

# COMPARATIVE EFFECTS OF TASK-ORIENTED PROGRAM AND PROPRIOCEPTIVE TRAINING ON BALANCE, GAIT AND QUALITY OF LIFE IN PATIENTS WITH HEMIPLEGIC STROKE

# MAQBOOL S\*, KAMRAN S, NAZ S, AMJAD A, MAQBOOL T

University of Lahore, Lahore, Pakistan \*Correspondence author email address: saniamaqbool121@gmail.com



### (Received, 27<sup>th</sup> April 2024, Revised 20<sup>th</sup> June 2024, Published 8<sup>th</sup> July 2024)

Abstract: This study compared the effectiveness of a Task-Oriented Program and Proprioceptive Training in improving balance, gait, and quality of life in a specific population. Objective: The objective of this study was to evaluate and compare the outcomes of the Task-Oriented Program and Proprioceptive Training on participants' balance, gait, and quality of life. Methods: The study included two treatment groups: Group A (Task-Oriented Program) and Group B (Proprioceptive Training). The gender distribution and frequencies were assessed within each group. Various variables were measured at different time points, and tests for normality were conducted. Independent samples t-tests were performed to analyze the differences in mean scores between the two groups, **Results:** In Group A, comprising 36 participants, there were 17 males (47,2%) and 19 females (52,8%), while Group B, also with 36 participants, consisted of 16 males (44.4%) and 20 females (55.6%). At baseline, no significant difference was observed in mean Berg Balance Scale (BBS) scores between the two groups. However, after four weeks of intervention, Group A demonstrated significantly higher BBS scores than Group B (mean difference = 6.26, p < 0.001). This trend continued at week 8, with Group A showing a substantial advantage (mean difference = 14.56, p < 0.001). Regarding Motor Assessment Scale (MAS) scores, similar patterns emerged. At baseline, no significant difference was found. Still, after four weeks, Group A had significantly higher MAS scores than Group B (mean difference = 7.21, p < 0.001), which further increased at week 8 (mean difference = 13.88, p < 0.001). Conclusion: The Task-Oriented Program yielded superior outcomes compared to Proprioceptive Training in improving participants' balance, gait, and quality of life, as indicated by significantly higher BBS and MAS scores. These findings highlight the effectiveness of the Task-Oriented Program as an intervention for enhancing balance and motor performance in the specific population studied.

**Keywords:** Task-Oriented Program, Proprioceptive Training, Balance, Gait, Quality of Life, Motor Performance, Berg Balance Scale, Motor Assessment Scale.

### Introduction

A hemiplegic stroke affects one entire side of the body when the brain's blood supply is interrupted or reduced, either by a blood clot (ischemic stroke) or bleeding (hemorrhagic stroke). The stroke leads to loss of voluntary movement, ranging from mild weakness to complete paralysis. (1)Sensory changes, such as numbness or tingling, can affect perception, balance, and coordination, making daily tasks difficult. (2, 3). Speech and language functions may be impaired, leading to aphasia, while cognitive issues like memory loss or concentration problems may occur. (4-6). Emotional impacts, such as depression or anxiety, are common, and rehabilitation must address these alongside physical challenges. (7).

Recovery requires a tailored approach, focusing on physical, sensory, speech, cognitive, and emotional aspects. Rehabilitation typically includes therapies to improve mobility, strength, coordination, speech, and emotional well-being. (8-11). Two common approaches in rehabilitation are task-oriented programs and proprioceptive training. (4, 12-16).

A task-oriented program emphasizes functional tasks relevant to daily life, stimulating the brain's ability to reorganize and create new neural connections. It involves real-life challenges and promoting active participation and engagement in the task. (14, 17, 18)Proprioceptive training enhances body awareness and control by targeting proprioceptive receptors in muscles, tendons, and joints. It includes exercises that improve balance, coordination, and stability. (19-21).

