

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<u>http://bmjopen.bmj.com</u>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email <u>info.bmjopen@bmj.com</u>

BMJ Open

Obstacle avoidance training in individuals with stroke: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-028873
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	02-Jan-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Muroi, Daisuke; Kameda Medical Center; Department of Health Promotion Science, Tokyo Metropolitan University Ohtera, Shosuke; Division of Medical Information Technology and Administration Planning, Kyoto University Hospital Kataoka, Yuki; Hyogo Prefectural Amagasaki Hospital, Banno, Masahiro; Seichiryo Hospital, Department of Psychiatry; Nagoya University Graduate School of Medicine, Department of Psychiatry Tsujimoto, Yasushi ; School of Public Health in the Graduate School of Medicine, Kyoto University, Healthcare Epidemiology; Kyoritsu Hospital, Nephrology and Dialysis Tsujimoto, Hiraku; Hospital Care Research Unit, Hyogo Prefectural Amagasaki General Medical Center Higuchi, Takahiro; Department of Health Promotion Science, Tokyo Metropolitan University
Keywords:	Stroke < NEUROLOGY, REHABILITATION MEDICINE, MEDICAL EDUCATION & TRAINING

SCHOLARONE[™] Manuscripts

 Obstacle avoidance training in individuals with stroke: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Daisuke Muroi, PhD, PT^{1,2}, Shosuke Ohtera, PhD, PT³, Yuki Kataoka, MPH, MD^{4,5}, Masahiro Banno, PhD, MD^{6,7}, Yasushi Tsujimoto, MPH, MD^{8,9}, Hikaru Tsujimoto, MD⁴, Takahiro Higuchi , PhD²

¹ Department of Rehabilitation, Kameda Medical Center, Chiba, Japan

² Department of Health Promotion Science, Tokyo Metropolitan University, Tokyo, Japan

³ Division of Medical Information Technology and Administration Planning, Kyoto
 University Hospital, Kyoto, Japan4
 ⁴ Hospital Care Research Unit, Hyogo Prefectural Amagasaki General Medical Center,

Hyogo, Japan

⁵ Department of Respiratory Medicine, Hyogo Prefectural Amagasaki General Medical

Center, Hyogo, Japan

⁶ Department of Psychiatry, Seichiryo Hospital, Nagoya, Aichi, Japan

⁷ Department of Psychiatry, Nagoya University Graduate School of Medicine, Nagoya,

Aichi, Japan

⁸ Department of Health care Epidemiology, School of Public Health in the Graduate

School of Medicine, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan

⁹ Department of Nephrology and Dialysis, Kyoritsu Hospital, Hyogo, Japan

Correspondence to Daisuke Muroi, PhD, PT, Kameda Medical Center, 929 Higashicho,

Kamogawa, Chiba 296-8602, Japan, Phone: +81-4-7093-1400, e-mail: mutyon88@hotmail.com relien.

(2376 words)

Abstract

Objective: Obstacle avoidance training in individuals with stroke in combination with other circuit training has been conducted and the effect reported in a systematic review. However, the effect of obstacle avoidance training, when tested alone, remained unknown. The present study conducted a systematic review to seek evidence that obstacle avoidance training alone is effective in helping stroke individuals to improve their locomotor ability. Design: Systematic review and meta-analysis.

BMJ Open

Data sources: MEDLINE, EMBASE, CENTRAL, ICTRP, and PEDro searched up to December 2018.

Review methods: We included only randomized controlled trials examining the effects of obstacle avoidance training on stroke individuals. The main outcome included measures of gait ability and balance ability. Data on outcome measures were subjected to meta-analyses using random-effects models. The certainty of evidence was determined using the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation (GRADE) approach.

Results: Three studies with a total of 81 participants met the inclusion criteria, and 67 participants were used as data sources for the meta-analysis. Obstacle avoidance training was not superior to the control group for gait speed [mean difference (MD) 0.06, 95% confidence interval (CI) (-0.16, 0.04), P = 0.67], and subjective balance ability (Activities-specific Balance Confidence (ABC) scale) also showed no significant difference between the intervention group and the control group [MD 6.65, 95% CI (-7.59, 20.89), P = 0.36]. The certainty of the evidence (GRADE) for all outcomes were low or very low.

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

Conclusion: The present study suggests that obstacle avoidance training alone may have little or no effect. The reasons for failure to find the effectiveness of obstacle training alone would be the insufficient amount of training in the intervention, as well as the lack

of well-designed studies that measured relevant outcomes.

Keywords: stroke, obstacle avoidance, systematic review, meta-analysis

Strengths and limitations of this study

This is a systematic review and meta-analysis of evidence of the effect of obstacle avoidance training in individuals who have suffered a stroke.

The systematic review was conducted based on the Cochrane Handbook and the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) guidelines.

The literature search and study selection, data extraction and risk of bias assessment were conducted by two independent authors.

