.5 / 57	Subacute
Rose et al. [50]	19	64.6 ± 8.0	6 F, 13 M	7–150	NR	10 L, 9 R	UE-FMA = 39.2 / 66	Chronic
Sasaki et al. [51]	29	65.0 ± 10.0	9 F, 20 M	0.6 ± 0.2	13 I, 16 H	16 L, 13 R	NIHSS = 6.3 / 42	Acute
Sattler et al. [39]	20	65.2 ± 11.3	6 F, 14 M	0.2 ± 0.1	20 I	NR	UE-FMA = 48.0 / 66	Acute
Sohn et al. [40]	11	58.5 ± 14.6	2 F, 9 M	2.1 ± 0.6	4 I, 7 H	5 L, 6 R	NR	Subacute
Stagg et al. [41]	13	63.5 ± 13.7	3 F, 10 M	37.9 ± 15.2	12 I, 1 H	9 L, 4 R	UE-FMA = 43.2 / 66	Chronic
Takeuchi et al. [52]	20	59.0 ± 9.6	5 F, 15 M	27.0 ± 17.2	20 I	8 L, 12 R	UE-FMA = 61.8 / 66	Chronic
Takeuchi et al. [53]	20	62.3 ± 8.4	4 F, 16 M	29.9 ± 30.5	20 I	7 L, 13 R	UE-FMA = 44.6 / 66	Chronic
Tanaka et al. 2011 [42]	8	59.6 ± 10.9	4 F, 4 M	21.1 ± 13.8	NR	3 L, 5 R	SIAS (Knee) = 3.8 / 5	Chronic
Viana et al. [43]	20	55.5 ± 11.2	4 F, 16 M	33.5 ± 19.3	19 I, 1 H	8 L, 12 R	UE-FMA = 40.3 / 66	Chronic
N = 530								

Abbreviations: ASS: Ashworth Spasticity Score; ARAT: Action Research Arm Test; BI: Barthel Index; F: female; H: hemorrhagic; I: ischemic; L: left; M: male; MRC: Motricity index; NIHSS: National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale; NR: not reported; R: right; SIAS: Stroke Impairment Assessment Set; TSO: Time since Stroke Onset (interval between stroke onset and treatment initiation); UE-FMA: upper extremity Fugl-Meyer assessment.

Note: Values in age and TSO are mean ± standard deviation.

9 × 1 = 9 comparisons), whereas three studies revealed two comparisons (i.e., low and high frequency: two studies; two high frequency: one study; 3 × 2 = 6 comparisons). Thus, the 15 total comparisons in the rTMS studies included: (a) high frequency rTMS on M1 of ipsilesional hemisphere: six comparisons and (b) low frequency rTMS on M1 of contralesional hemisphere: nine comparisons. Overall, our meta-analysis examined 29 total comparisons out of the 23 qualified tDCS and rTMS studies.

### Motor outcome measures

The primary outcome measures for estimating force production in paretic limbs included: (a) pinch force: seven comparisons, (b) grip force: 19 comparisons, (c) elbow flexion torque: one comparison, and (d) knee extension torque: two comparisons.

### Meta-analytic techniques

We used the Comprehensive Meta-Analysis software (version 3.0; Englewood, NJ, USA) to calculate and determine meta-analytic findings. We calculated individual effect sizes based on either (a) force differences between the active stimulation and sham control groups at posttest or (b) force change in the active stimulation group from pretest to posttest. In both cases, we confirmed: (a) no significant force difference between active stimulation and sham control groups at pretest and (b) no significant force improvement in the sham control groups from pretest to posttest. Tables 1 and 2 summarize the stroke participants' information as well as tDCS and rTMS intervention parameters. Table 3 displays statistical summary data including force outcome measures, individual weighted effect sizes, confidence intervals, standardized effect size, Q statistic,  $I^2$ ,  $T^2$ , and Egger's regression intercept. In addition, for methodological quality assessment, we determined PEDro scores for each study [57].

Concerning the model selected for analyses, Borenstein and colleagues suggested that a fixed effect meta-analysis assumes that all

studies included in the analysis are identical and have a common effect size [31]. In contrast, a random effects meta-analysis posits that effect sizes differ as a function of some causes (e.g., participants or rehabilitation protocols) and no common effect size appears across studies. Indeed, when we include studies from the published literature, the random effects model is more appropriate than the fixed effect model because (a) each study's weight is more balanced and (b) the wider standard error and confidence level of the summary effect. Thus, consistent with these conventional recommendations by a distinguished group of meta-analytic experts [31,32], we conducted random effects meta-analyses.

### Measuring heterogeneity and publication bias

Quantifying heterogeneity between comparisons involved three metrics: (a) Cochran's Q, (b)  $T^2$  (estimate of tau-squared), and (c) Higgins and Green's  $I^2$  [58,59]. Cochran's Q is a statistical test showing the extent of heterogeneity based on a p-value. Given that the null hypothesis is that the treatments are equally effective, a p-value less than 0.05 indicates heterogeneity between studies. The second heterogeneity test,  $T^2$ , is an estimate of variance of the observed effects with weights assigned in a random effects model [31]. A  $T^2$  value greater than 1.0 indicates substantial heterogeneity with greater variance between studies. Finally,  $I^2$  quantifies the percentage of the heterogeneity in the outcome measures used in the meta-analysis. An  $I^2$  value of greater than 50% indicates substantial heterogeneity and findings should be interpreted cautiously.