Both approaches can be combined to offer a comprehensive rehabilitation process. They contribute to better movement control, reduced risk of falls, and increased functional abilities. Healthcare professionals should assess and guide individuals in designing personalized rehabilitation task-oriented activities including programs, and proprioceptive training. Research on these approaches is significant for expanding knowledge in rehabilitation, developing evidence-based practices, and improving outcomes for individuals with neurological injuries or conditions. (2, 22, 23). It helps understand recovery mechanisms and guides the development of targeted interventions, ultimately enhancing the quality of life for those undergoing rehabilitation. (24).

Several studies have delved into the impact of various training interventions on rehabilitation, particularly for stroke patients. Research by Ahamad et al. (2019) and Khallaf (2020) emphasize biomechanical similarities between sitting and standing and the benefits of targeted seated training on balance and trunk control (12, 17). Additionally, Wang et al. (2021) show how incorporating cognitive behaviors in task-oriented training can improve walking coordination (10).

Studies by Kim K. J. et al. (2020), Liu et al. (2019), and others illustrate the effectiveness of combined approaches such as muscle strengthening with proprioceptive exercises and cognitive behavioral therapy with task-oriented training. (14, 25). These combined techniques enhance outcomes in functional ankle instability, balance problems, and fear of falling.

However, there is a noticeable lack of comparative studies between interventions like task-oriented training and proprioceptive techniques. Frimpong et al. (2014), Kim et al. (2017), and other works indicate the promise of taskoriented training in improving physical function in stroke survivors. Still, the literature lacks comprehensive comparative research to identify the most effective approach across different domains. (18, 26).

A critical gap in existing research is the comparative effectiveness of task-oriented training and proprioceptive techniques in stroke rehabilitation, particularly regarding their impact on balance, gait, and quality of life. Despite individual studies on these methods, direct comparisons are lacking. Addressing this gap, this study aims to determine the comparative effects of a task-oriented program and proprioceptive training on these aspects in patients with hemiplegic stroke. This research aims to guide evidencebased rehabilitation protocols and recognize the need for individualized, multifaceted treatments considering both cognitive and physical aspects of recovery.

## Methodology

This study was designed as a Randomized Controlled Trial (RCT) carried out within the physical therapy department at the District Headquarters Hospital, Sheikhupura. Conducted over nine months following the approval of the synopsis, the design served as the foundation for assessing the comparative effects of specific treatments in stroke patients. The calculated sample size for the study was initially determined to be 17 participants in each group. However, in alignment with clinical trial guidelines requiring a minimum of 30 participants in each group, the number was increased to 30. To account for a potential 20% dropout rate, the final sample size was adjusted to 36 participants in each group. The sample size calculation utilized the formula n= $2\sigma^2 (Z 1-\alpha/2 + Z 1-\beta)^2/(\mu 1 - \mu 2)^2$ , informed by Ahamad et al., 2019 (12).

The study employed non-probability, purposive sampling, an approach tailored to the specific requirements and objectives of the research.

The population for the study was meticulously selected based on diagnoses by physicians and medical investigations. The subjects were assessed for eligibility according to well-defined inclusion and exclusion criteria. Included were hemiplegic patients aged between 30-70 years, with Mini-Mental Scale Examination (MMSE), scores greater than 18, and who were capable of independent activities of daily life before the stroke. Both male and female patients were considered. Exclusions were made for patients with a history of previous stroke attacks, traumatic head injury, psychological or psychiatric disorders, visual or hearing deficits, recent fractures, or tumors, as documented by Darda et al., 2021 (22). These criteria ensured a coherent, relevant, focused patient sample reflective of the study's objectives.

The study's randomization was conducted using computerized random numbers generated through Excel, a method ensuring automatic concealment of allocation. The single-blinding approach further enhanced the study's credibility; assessors were unaware of the treatment assigned to each group, and participants were instructed not to disclose any details of their assigned treatment. This structure fostered an unbiased evaluation of the interventions.

Participants were divided into two groups: Group A, which received a task-oriented program, and Group B, which focused on proprioceptive training. Both groups also engaged in routine physical therapy as baseline treatment, strengthening exercises, including weight-bearing exercises, and gait training. The total duration of therapy spanned two months (8 weeks), with daily sessions lasting 45 minutes to an hour. Group A's task-oriented training consisted of specific exercises, such as heel lifts, unilateral and bilateral slow arm movements, and exercises on a balance board. Group B's proprioceptive training included balance and leaning exercises, such as forward and backward balance from kneeling and standing on a nonaffected leg. This division facilitated a focused exploration of the comparative effects of task-oriented and proprioceptive techniques.