The limitation on the conclusion of this research include the insufficient amount of training in the intervention, and the lack of well-designed studies that measured relevant outcomes.

1 Introduction

Individuals with stroke often have impaired walking abilities, primarily due to motor paralysis on one side of their body. Maintaining balance becomes increasingly difficult particularly when adaptive locomotor adjustments in response to environmental properties are necessary (e.g., obstacle avoidance). In fact, the risk of falling is likely to increase when individuals with stroke avoid an obstacle.¹⁻³ Therefore, it is important for individuals with stroke to improve their walking ability under various environmental constraints through rehabilitation.

Rehabilitation after a stroke involves having the patient correctly recognize both the function that has been lost and the function that remains. Rehabilitation is also designed to make plastic changes in the brain by relearning through repetitive task training.⁴ The mixed task-oriented circuit class training, including obstacle avoidance training, may promote relearning of gait.⁵ A previous study demonstrated that walking training and task-oriented training related to walking, including obstacle avoidance training, improved both step distance and walking speed,⁵ thus shortening the length of stay in the hospital.⁶ Obstacle avoidance training has been carried out as part of circuit class training, and the effect was reported in a systematic review.

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies

Several studies that support the effectiveness of obstacle avoidance training were conducted without any combination with other types of training, using a randomized controlled design.⁷⁻¹⁰ Additionally, a systematic-review study showed the effectiveness of obstacle avoidance training in combination with other circuit training.⁵ To obtain further evidence of the effectiveness of obstacle avoidance training, we conducted a systematic-review and meta-analysis study. We searched for randomized controlled trials in obstacle avoidance training for individuals with stroke and examined the efficacy of

such training compared with the usual approaches. Based on these results, we sought evidence that obstacle avoidance training alone is effective in helping individuals with stroke to improve their locomotor ability.

29 Methods

The protocol was registered in PROSPERO (CRD42017060691).¹¹ The systematic review was conducted based on the Cochrane Handbook¹² and the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) guidelines.¹³ The systematic review and meta-analysis were assessed in accordance with the PRISMA checklist (see supplementary table).¹⁴

We posed the following research question: "In stroke patients, dose obstacle avoidance training result in an improved, clinically relevant outcome as compared with the usual care without obstacle avoidance training?"

39 Data sources and searches

Systematic searches were conducted in four academic databases: MEDLINE (searched on December 18, 2018), EMBASE (December 18, 2018), CENTRAL (December 18, 2018), and PEDro (December 18, 2018). A supplemental file shows this process in more detail. We searched for the trials in the ICTRP on December 18, 2018 (the full search strategy is shown in supplementary table). We also searched references in the guidelines of the following organizations: the European Stroke Organization (ESO), the American Heart Association (AHA)/American Stroke Association (ASA), and the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE).¹⁵⁻¹⁷

49 Study selection

The selection and review of the papers were conducted by two independent authors. Two reviewers (D.M. and S.O.) screened the titles and abstracts for the study selection independently to determine whether each citation met the inclusion criteria. They assessed the eligibility based on a full-text review. The reviewers compared their lists, and any differences in opinion between the two authors were resolved through discussion.

To be eligible for inclusion in this systematic review, papers were required to (1)focus on patients with various types of strokes (brain ischemia, or intracranial hemorrhages, or subarachnoid hemorrhage) individuals and (2) conduct obstacle avoidance training in walking practice (interventions of any type, intensity, duration, and frequency). We also searched for references in extracted articles and contacted the authors of each study to obtain necessary data. The search was limited to published and unpublished randomized controlled trials. Crossover trials, cluster randomized trials, non-randomized trials, and observational studies were excluded.

The following primary outcomes were measured: (1) gait speed, measured in a 10 m walking test (10MWT) or obtained during a 6-minute walking test (6MWT); (2) composite gait ability, measured in a Timed Up and Go test (TUG); (3) objective balance ability, measured according to the Berg Balance Scale (BBS). Secondary outcomes were subjective balance ability, measured according to the Activities-specific Balance Confidence scale (ABC); gait endurance, measured in a 6-minute walking test (6MWT); and fall incidence (the incidence of falls six months or one year after intervention).

71 Data extraction and quality assessment

Data extraction was done using a standardized form that included characteristics of

the participants (number of participants, number of patients excluded from the analysis, and settings), the setup of the intervention environment (obstacle avoidance, other rehabilitation, and using a virtual reality system), types of outcomes (fall incidence, activities of daily living, gait ability, and balance ability), and details of the training programs (types of exercises, duration, and frequency).

Standard data extraction forms were used by the two authors independently. Disagreement in data extraction was resolved through discussion. When the information was inadequate, we contacted the study authors to gather sufficient information.