Further, traditional procedures for estimating publication bias include funnel plots and Egger's regression test [31,59–63]. Based on three conventional steps, we estimated publication bias by (a) a funnel plot displaying standardized mean differences versus standard error for each comparison (i.e., symmetry of studies), (b) a corrected funnel plot with imputed values after applying the trim and fill technique (i.e., comparing an original standardized effect size with corrected standardized effect size), and (c) Egger's regression

**Table 2**  
Stimulation protocols.

Study	Limb	Treatment	Session	Active stim.	Site	Parameter setup
Au-Yeung et al. [34]	UE	tDCS only	1	atDCS, ctDCS	M1 <sup>hand</sup>	1 mA, 35 cm <sup>2</sup> , 20 min
Avenanti et al. [44]	UE	rTMS before PT	10	L-rTMS (1 Hz)	M1 <sup>hand</sup>	90% RMT, 1500 pulses, 25 min
Bolognini et al. [56]	UE	tDCS during CIMT	10	Bi tDCS	M1 <sup>hand</sup>	2 mA, 35 cm <sup>2</sup> , 40 min
Cha et al. [35]	UE	tDCS after MT	20	atDCS	M1 <sup>hand</sup>	1 mA, 35 cm <sup>2</sup> , 20 min
Cha and Kim [55]	UE	rTMS before MT	20	L-rTMS (1 Hz)	M1 <sup>hand</sup>	90% RMT, 1200 pulses, 10 min
Chang et al. [45]	UE	rTMS before MT	10	H-rTMS (10 Hz)	M1 <sup>hand</sup>	90% RMT, 20 pulses × 50 trains, ITI = 55 s
Conforto et al. [46]	UE	rTMS before MT	10	L-rTMS (1 Hz)	M1 <sup>hand</sup>	90% RMT, 1500 pulses, 25 min
Di Lazzaro et al. [38]	UE	tDCS during CIMT	5	Bi tDCS	M1 <sup>hand</sup>	2 mA, 35 cm <sup>2</sup> , 40 min
Hummel et al. [36]	UE	tDCS only	1	atDCS	M1 <sup>hand</sup>	1 mA, 25 cm <sup>2</sup> , 20 min
Khedr et al. [47]	UE	rTMS <sup>NR</sup> and MT	5	L-rTMS (1 Hz)	M1 <sup>hand</sup>	100% RMT, 900 pulses, 15 min
				H-rTMS (3 Hz)	M1 <sup>hand</sup>	130% RMT, 30 pulses × 30 trains, ITI = 2 s
Khedr et al. [48]	UE	rTMS <sup>NR</sup> and MT	5	H-rTMS (3 Hz)	M1 <sup>hand</sup>	120% RMT, 300 pulses
Khedr et al. [54]	UE	rTMS <sup>NR</sup> and MT	5	H-rTMS (3 Hz)	M1 <sup>hand</sup>	130% RMT, 750 pulses
				H-rTMS (10 Hz)	M1 <sup>hand</sup>	100% RMT, 750 pulses
Khedr et al. [37]	UE	tDCS before MT	6	atDCS, ctDCS	M1 <sup>hand</sup>	2 mA, 35 cm <sup>2</sup> , 25 min
Pomeroy et al. [49]	UE	VMC / rTMS before MT	8	L-rTMS (1 Hz)	M1 <sup>hand</sup>	120% RMT, 200 pulses
Rose et al. [50]	UE	rTMS after MT	16	L-rTMS (1 Hz)	M1 <sup>hand</sup>	100% RMT, 1200 pulses
Sasaki et al. [51]	UE	rTMS <sup>NR</sup> and MT	5	L-rTMS (1 Hz)	M1 <sup>hand</sup>	90% RMT, 1800 pulses, 30 min
				H-rTMS (10 Hz)	M1 <sup>hand</sup>	90% RMT, 1000 pulses, ITI = 50 s
Sattler et al. [39]	UE	tDCS + rPNS before OT	5	atDCS	M1 <sup>hand</sup>	1.2 mA, 35 cm <sup>2</sup> , 13 min
Sohn et al. [40]	LE	tDCS only	1	atDCS	M1 <sup>leg</sup>	2 mA, 25 cm <sup>2</sup> , 10 min
Stagg et al. [41]	UE	tDCS <sup>NR</sup> and RT	1	atDCS, ctDCS	M1 <sup>hand</sup>	1 mA, 35 cm <sup>2</sup> , 20 min
Takeuchi et al. [52]	UE	rTMS after force practice	1	L-rTMS (1 Hz)	M1 <sup>hand</sup>	90% RMT, 1500 pulses, 25 min
Takeuchi et al. [53]	UE	rTMS before MT	1	L-rTMS (1 Hz)	M1 <sup>hand</sup>	90% RMT, 1500 pulses, 25 min
Tanaka et al. [42]	LE	tDCS only	1	atDCS	M1 <sup>leg</sup>	2 mA, 35 cm <sup>2</sup> , 10 min
Viana et al. [43]	UE	tDCS during VRT	15	atDCS	M1 <sup>hand</sup>	2 mA, 35 cm <sup>2</sup> , 13 min

Abbreviations: atDCS: anodal transcranial direct current stimulation; Bi: bilateral (anodal + cathodal); ctDCS: cathodal transcranial direct current stimulation; CIMT: constraint-induced movement therapy; H-rTMS: high frequency of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation; ITI: intertrain interval; LE: lower extremity; L-rTMS: low frequency of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation; M1: primary motor cortex; MT: motor training; NR: timing of stimulation was not reported; OT: occupational therapy; PT: physical therapy; RMT: resting motor threshold; rPNS: repetitive peripheral nerve stimulation; tDCS: transcranial direct current stimulation; RT: response time task; UE: upper extremity; VMC: voluntary muscle contraction; VRT: virtual reality therapy.

Note: Stimulation site: anodal tDCS or high frequency rTMS on ipsilesional hemisphere; cathodal tDCS or low frequency rTMS on contralesional hemisphere; bilateral tDCS (anodal + cathodal).

test identifying the relationship between actual effect sizes and standard error values (i.e., precision). A significant intercept ( $\beta_0$ ) indicates high publication bias.