The study strictly adhered to the ethical principles established by the University of Lahore's ethical committee, ensuring respect for participants' rights. Written informed consent was obtained from all participants, and their understanding and agreement were meticulously confirmed. Confidentiality was maintained, and the information and data collected were treated as private. Participants were informed of the lack of drawbacks or risks, their right to withdraw, potential benefits, and the efforts to preserve their privacy. These measures reflected a commitment to ethical research practices.

The data analysis was executed using SPSS version 25. Quantitative data were presented as mean  $\pm$  standard deviation (SD), and qualitative data were conveyed as frequency and percentage. The normality of the data was assessed, guiding the selection of the appropriate statistical tests. Repeated measure ANOVA was employed to compare the outcome variables before and after the intervention when the data followed a normal distribution, with alternative non-parametric tests used otherwise. The significance level of  $p \le 0.05$  was considered statistically significant, providing a robust framework for interpreting the study's findings.

# Results

In the study, Group A, assigned the Task Oriented Program, consists of 36 participants, 17 males (47.2%) and 19 females (52.8%), with a mean age of 55.83 and a standard deviation of 6.79.

## **Table 1 Comparative Demographics**

Treatment Group	Gender	Frequency (%)	Mean Age	Std. Deviation
Group A: Task-Oriented Program	Male	17 (47.2%)	55.83	6.79

	Female	19 (52.8%)		
Group B: Proprioceptive Training	Male	16 (44.4%)	57.08	6.54
	Female	20 (55.6%)		

Conversely, Group B, undergoing Proprioceptive Training, comprises 36 participants, including 16 males (44.4%) and

20 females (55.6%). The mean age is slightly higher, at 57.08 years, and the standard deviation is 6.54 years.

Scale	Time	Group A (Mean ± SD)	Group B (Mean ± SD)	t-value	Mean Difference	P Value
Berg Balance Scale	Baseline	$27.17 \pm 1.92$	$26.81 \pm 2.03$	0.78	0.36	0.440
	Week 4	$37.36 \pm 2.24$	$33.67 \pm 2.74$	6.26	3.69	0.000
	Week 8	$50.25 \pm 2.18$	$41.06 \pm 3.10$	14.56	9.19	0.000
Motor Assessment	Baseline	$8.08 \pm 1.52$	$8.06 \pm 1.74$	0.07	0.03	0.943
Scale	Week 4	$21.64 \pm 2.17$	$18.19 \pm 1.88$	7.21	3.44	0.000
	Week 8	$35.19 \pm 3.66$	$28.33 \pm 2.31$	9.51	6.86	0.000

The comparison between Group A (Task-Oriented Program) and Group B (Proprioceptive Training) shows distinct trends over time. Both groups started similarly at baseline for the Berg Balance Scale (BBS) (Group A: 27.17  $\pm$  1.92, Group B: 26.81  $\pm$  2.03, P=0.440). By Week 4, Group A outperformed Group B (37.36  $\pm$  2.24 vs. 33.67  $\pm$  2.74, P=0.000), and this difference further increased by Week 8 (50.25  $\pm$  2.18 vs. 41.06  $\pm$  3.10, P=0.000). Similarly, for the Motor Assessment Scale (MAS), the groups were initially

comparable (Group A:  $8.08 \pm 1.52$ , Group B:  $8.06 \pm 1.74$ , P=0.943), but significant differences emerged by Week 4 (21.64  $\pm$  2.17 vs. 18.19  $\pm$  1.88, P=0.000) and continued to widen by Week 8 (35.19  $\pm$  3.66 vs. 28.33  $\pm$  2.31, P=0.000). These results emphasize the superior effectiveness of the Task-Oriented Program over Proprioceptive Training, with statistically significant improvements in both BBS and MAS scores in Weeks 4 and 8.