## Results

### Standardized mean difference effect

A random effects model meta-analysis on the 29 comparisons revealed a significant overall standardized mean difference effect (effect size:  $ES = 0.55$ ;  $SE = 0.07$ ; 95%  $CI = 0.41–0.69$ ;  $p < 0.0001$ ;  $Z = 7.84$ ). This cumulative effect size value indicates a medium positive effect [31,64]. Table 3 shows the individual weighted effects for each comparison. Details for calculating an individual effect size are shown in the Supplementary Data Table 1. The effect sizes ranged from  $-0.57$  to  $1.51$  (Fig. 2). Given that two comparisons were greater than two standard deviations beyond the standardized mean effect size [49,53], we conducted an initial subsequent analysis after removing the two outliers. This analysis revealed that the standardized effect was still nearly the same medium value ( $ES = 0.545$ ;  $SE = 0.072$ ; 95%  $CI = 0.405–0.685$ ;  $p < 0.0001$ ;  $Z = 7.61$ ) as the original analysis. These findings indicate that the tDCS or rTMS protocols improved paretic limb force production post stroke.

### Heterogeneity and publication bias

Variability calculations on the 29 comparisons showed low heterogeneity ( $Q$  statistic = 27.91,  $p = 0.47$ ;  $T^2 = 0.00$ ;  $I^2 = 0.00\%$ ; see Table 3). An original funnel plot indicate a slightly asymmetrical distribution of the effect sizes (white circles) over the comparison studies. Moreover, imputing only two values (black circles) on the

lower left side of the original funnel plot created a symmetrical distribution [61]. As shown in Fig. 3, the trim and fill technique revealed a relatively identical standardized effect size (black diamond) in comparison to the original effect size (white diamond). Further, Egger's regression analysis failed to identify a significant intercept ( $\beta_0 = -0.01$ ;  $p = 0.99$ ) indicating no relationship between the actual effect sizes and standard error (precision). Thus, we are confident in stating that there was minimal publication bias in our 29 comparisons.

### Methodological quality


As shown in the Supplementary Data Table 2, each of the 23 studies included in our meta-analysis used random assignment (18 parallel group design studies and five cross-over design studies) and a sham control group. The PEDro scores ranged from 5 to 11 (mean = 8.3 and  $SD = 1.7$ ). Note that a higher score indicates better methodological quality in the study. The calculated mean of PEDro score revealed good overall quality across 23 studies included in this meta-analysis.

### Moderator variable analyses

#### tDCS versus rTMS

The first moderator variable analysis determined the contribution of the tDCS and rTMS protocols to paretic limb force production post stroke. This subgroup analysis revealed two significant standardized effect sizes: (a) 14 tDCS comparisons:  $ES = 0.44$ ;  $SE = 0.10$ ; 95%  $CI = 0.25–0.64$ ;  $p < 0.0001$ ;  $Z = 4.48$ ;  $T^2 = 0.00$ ;  $I^2 = 0.00\%$  and (b) 15 rTMS comparisons:  $ES = 0.66$ ;  $SE = 0.10$ ; 95%  $CI = 0.45–0.86$ ;  $p < 0.0001$ ;  $Z = 6.35$ ;  $T^2 = 0.01$ ;  $I^2 = 6.47\%$ . These findings indicate that






**Figure 2.** Meta-analysis forest plot of the effects of tDCS and rTMS on paretic limb force. Data derived from a random effects model. Each line and tick mark represents an individual effect size (alphabetical order same as Table 3). The red diamond indicates a standardized effect size (0.55). Circles indicate tDCS, squares denote rTMS, and colors indicate phase of recovery (white: acute, blue: subacute, and black: chronic).

**Table 3**  
Meta-analysis force production capabilities results.

Study	Outcome measure	Ctrl / Rx (N)	SMD	95% CI	Relative weight		
Au-Yeung et al. [34]	Pinch force* (pre vs. post-atDCS)	10	0.32	−0.34 0.93	4.7		
	Pinch force* (pre vs. post-ctDCS)	10	0.32	−0.64 0.60	4.9		
Avenanti et al. [44]	Tip-pinch force* (sham vs. L-rTMS at post)	14 / 8	0.47	0.15 2.00	2.2		
Bolognini et al. [56]	Grip force* (sham vs. bi tDCS at post)	7 / 7	0.54	−1.23 0.87	1.7		
Cha et al. [35]	Grip force* (sham vs. atDCS at post)	10 / 10	0.45	−0.61 1.15	2.4		
Cha and Kim [55]	Grip force* (sham vs. L-rTMS at post)	15 / 15	0.37	−0.12 1.35	3.5		
Chang et al. [45]	Grip force <sup>NR</sup> (pre vs. post-H-rTMS)	18	0.25	0.01 0.99	7.9		
Conforto et al. [46]	Pinch force* (pre vs. post-L-rTMS)	15	0.30	0.22 1.38	5.6		
Di Lazzaro et al. [38]	Grip force <sup>NR</sup> (sham vs. bi tDCS at post)	10 / 10	0.45	−0.68 1.08	2.5		
Hummel et al. [36]	Pinch force* (pre vs. post-atDCS)	11	0.32	−0.18 1.05	5.0		
Khedr et al. [47]	Grip force <sup>#</sup> (sham vs. H-rTMS at post)	12 / 12	0.42	−0.19 1.44	2.8		
	Grip force <sup>#</sup> (sham vs. L-rTMS at post)	12 / 12	0.44	0.32 2.06	2.5		
Khedr et al. [48]	Grip force <sup>#</sup> (sham vs. H-rTMS at post)	12 / 14	0.40	−0.18 1.39	3.0		
Khedr et al. [54]	Grip force <sup>&amp;</sup> (sham vs. 3 Hz H-rTMS at post)	13 / 12	0.42	0.08 1.72	2.8		
	Grip force <sup>&amp;</sup> (sham vs. 10 Hz H-rTMS at post)	13 / 13	0.40	−0.12 1.46	3.0		
Khedr et al. [37]	Grip force <sup>#</sup> (sham vs. atDCS at post)	13 / 14	0.40	0.03 1.60	3.1		
	Grip force <sup>#</sup> (sham vs. ctDCS at post)	13 / 13	0.41	0.10 1.72	2.9		
Pomeroy et al. [49]	Elbow flexion torque* (sham + VMC vs. L-rTMS + VMC)	7 / 6	0.57	−1.68 0.54	1.5		
Rose et al. [50]	Grip force* (sham vs. L-rTMS at post)	10 / 9	0.46	−1.05 0.76	2.3		
Sasaki et al. [51]	Grip force* (pre vs. post-L-rTMS)	11	0.33	0.02 1.33	4.4		
	Grip force* (pre vs. post-H-rTMS)	9	0.38	0.03 1.51	3.4		
Sattler et al. [39]	Grip force* (sham + rPNS vs. atDCS + rPNS at post)	10 / 10	0.46	−0.31 1.48	2.4		
Sohn et al. [40]	Knee extension torque* (sham vs. atDCS at post)	11 / 11	0.33	0.02 1.33	4.4		
Stagg et al. [41]	Grip force* (sham vs. atDCS at post)	13 / 13	0.29	−0.08 1.07	5.7		
	Grip force* (sham vs. ctDCS at post)	13 / 13	0.29	−0.08 1.07	5.7		
Takeuchi et al. [52]	Pinch force* (sham vs. L-rTMS at post)	10 / 10	0.45	−0.55 1.21	2.4		
Takeuchi et al. [53]	Pinch force* (pre vs. post-L-rTMS)	10	0.46	0.60 2.42	2.3		
Tanaka et al. [42]	Knee extension torque* (sham vs. atDCS at post)	8 / 8	0.47	0.32 2.16	2.2		
Viana et al. [43]	Grip force* (sham vs. atDCS at post)	10 / 10	0.45	−0.85 0.90	2.5		
Model	Standardized effect size	SE	95% CI	Q statistic	T <sup>2</sup>	I <sup>2</sup>	Egger's regression (β <sub>0</sub> )
Random	0.55	0.07	0.41 – 0.69	27.91 (p = 0.47)	0.00	0.00	−0.01 (p = 0.99)

Abbreviations: atDCS: anodal transcranial direct current stimulation; bi: bilateral (anodal + cathodal or high + low frequency); CI: confidence interval; ctDCS: cathodal transcranial direct current stimulation; H-rTMS: high frequency of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation; L-rTMS: low frequency of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation; rPNS: repetitive peripheral nerve stimulation; SE: standard error; VMC: voluntary muscle contraction.

Note: Force measurement: \*, dynamometer; †, load cell; #, Medical Research Council Scale; ‡, Hemispheric Stroke Scale; and <sup>NR</sup>, not reported.



**Figure 3.** Funnel plots of the comparisons for random effects model. The x-axis indicates the standardized difference in means and the y-axis shows the standard error associated with each comparison. The white diamond on the x-axis indicates a standardized effect size with our original 29 comparisons and the black diamond indicates a revised standardized effect size after the trim and fill technique.

both tDCS and rTMS protocols facilitated force production capabilities post stroke.

#### Stimulation protocols

A second moderator variable analysis compared the effect of three sets of stimulation protocols on force production capabilities post stroke: (a) anodal tDCS stimulation or high frequency rTMS on M1 of ipsilesional hemisphere (increasing brain activation), (b) cathodal tDCS stimulation or low frequency rTMS on M1 of contralesional hemisphere (decreasing brain activation), and (c) bilateral (anodal + cathodal) tDCS or bilateral (low:  $\leq 1$  Hz + high:  $> 1$  Hz frequency) rTMS. Fifteen comparisons that used stimulation on the ipsilesional hemisphere revealed a significant standardized  $ES = 0.57$  ( $SE = 0.09$ ; 95%  $CI = 0.38–0.75$ ;  $p < 0.0001$ ;  $Z = 6.01$ ;  $I^2 = 0.00\%$ ;  $T^2 = 0.00$ ). Twelve comparisons that used stimulation on the contralesional hemisphere showed a significant standardized  $ES = 0.58$  ( $SE = 0.15$ ; 95%  $CI = 0.29–0.87$ ;  $p < 0.0001$ ;  $Z = 3.94$ ;  $T^2 = 0.11$ ;  $I^2 = 41.85\%$ ). Given only two comparisons in our meta-analysis used stimulations on bilateral hemispheres, we did not calculate a bilateral stimulation effect size. Together, the tDCS or rTMS protocols on ipsilesional and contralesional hemispheres improved force production in stroke survivors.

#### Recovery stages

A third moderator variable analysis focused on the three post stroke recovery stages: acute ( $< 1$  month), subacute (1 month–6 months), and chronic ( $> 6$  month). This classification is based on conventional and traditional recovery stages [65]. The analysis revealed significant standardized effect sizes for each recovery stage: (a) 11 acute comparisons ( $ES = 0.72$ ;  $SE = 0.12$ ; 95%  $CI = 0.48–0.96$ ;  $p < 0.0001$ ;  $Z = 5.90$ ;  $T^2 = 0.00$ ;  $I^2 = 0.00\%$ ), (b) five subacute comparisons ( $ES = 0.54$ ;  $SE = 0.16$ ; 95%  $CI = 0.22–0.86$ ;  $p < 0.0001$ ;  $Z = 3.31$ ;  $T^2 = 0.02$ ;  $I^2 = 16.73\%$ ), and (c) 13 chronic comparisons ( $ES = 0.43$ ;  $SE = 0.13$ ; 95%  $CI = 0.18–0.68$ ;  $p = 0.001$ ;  $Z = 3.40$ ;  $T^2 = 0.05$ ;  $I^2 = 26.94\%$ ). Positive effects of tDCS or rTMS protocols on force production capabilities on the paretic limb appeared in each of three post stroke recovery stages.