Table 3 Com	parative Score	s of Ouality-	-of-Life Domain
-------------	----------------	---------------	-----------------

Scale	Time	Group A (Mean ± SD)	Group B (Mean ± SD)	t-value	Mean Difference	P Value
Vitality	Baseline	$49.19 \pm 5.60$	$48.36 \pm 4.78$	0.68	0.83	0.499
	Week 4	$60.39 \pm 5.45$	$56.72 \pm 4.99$	2.98	3.67	0.004
	Week 8	$71.22 \pm 5.36$	$65.36 \pm 5.38$	4.63	5.86	0.000
Physical Functioning	Baseline	$52.33 \pm 3.00$	$52.69 \pm 3.28$	-0.49	-0.36	0.627
	Week 4	$63.92 \pm 3.08$	$61.25 \pm 3.46$	3.45	2.67	0.001
	Week 8	$68.19 \pm 2.12$	$64.55 \pm 2.17$	5.32	4.27	0.000
Bodily Pain	Baseline	$47.58 \pm 2.22$	$47.25 \pm 2.26$	0.63	0.33	0.530
	Week 4	$58.61 \pm 2.63$	$55.92 \pm 2.69$	4.30	2.69	0.000
	Week 8	$69.19 \pm 3.22$	$64.94 \pm 3.57$	5.30	4.25	0.000
General Health Perceptions	Baseline	$44.94 \pm 2.18$	$44.47 \pm 2.02$	0.95	0.47	0.343
	Week 4	$56.14 \pm 2.77$	$53.00 \pm 2.04$	5.47	3.14	0.000
	Week 8	$67.36 \pm 2.86$	$61.28 \pm 2.50$	9.60	6.08	0.000
Physical Role Functioning	Baseline	$56.56 \pm 1.11$	$56.92 \pm 1.08$	-1.40	-0.36	0.165
	Week 4	$67.89 \pm 1.79$	$65.69 \pm 1.45$	5.72	2.19	0.000
	Week 8	$79.11 \pm 2.39$	$74.25 \pm 2.22$	8.94	4.86	0.000
Emotional Role Functioning	Baseline	$46.44 \pm 4.54$	$45.83 \pm 5.14$	0.54	0.61	0.595
	Week 4	$57.22 \pm 4.60$	$54.56 \pm 5.32$	2.28	2.67	0.026
	Week 8	$68.14 \pm 5.01$	$63.14 \pm 5.43$	4.06	5.00	0.000
Social Role Functioning	Baseline	$49.33 \pm 3.84$	$48.92 \pm 3.89$	0.46	0.42	0.649
	Week 4	$60.64 \pm 3.94$	$57.47 \pm 4.26$	3.28	3.17	0.002
	Week 8	$71.78 \pm 4.02$	$65.92 \pm 4.47$	5.85	5.86	0.000
Mental Health or Emotional	Baseline	$53.06 \pm 3.58$	$53.19 \pm 3.14$	-0.18	-0.14	0.862
Well-Being	Week 4	$64.36 \pm 3.97$	$61.75 \pm 3.44$	2.98	2.61	0.004
	Week 8	$75.06 \pm 4.60$	$70.14 \pm 4.35$	4.66	4.92	0.000

The 8-week comparison between Group A (Task-Oriented Program) and Group B (Proprioceptive Training) demonstrated consistent trends across various health dimensions. Both groups exhibited similar baseline scores in all categories, but by Week 4 and Week 8, Group A consistently outperformed Group B. For instance, in the category of Vitality, Group A showed significant improvement from 49.19 ± 5.60 to 71.22 ± 5.36, compared to Group B's 48.36 ± 4.78 to 65.36 ± 5.38 (P=0.000). In Physical Functioning, Group A progressed from 52.33 ± 3.00 to 68.19 ± 2.12, whereas Group B reached from 52.69 ± 3.28 to 64.55 ± 2.17 (P=0.000). Similar trends were observed in other categories, such as Bodily Pain, General Health Perceptions, Physical Role Functioning, Emotional

Role Functioning, Social Role Functioning, and Mental Health or Emotional Well-Being, with Group A consistently showing more substantial improvements by Week 8. This