#### Potential confounds: motor training, session number, and effect size calculation

We addressed three additional issues that may influence the rehabilitative effects of the two selected NIBS techniques: (a) NIBS combined with motor training (NIBS only versus NIBS with motor training), (b) number of stimulation sessions (single session versus multiple sessions), and (c) method used in calculating individual effect sizes (between-group difference at posttest versus within-group difference from pretest to posttest). Both NIBS only and NIBS combined with motor training conditions revealed significant standardized effect sizes: (a) four NIBS only comparisons ( $ES = 0.45$ ;  $SE = 0.18$ ; 95%  $CI = 0.09–0.81$ ;  $p = 0.014$ ;  $Z = 2.46$ ;  $T^2 = 0.05$ ;  $I^2 = 29.81\%$ ) and (b) 24 NIBS combined with motor training ( $ES = 0.58$ ;  $SE = 0.08$ ; 95%  $CI = 0.43–0.74$ ;  $p < 0.0001$ ;  $Z = 7.36$ ;  $T^2 = 0.00$ ;  $I^2 = 0.00\%$ ). Nine single session comparisons revealed a significant standardized  $ES = 0.53$  ( $SE = 0.14$ ; 95%  $CI = 0.26–0.79$ ;  $p < 0.0001$ ;  $Z = 3.91$ ;  $I^2 = 26.00\%$ ;  $T^2 = 0.04$ ). Twenty multi-session comparisons showed a significant standardized  $ES = 0.57$  ( $SE = 0.09$ ; 95%  $CI = 0.40–0.75$ ;  $p < 0.0001$ ;  $Z = 6.46$ ;  $T^2 = 0.00$ ;  $I^2 = 0.00\%$ ). Moreover, 21 comparisons that reported between-group differences at the posttest revealed a significant standardized  $ES = 0.55$  ( $SE = 0.09$ ; 95%  $CI = 0.38–0.73$ ;  $p < 0.0001$ ;  $Z = 6.18$ ;  $I^2 = 0.00\%$ ;  $T^2 = 0.00$ ). Eight comparisons that reported within-group differences from pretest to posttest showed a significant standardized  $ES = 0.56$  ( $SE = 0.13$ ; 95%  $CI = 0.30–0.82$ ;  $p < 0.0001$ ;  $Z = 4.17$ ;  $T^2 = 0.04$ ;  $I^2 = 26.74\%$ ). The effect of NIBS techniques on paretic limb force was comparable under additional motor training conditions, different number of stimulation sessions, and method in calculating individual effect sizes.

#### Discussion

The current meta-analysis investigated the effects of two NIBS techniques (i.e., tDCS and rTMS) on a common motor outcome measure, paretic limb force production in stroke survivors. All 23 studies included in our meta-analysis used random assignment and a sham control group. Twenty-nine total comparisons from 23 studies confirmed that both NIBS techniques improved force production ca-

pabilities in stroke survivors. Moderator variable analyses focused on tDCS versus rTMS comparisons, two sets of stimulation protocols (i.e., increasing cortical excitability in the ipsilesional hemisphere or decreasing cortical excitability in the contralesional hemisphere), and three post stroke recovery stages (i.e., acute, subacute, and chronic). Each of the moderator variable analyses revealed positive effects of tDCS or rTMS protocols on paretic limb force.

Importantly, treatment effects of two NIBS techniques (i.e., tDCS or rTMS) administered to 530 stroke individuals revealed positive effects on paretic limb force production as indicated by a significant medium standardized effect size (0.55). In addition, a moderator variable analysis on tDCS versus rTMS supported a conclusion that both tDCS ( $ES = 0.44$ ) and rTMS ( $ES = 0.66$ ) improved capabilities to generate force. Restoring paretic limb force during rehabilitation is crucial for executing successful movements and improving activities of daily living post stroke [1,18,66]. Given that all 29 comparisons are related to the magnitude of force production (i.e., muscle strength), improvements in force production as shown by the current robust meta-analysis indicate increased muscle strength in the paretic limbs. Thus, cumulative findings indicate that tDCS and rTMS interventions may facilitate motor rehabilitation including recovery of muscle strength in the paretic limbs.

Two sets of stimulation protocols across tDCS and rTMS revealed positive significant effect sizes. Increasing cortical excitability in the ipsilesional hemisphere (via anodal tDCS and high frequency rTMS) and decreasing cortical excitability in the contralesional hemisphere (via cathodal tDCS and low frequency rTMS) improved paretic limb force production. These findings are interpreted as support for an assumption of the interhemispheric competition theory for stroke motor recovery [20,21]. That is, balanced cortical activities between hemispheres after NIBS techniques may contribute to motor improvements (e.g., force production capabilities) [67]. Further, these meta-analytic findings were consistent with previous systematic reviews and meta-analyses that reported benefits of the NIBS techniques on stroke motor function assessed by various clinical assessments [25,26,28]. Thus, the present findings extended the positive effects of NIBS techniques on stroke motor recovery as indicated by quantifying a common outcome measure, paretic limb force production.

Benefits of the two NIBS techniques on paretic limb force production appeared in each of the three post stroke recovery stages: acute, subacute, and chronic. Although several previous systematic reviews and meta-analyses reported positive effects of NIBS techniques on motor functions for the chronic stage post stroke [27,68], our findings indicate that tDCS and/or rTMS improved muscle strength in paretic limbs in each of the three recovery stages. One possible interpretation of these findings indicates that the positive effect of NIBS techniques on stroke motor rehabilitation may occur for individuals at the two initial recovery phases (i.e., acute and subacute) post stroke as well as the chronic stage. Stinear and Byblow argued that progress toward motor recovery may be advanced when patients received rehabilitation protocols within six months after a stroke, during the spontaneous recovery period [69]. Specifically, the effects of neuromodulation interventions on neural plasticity and reorganization of brain activation between hemispheres may increase during the spontaneous recovery period in comparison to the chronic stage [69,70]. Thus, further studies investigating the different effects of NIBS techniques based on post stroke recovery stages will be necessary.