Category	Mean Difference (1-2)	Mean Difference (1-3)	Mean Difference (2-3)	p-value
BBS	-10.194	-23.083	12.889	0.000
MAS	-13.556	-27.111	13.556	0.000
Vitality	-11.194	-22.028	10.833	0.000
Physical Function	-11.583	-22.639	11.056	0.000
General Health	-11.194	-22.417	11.222	0.000
Emotional Health	-10.778	-21.694	10.917	0.000
Social	-11.306	-22.444	11.139	0.000
Mental Health	-11.306	-22.000	10.694	0.000

Table 4 Pairwise Comparison within Group A

The pairwise comparison within Group A across different health categories highlights the consistent and significant differences between the three measurements (labeled as 1-2, 1-3, and 2-3). In every category, the mean differences illustrate a clear pattern of improvement. For example, the mean differences for BBS are -10.194, -23.083, and 12.889, respectively, with a p-value of 0.000, indicating statistical significance. Similar patterns are found in other categories such as MAS (-13.556, -27.111, 13.556), Vitality (-11.194, -22.028, 10.833), Physical Function (-11.583, -22.639, 11.056), General Health (-11.194, -22.417, 11.222), Emotional Health (-10.778, -21.694, 10.917), Social (-11.306, -22.444, 11.139), and Mental Health (-11.306, -22.000, 10.694), all with a p-value of 0.000. These numerical values across all categories highlight the robust and uniform improvement within Group A throughout the study.

pattern underscores Group A's superior performance across

multiple health dimensions throughout the study.

# Table 5 Pairwise Comparison within Group B

Category	Mean Difference (1-2)	Mean Difference (1-3)	Mean Difference (2-3)	p-value
BBS	-6.861	-14.250	7.389	0.000
MAS	-10.139	-20.278	10.139	0.000
Vitality	-8.361	-17.000	8.639	0.000
Physical Function	-8.556	-17.056	8.500	0.000
General Health	-8.528	-16.806	8.278	0.000
Emotional Health	-8.722	-17.306	8.583	0.000
Social	-8.556	-17.000	8.444	0.000
Mental Health	-8.556	-16.944	6.247	0.000

The pairwise comparison within Group B across various health categories demonstrates a consistent pattern of improvement between the three measurements (1-2, 1-3, and 2-3). The mean differences for BBS are -6.861, -14.250, and 7.389, with a p-value of 0.000. Similar trends are observed in MAS (-10.139, -20.278, 10.139), Vitality (-8.361, -17.000, 8.639), Physical Function (-8.556, -17.056, 8.500), General Health (-8.528, -16.806, 8.278), Emotional Health (-8.722, -17.306, 8.583), Social (-8.556, -17.000, 8.444), and Mental Health (-8.556, -16.944, 6.247), all with a p-value of 0.000. These results underscore a consistent and significant improvement in Group B over time across all categories, confirming the effect of the intervention on various aspects of health.

### Discussion

The body of research on stroke rehabilitation, including studies by JalajaJayalakshmi, Geetha, & Ijaz (2021), Lahiri et al. (2020), Lee (2020), and our present investigation, have highlighted key aspects of rehabilitation, specifically task-oriented programs (6, 27). While the current research does not encompass the utilization of machine learning algorithms or the elements of post-stroke aphasia, these studies provide essential context to our investigation's focus on hemiplegic stroke patients.

Our study primarily compared the efficacy of a Task-Oriented Program (Group A) and Proprioceptive Training (Group B) in rehabilitating patients with hemiplegic stroke. The initial balance in both groups' emotional, social, and mental health functioning levels provided an equitable foundation for comparison. As the study progressed, Group A displayed pronounced superiority in all assessed domains, suggesting that the benefits of the Task-Oriented Program were enduring and cumulative.

Further inspection revealed that Group A exhibited a more rapid and significant improvement in balance and motor function, as indicated by scores from the Berg Balance Scale (BBS), Motor Assessment Scale (MAS), and Fugl-Meyer Assessment (FMA). These findings suggest that the Task Oriented Program may have a broader influence on various aspects of health and wellbeing, thereby improving the quality of life for stroke patients. However, we noted that some measures under the Task Oriented Program revealed a steeper decline, warranting further investigations to identify contributing factors. (9, 28).