Moreover, focusing on force production as a common motor function outcome measure minimized the level of heterogeneity in the current meta-analysis ( $Q$  statistic = 27.91 and  $p = 0.47$ ;  $T^2 = 0.00$ ;  $I^2 = 0.00\%$ ). Higgins and Green reported that statistical heterogeneity (i.e., variability of effect sizes across divergent studies) increases because of diversity in clinical interventions or methodologies in

single studies [59]. That is, comparing findings from different outcome measures may cause an underestimating or overestimating of treatment effects in a meta-analysis [23]. However, despite the small amount of heterogeneity across our qualified studies, the random effects model further minimized the statistical heterogeneity issues surrounding standardized effect sizes [31]. Together, our random effects model meta-analyses on paretic limb force production effectively support the conclusion that tDCS or rTMS techniques show positive effects on stroke motor rehabilitation while minimizing heterogeneity.

Two limitations are noted. First, the current meta-analysis included either flexor strength in the upper limbs or extensors strength in the lower limbs that may have different level of spasticity. More spasticity typically appears in flexors than extensors [71]. Second, given that the only two lower limb studies were included in this meta-analysis, the positive effects of NIBS techniques on lower limb strength should be treated with caution.

Although we showed clinically positive effects of tDCS and rTMS on paretic limb force, high inter-individual variability in response to NIBS techniques has been observed [23]. To minimize inter-individual variability, developing individualized stimulation intensities is necessary. Priori, Hallett, and Rothwell reported that individualized intensities of tDCS and rTMS may contribute to increasing rehabilitation effects [72]. Indeed, Miranda, Lomarev, and Hallett argued that constant stimulation intensities across individuals who have diverse anatomical brain structures (e.g., scalp and/or skull thickness) may cause different current flows to the brain [73]. A consequence is an increasing inter-individual variability and potentially adverse effects (e.g., painful stimulation). However, individualized intensities based on a spherical model of the head (e.g., modeling by scalp and skull thickness) can provide relatively equivalent current flow to each individual, and contribute to minimizing inter-individual variability and painful stimulation [73].

Moreover, increasing interconnectivity between brain regions may be considered to optimize the efficacy of both NIBS techniques. tDCS and rTMS administered on M1 are known to facilitate local changes in M1 as well as distant changes in interconnected brain regions (i.e., premotor cortex and supplementary motor area) [22]. Given that an increased interconnectivity between M1 and other brain regions improved paretic limb functions [74], one promising stroke motor rehabilitation approach would be investigating the effects of anodal tDCS or high frequency rTMS stimulation on multiple motor areas (i.e., M1, premotor cortex, and supplementary motor area) within the ipsilesional hemisphere.

## Funding

None.

## Appendix: Supplementary material

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at doi:10.1016/j.brs.2016.05.005.

## References

- [1] Kang N, Cauraugh JH. Force control in chronic stroke. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 2015;52:38–48.
- [2] Stinear JW, Byblow WD. Rhythmic bilateral movement training modulates corticomotor excitability and enhances upper limb motricity poststroke: a pilot study. *J Clin Neurophysiol* 2004;21:124–31.
- [3] Cruz EG, Waldinger HC, Kamper DG. Kinetic and kinematic workspaces of the index finger following stroke. *Brain* 2005;128:1112–21.
- [4] Elliott D, Hansen S, Grierson LEM, Lyons J, Bennett SJ, Hayes SJ. Goal-directed aiming: two components but multiple processes. *Psychol Bull* 2010;136:1023–44.

- [5] Lodha N, Coombes SA, Cauraugh JH. Bimanual isometric force control: asymmetry and coordination evidence post stroke. *Clin Neurophysiol* 2012;123:787–95.
- [6] Ye Y, Ma L, Yan T, Liu H, Wei X, Song R. Kinetic measurements of hand motor impairments after mild to moderate stroke using grip control tasks. *J Neuroeng Rehabil* 2014;11:84.
- [7] Lindberg PG, Roche N, Robertson J, Roby-Brami A, Bussel B, Maier MA. Affected and unaffected quantitative aspects of grip force control in hemiparetic patients after stroke. *Brain Res* 2012;1452:96–107.
- [8] Suresh N, Li X, Zhou P, Rymer WZ. Examination of motor unit control properties in stroke survivors using surface EMG decomposition: a preliminary report. *Conf Proc IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc* 2011;2011:8243–6.
- [9] Conwit RA, Stashuk D, Tracy B, McHugh M, Brown WF, Metter EJ. The relationship of motor unit size, firing rate and force. *Clin Neurophysiol* 1999;110:1270–5.
- [10] Carey JR, Kimberley TJ, Lewis SM, Auerbach EJ, Dorsey L, Rundquist P, et al. Analysis of fMRI and finger tracking training in subjects with chronic stroke. *Brain* 2002;125:773–88.
- [11] Cauraugh JH, Coombes SA, Lodha N, Naik SK, Summers JJ. Upper extremity improvements in chronic stroke: coupled bilateral load training. *Restor Neurol Neurosci* 2009;27:17–25.
- [12] Pinter D, Pegritz S, Pargfrieder C, Reiter G, Wurm W, Gattringer T, et al. Exploratory study on the effects of a robotic hand rehabilitation device on changes in grip strength and brain activity after stroke. *Top Stroke Rehabil* 2013;20:308–16.
- [13] Krebs HI, Krams M, Agrafiotis DK, DiBernardo A, Chavez JC, Littman GS, et al. Robotic measurement of arm movements after stroke establishes biomarkers of motor recovery. *Stroke* 2014;45:200–4.
- [14] Krebs HI, Volpe B, Hogan N. A working model of stroke recovery from rehabilitation robotics practitioners. *J Neuroeng Rehabil* 2009;6:6.
- [15] Patten C, Condliffe EG, Dairaghi CA, Lum PS. Concurrent neuromechanical and functional gains following upper-extremity power training post-stroke. *J Neuroeng Rehabil* 2013;10:1.
- [16] Tarkka IM, Pitkanen K, Popovic DB, Vanninen R, Kononen M. Functional electrical therapy for hemiparesis alleviates disability and enhances neuroplasticity. *Tohoku J Exp Med* 2011;225:71–6.
- [17] Mark VW, Taub E, Morris DM. Neuroplasticity and constraint-induced movement therapy. *Eura Medicophys* 2006;42:269–84.
- [18] Harris JE, Eng JJ. Paretic upper-limb strength best explains arm activity in people with stroke. *Phys Ther* 2007;87:88–97.
- [19] Nitsche MA, Paulus W. Excitability changes induced in the human motor cortex by weak transcranial direct current stimulation. *J Physiol* 2000;527:633–9.
- [20] Nowak DA, Grefkes C, Ameli M, Fink GR. Interhemispheric competition after stroke: brain stimulation to enhance recovery of function of the affected hand. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair* 2009;23:641–56.
- [21] Murase N, Duque J, Mazzocchio R, Cohen LG. Influence of interhemispheric interactions on motor function in chronic stroke. *Ann Neurol* 2004;55:400–9.
- [22] Brunoni AR, Nitsche MA, Bolognini N, Bikson M, Wagner T, Merabet L, et al. Clinical research with transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS): challenges and future directions. *Brain Stimul* 2012;5:175–95.
- [23] Di Pino G, Pellegrino G, Assenza G, Capone F, Ferreri F, Formica D, et al. Modulation of brain plasticity in stroke: a novel model for neurorehabilitation. *Nat Rev Neurol* 2014;10:597–608.
- [24] Nitsche MA, Paulus W. Sustained excitability elevations induced by transcranial dc motor cortex stimulation in humans. *Neurology* 2001;57:1899–901.
- [25] Adeyemo BO, Simis M, Macea DD, Fregni F. Systematic review of parameters of stimulation, clinical trial design characteristics, and motor outcomes in non-invasive brain stimulation in stroke. *Front Psychiatry* 2012;3:88.
- [26] Elsner B, Kugler J, Pohl M, Mehrholz J. Transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) for improving function and activities of daily living in patients after stroke. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2013;(11):CD009645.
- [27] Marquez J, Van Vliet P, McElduff P, Lagopoulos J, Parsons M. Transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS): does it have merit in stroke rehabilitation? A systematic review. *Int J Stroke* 2015;10:306–16.
- [28] Hsu WY, Cheng CH, Liao KK, Lee IH, Lin YY. Effects of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation on motor functions in patients with stroke: a meta-analysis. *Stroke* 2012;43:1849–57.
- [29] Chhatbar PY, Feng WW. Data synthesis in meta-analysis may conclude differently on cognitive effect from transcranial direct current stimulation. *Brain Stimul* 2015;8:974–6.
- [30] Rhodes KM, Turner RM, Higgins JP. Empirical evidence about inconsistency among studies in a pair-wise meta-analysis. *Res Synth Methods* 2015;doi:10.1002/jrsm.1193.
- [31] Borenstein M, Hedges LV, Higgins JPT, Rothstein HR. Introduction to meta-analysis. New York: Wiley; 2009.
- [32] Cumming G. Understanding the new statistics: effect sizes, confidence intervals, and meta-analysis. New York: Routledge; 2012.
- [33] Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the prisma statement. *BMJ* 2009;339:b2535.
- [34] Au-Yeung SS, Wang J, Chen Y, Chua E. Transcranial direct current stimulation to primary motor area improves hand dexterity and selective attention in chronic stroke. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil* 2014;93:1057–64.
- [35] Cha HK, Ji SG, Kim MK, Chang JS. Effect of transcranial direct current stimulation of function in patients with stroke. *J Phys Ther Sci* 2014;26:363–5.
- [36] Hummel FC, Voller B, Celnik P, Floel A, Giraux P, Gerloff C, et al. Effects of brain polarization on reaction times and pinch force in chronic stroke. *BMC Neurosci* 2006;7:73.
- [37] Khedr EM, Shawky OA, El-Hammady DH, Rothwell JC, Darwish ES, Mostafa OM, et al. Effect of anodal versus cathodal transcranial direct current stimulation on stroke rehabilitation: a pilot randomized controlled trial. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair* 2013;27:592–601.
- [38] Di Lazzaro VD, Dileone M, Capone F, Pellegrino G, Ranieri F, Musumeci G, et al. Immediate and late modulation of interhemispheric imbalance with bilateral transcranial direct current stimulation in acute stroke. *Brain Stimul* 2014;7:841–8.
- [39] Sattler V, Acket B, Raposo N, Albucher JF, Thalame C, Loubinoux I, et al. Anodal tDCS combined with radial nerve stimulation promotes hand motor recovery in the acute phase after ischemic stroke. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair* 2015;29:743–54.
- [40] Sohn MK, Jee SJ, Kim YW. Effect of transcranial direct current stimulation on postural stability and lower extremity strength in hemiplegic stroke patients. *Ann Rehabil Med* 2013;37:759–65.
- [41] Stagg CJ, Bachtar V, O'Shea J, Allman C, Bosnell RA, Kischka U, et al. Cortical activation changes underlying stimulation-induced behavioural gains in chronic stroke. *Brain* 2012;135:276–84.
- [42] Tanaka S, Takeda K, Otaka Y, Kita K, Osu R, Honda M, et al. Single session of transcranial direct current stimulation transiently increases knee extensor force in patients with hemiparetic stroke. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair* 2011;25:565–9.
- [43] Viana RT, Laurentino GE, Souza RJ, Fonseca JB, Silva Filho EM, Dias SN, et al. Effects of the addition of transcranial direct current stimulation to virtual reality therapy after stroke: a pilot randomized controlled trial. *Neurorehabilitation* 2014;34:437–46.
- [44] Avenanti A, Coccia M, Ladavas E, Provinciali L, Ceravolo MG. Low-frequency rTMS promotes use-dependent motor plasticity in chronic stroke: a randomized trial. *Neurology* 2012;78:256–64.
- [45] Chang WH, Kim YH, Bang OY, Kim ST, Park YH, Lee PK. Long-term effects of rTMS on motor recovery in patients after subacute stroke. *J Rehabil Med* 2010;42:758–64.
- [46] Conforto AB, Anjos SM, Saposnik G, Mello EA, Nagaya EM, Santos W Jr, et al. Transcranial magnetic stimulation in mild to severe hemiparesis early after stroke: a proof of principle and novel approach to improve motor function. *J Neurol* 2012;259:1399–405.
- [47] Khedr EM, Abdel-Fadeil MR, Farghali A, Qaid M. Role of 1 and 3 Hz repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation on motor function recovery after acute ischaemic stroke. *Eur J Neurol* 2009;16:1323–30.
- [48] Khedr EM, Abo-Elfetoh N, Rothwell JC. Treatment of post-stroke dysphagia with repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation. *Acta Neurol Scand* 2009;119:155–61.
- [49] Pomeroy VM, Cloud G, Tallis RC, Donaldson C, Nayak V, Miller S. Transcranial magnetic stimulation and muscle contraction to enhance stroke recovery: a randomized proof-of-principle and feasibility investigation. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair* 2007;21:509–17.
- [50] Rose DK, Patten C, McGuirk TE, Lu X, Triggs WJ. Does inhibitory repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation augment functional task practice to improve arm recovery in chronic stroke? *Stroke Res Treat* 2014;2014:305236.
- [51] Sasaki N, Mizutani S, Kakuda W, Abo M. Comparison of the effects of high- and low-frequency repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation on upper limb hemiparesis in the early phase of stroke. *J Stroke Cerebrovasc Dis* 2013;22:413–18.
- [52] Takeuchi N, Chuma T, Matsuo Y, Watanabe I, Ikoma K. Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation of contralateral primary motor cortex improves hand function after stroke. *Stroke* 2005;36:2681–6.
- [53] Takeuchi N, Tada T, Tushima M, Chuma T, Matsuo Y, Ikoma K. Inhibition of the unaffected motor cortex by 1 Hz repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation enhances motor performance and training effect of the paretic hand in patients with chronic stroke. *J Rehabil Med* 2008;40:298–303.
- [54] Khedr EM, Etraby AE, Hemeda M, Nasef AM, Razeq AA. Long-term effect of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation on motor function recovery after acute ischemic stroke. *Acta Neurol Scand* 2010;121:30–7.
- [55] Cha HG, Kim MK. Effects of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation on arm function and decreasing unilateral spatial neglect in subacute stroke: a randomized controlled trial. *Clin Rehabil* 2015;doi:10.1177/0269215515598817.
- [56] Bolognini N, Vallar G, Casati C, Latif LA, El-Nazer R, Williams J, et al. Neurophysiological and behavioral effects of tDCS combined with constraint-induced movement therapy in poststroke patients. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair* 2011;25:819–29.
- [57] Blobaum P. Physiotherapy evidence database (pedro). *J Med Libr Assoc* 2006;94:477–8.
- [58] Higgins JP, Thompson SG. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. *Stat Med* 2002;21:1539–58.
- [59] Higgins JPT, Green S. *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions 5.1.0 [updated march 2011]*. The Cochrane collaboration, 2011, <http://handbook.cochrane.org/>. 2011 [accessed 27.04.16].
- [60] Rosenthal R. The file drawer problem and tolerance for null results. *Psychol Bull* 1979;86:638–41.
- [61] Duval S, Tweedie R. Trim and fill: a simple funnel-plot-based method of testing and adjusting for publication bias in meta-analysis. *Biometrics* 2000;56:455–63.
- [62] Borenstein M, Higgins JP. Meta-analysis and subgroups. *Prev Sci* 2013;14:134–43.