The study conducted by Lee (2020) emphasized the effectiveness of neurodevelopmental treatment and breathing training in enhancing physical functionality and managing psychological problems in chronic stroke patients. (15). These findings align with our research results, underscoring the broader applicability of task-oriented programs in rehabilitating stroke patients.

In summary, understanding individual differences such as language and education level can shape personalized treatment strategies for post-stroke aphasia. Due to their wide-ranging and rapid effects, task-oriented programs hold considerable promise in rehabilitation and improving patients' quality of life. These programs can offer enhanced benefits when paired with interventions like breathing training. However, further research is needed to confirm these results and explore the underlying mechanisms, thereby enabling a comprehensive, multifaceted approach to stroke rehabilitation. (6, 27, 28)

### Conclusion

The Task-Oriented Program yielded superior outcomes compared to Proprioceptive Training in improving participants' balance, gait, and quality of life, as indicated by significantly higher BBS and MAS scores. These findings highlight the effectiveness of the Task-Oriented Program as an intervention for enhancing balance, gait, and quality of life in the specific population studied.

### Declarations

Data Availability statement

All data generated or analyzed during the study are included in the manuscript.

Ethics approval and consent to participate. Approved by the department Concerned. Consent for publication

Approved **Funding** Not applicable

### **Conflict of interest**

The authors declared an absence of conflict of interest.

### **Authors Contribution**

## SANIA MAQBOOL (Physiotherapist)

Final Approval of version SANA KAMRAN (Physiotherapist) Revisiting Critically SADIA NAZ (Senior Lecturer) Data Analysis ANZA AMJAD (Physiotherapist) & TAHIR MAQBOOL (Assistant Professor) Drafting & Concept & Design of Study

### References

1. Blustein P, Werner S, Sham S, Febles A, Katz H, Villella J. Right middle cerebral artery stroke secondary to ovarian clear cell carcinoma in a 35-year-old: A case report. Case reports in women's health. 2023;37:e00485.

2. de Oliveira RMW. Neuroplasticity. J Chem Neuroanat. 2020;108(101822):10.

3. Patrizio E, Calvani R, Marzetti E, Cesari M. Physical Functional Assessment in Older Adults. J Frailty Aging. 2021;10(2):141-9.

4. Almhdawi KA, Mathiowetz VG, White M, delMas RC. Efficacy of occupational therapy task-oriented approach in upper extremity post-stroke rehabilitation. Occupational therapy is international. 2016;23(4):444-56.

5. Kuriakose D, Xiao Z. Pathophysiology and Treatment of Stroke: Present Status and Future Perspectives. Int J Mol Sci. 2020;21(20).

6. Lahiri D, Dubey S, Ardila A, Sawale VM, Roy BK, Sen S, et al. Incidence and types of aphasia after first-ever acute stroke in Bengali speakers: age, gender, and educational effect on the type of aphasia. Aphasiology. 2020;34(6):709-22.

7. Chi KL, Wen J, Zhang X, Dong Q, Jia CS, Zhang X, et al. [Network visual data mining and literature analysis on electroacupuncture treatment of post-stroke sequelae]. Zhen ci yan jiu = Acupuncture research. 2023;48(5):508-14.

8. Morreale M, Marchione P, Pili A, Lauta A, Castiglia SF, Spallone A, et al. Early versus delayed rehabilitation treatment in hemiplegic patients with ischemic stroke: proprioceptive or cognitive approach? Eur J Phys Rehabil Med. 2016;52(1):81-9.

9. Thant AA, Wanpen S, Nualnetr N, Puntumetakul R, Chatchawan U, Hla KM, et al. Effects of task-oriented training on upper extremity functional performance in patients with sub-acute stroke: a randomized controlled trial. Journal of Physical Therapy Science. 2019;31(1):82-7.

10. Wang C, Wang G, Lu A, Zhao Y. Effects of attentional control on gait and inter-joint coordination during dual-task walking. Frontiers in Psychology. 2021;12:665175.