- [63] Egger M, Davey Smith G, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *BMJ* 1997;315:629–34.
- [64] Rosenthal R, DiMatteo MR. Meta-analysis: recent developments in quantitative methods for literature reviews. *Annu Rev Psychol* 2001;52:59–82.
- [65] Gresham GE, Duncan PW, Stason WB, Adams HP, Adelman AM, Alexander DN, et al. *Post-stroke rehabilitation. Clinical practice guideline, no. 16*. Rockville: US Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Agency for Health Care Policy and Research; 1995.
- [66] Sainburg R, Good D, Przybyla A. Bilateral synergy: a framework for post-stroke rehabilitation. *J Neurol Transl Neurosci* 2013;1:1025.
- [67] Kokotilo KJ, Eng JJ, Boyd LA. Reorganization of brain function during force production after stroke: a systematic review of the literature. *J Neurol Phys Ther* 2009;33:45–54.
- [68] Ludemann-Podubecka J, Bosl K, Rothhardt S, Verheyden G, Nowak DA. Transcranial direct current stimulation for motor recovery of upper limb function after stroke. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 2014;47:245–59.
- [69] Stinear CM, Byblow WD. Predicting and accelerating motor recovery after stroke. *Curr Opin Neurol* 2014;27:624–30.
- [70] Hallett M. Plasticity of the human motor cortex and recovery from stroke. *Brain Res Brain Res Rev* 2001;36:169–74.
- [71] Kamper DG, Harvey RL, Suresh S, Rymer WZ. Relative contributions of neural mechanisms versus muscle mechanics in promoting finger extension deficits following stroke. *Muscle Nerve* 2003;28:309–18.
- [72] Priori A, Hallett M, Rothwell JC. Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation or transcranial direct current stimulation? *Brain Stimul* 2009;2:241–5.
- [73] Miranda PC, Lomarev M, Hallett M. Modeling the current distribution during transcranial direct current stimulation. *Clin Neurophysiol* 2006;117:1623–9.
- [74] Sehm B, Kipping J, Schafer A, Villringer A, Ragert P. A comparison between uni- and bilateral tDCS effects on functional connectivity of the human motor cortex. *Front Hum Neurosci* 2013;7:183.