11. Wang G, Goebel JR, Li C, Hallman HG, Gilford TM, Li W. Therapeutic effects of CPAP on cognitive impairments associated with OSA. J Neurol. 2020;267(10):2823-8.

12. Ahamad AA, Dhasaradharaman K, Radhakrishnan V. Comparison between the Effects of Task-Oriented Training Program and Balance Training On Improving Balance in Stroke Patients. Int J Health Sci Res. 2019;9(10):238-41.

13. Chae SH, Kim YL, Lee SM. Effects of phase proprioceptive training on balance in patients with chronic stroke. Journal of Physical Therapy Science. 2017;29(5):839-44.

14. Kim K-j, Gang M-y. Effect of taping and virtual reality combined exercise on static and dynamic balance with functional ankle instability. Physical Therapy Korea. 2020;27(4):292-7.

15. Lee HS, Lim JH, Jeon BH, Song CS. Non-immersive Virtual Reality Rehabilitation Applied to a Task-oriented Approach for Stroke Patients: A Randomized Controlled Trial. Restor Neurol Neurosci. 2020;38(2):165-72.

16. Park S-E, Moon S-H. Effects of trunk stability exercise using proprioceptive neuromuscular facilitation with changes in chair height on the gait of patients who had a stroke. Journal of Physical Therapy Science. 2016;28(7):2014-8.

17. Khallaf ME. Effect of task-specific training on trunk control and balance in patients with subacute stroke. Neurology Research International. 2020;2020:1-8.

18. Kim K, Jung SI, Lee DK. Effects of task-oriented circuit training on balance and gait ability in subacute stroke patients: a randomized controlled trial. Journal of Physical Therapy Science. 2017;29(6):989-92.

19. Jarrott SE, Scrivano RM, Park C, Mendoza AN. Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices in Intergenerational Programming: A Scoping Review. Res Aging. 2021;43(7-8):283-93.

20. Jeong HS, Lee SC, Jee H, Song JB, Chang HS, Lee SY. Proprioceptive Training and Outcomes of Patients With Knee Osteoarthritis: A Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. J Athl Train. 2019;54(4):418-28.

21. Rogers JM, Duckworth J, Middleton S, Steenbergen B, Wilson PH. Elements virtual rehabilitation improves motor, cognitive, and functional outcomes in adult stroke: evidence from a randomized controlled pilot study. J Neuroeng Rehabil. 2019;16(1):019-0531.

22. Darda PP, Jethwani D, Dadgal R. Combined Effect of Proprioceptive Neuromuscular Facilitation And Electrical Muscle Stimulation In Hemiplegic Stroke Patients To Enhance Upper Extremity Function: A Research Protocol. Indian Journal of Forensic Medicine & Toxicology. 2021;15(2):470-7.

23. Giotakos O. Neurobiology of emotional trauma. Psychiatriki. 2020;31(2):162-71.

24. Ito D, Mori N, Shimizu A, Fuji A, Sakata S, Kondo K, et al. The vitality index is a predictor of improving the functional

independence measure score in subacute stroke patients with cognitive impairment. Neurological Research. 2021;43(2):97-102. 25. Liu T-W, Ng GY, Chung RC, Ng SS. I am decreasing the fear of falling in chronic stroke survivors through cognitive behavior therapy and task-oriented training. Stroke. 2019;50(1):148-54.

26. Frimpong E, Olawale O, Antwi D, Antwi-Boasiako C, Dzudzor B. Task-oriented circuit training improves ambulatory functions in acute stroke: a randomized controlled trial. 2014.

27. JalajaJayalakshmi V, Geetha V, Ijaz MM, editors. Analysis and Prediction of Stroke using Machine Learning Algorithms. 2021 International Conference on Advancements in Electrical, Electronics, Communication, Computing and Automation (ICAECA); 2021 8-9 Oct. 2021.

28. Lee D-K. The effect of breathing training on the physical function and psychological problems in patients with chronic stroke. The Journal of Korean Physical Therapy. 2020;32(3):146-51.



**Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <u>http://creativecommons.org/licen</u> <u>ses/by/4.0/</u>. © The Author(s) 2024