Risk of bias assessment was conducted using RevMan 5.3 (RevMan 2014). The following items were independently assessed by two reviewers (D.M. and O.S.) using the Cochrane Risk of Bias Tool.¹² Each domain was assessed as high risk, low risk or unclear. The assessments were compared by two authors, and any differences in opinion between the two reviewers were resolved through discussion and, where this failed, through arbitration by a third reviewer (Y.K.). In the evaluation of publication bias (PB), since the number of studies was less than 10, we did not test for funnel plot asymmetry; rather, we evaluated PB by searching the clinical trial registry.

90 Data synthesis and analysis

For continuous outcomes (gait speed, TUG, BBS, ABC, and 6MWT), the mean difference (MD) with 95% CI was calculated. The MD was used when data, including meta-analyses, were derived from the same indicators. Adverse events were narratively summarized, since the definition of these outcomes varied among studies.

95 The heterogeneity was assessed by visual inspection of the forest plots and calculated
96 I-squared statistic (I-squared values of 0% to 40%: might not be important; 30% to 60%:

BMJ Open

may represent moderate heterogeneity; 50% to 90%; may represent substantial heterogeneity; 75% to 100%: considerable heterogeneity). Where heterogeneity was identified (I-squared statistic> 50%), we investigated the reason.

Date syntheses were conducted with RevMan 5.3 (RevMan 2014). We conducted a meta-analysis using the random-effects model. We calculated MD with 95% CI in the continuous variables. All adverse events were excluded from the meta-analysis. An analysis of exercise versus any other controls was carried out.

We conducted a sensitivity analysis to determine the robustness of the findings. The sensitivity analysis of the primary outcome was planned in the following three ways: (1) restricting the analysis studies to those that had a low risk of selection bias, (2) excluding trials with missing data, and (3) converting the random-effects model to a eler R fixed-effects model.

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

- Patient and public involvement
 - No patients will be involved in this study.

Summary of findings table

The "Summary of findings table" was created using outcomes that included gait speed, composite gait ability, objective balance scale, subjective balance scale, and gait endurance (Table 1). The five GRADE considerations (study limitations, consistency of effect, imprecision, indirectness and publication bias) were used to assess the certainty of evidence as it relates to the studies contributing data to the review for the outcomes.^{12 18} ¹⁹ Two review authors independently assessed the quality of the evidence. The two authors compared their lists and any differences in opinion between the two authors were

121 resolved through discussion.

Table 1. Summary of findings.

Outcome (time frame)		No. patients (studies)	of Certainty of the evidence (GRADE)	Comparator	Intervention vs. comparat mean difference (95% CI)
Gait spe	eed (m/s)	67	@000	The mean gait speed across	-0.06 (95% CI: -0.16, 0.04) fast
(1 day	to 4 weeks)	(3 RCT)	Very low abc	control groups ranged from 0.71 to 0.95 m/s	in intervention group.
Compos	site gait ability	29		15.37 sec	-0.1 (95% CI: -1.0, 0.7) faster
TUG ((sec)	(1 RCT)	Low ^{ab}		intervention group.
(4 wee	eks)				
Objectiv	ve balance ability	29	⊕⊕⊖⊖	46.14	0.0 (95% CI: -0.6, 0.7)
BBS score		(1 RCT)	Low ab		
(4 wee	eks)				
Scale:	U to 56	40			
Subject	ive balance ability	49 (2 D C T)	\$000 · · · · ·	The mean ABC score across	6.65 (95% CI: -7.59, 20.8
ABUS	wooks	(2 KUI)	Very low ^{abc}	control groups ranged from	nigher in intervention group.
(5 10 4 Scale:	0 to 100			02.38 10 72.23	
Gait en	U IU IUU durance	29		277 /3 m	5 / (95% CI 20 70) lon
6MW	unance Γ (m)	(1 RCT)	T on ap	277.43 111	distance in intervention group
(4 we)	eks)	(1 KC1)	LOW "		distance in intervention group
124					
125	GRADE Workir	ng Group gra	des of evidence		
		0 10			
126	High quality: Fu	urther researc	h is very unlikely	to change our confidence in t	he estimate of effect.
	81 1		5 5		
		two Eurthern	asaarch is likaly	o have an important impact of	n our confidence in
127	Moderate quali	ty. Further f	USCALCH IS HIKCLY	to have an important impact of	
127	Moderate quali	ity. Fultiel I	escaren is intery	to have an important impact of	on our confidence in
127 128	Moderate qualities the estimate of e	ffect and may	y change the estin	nate.	on our confidence in
127 128	Moderate quality the estimate of e	ffect and ma	y change the estin	nate.	on our confidence in
127 128 129	Moderate qualit the estimate of e Low quality: Fu	ffect and mag	y change the estin	nate. have an important impact on o	our confidence in the
127 128 129	Moderate qualit the estimate of e Low quality: Fu	ffect and ma	y change the estin	nate. have an important impact on o	our confidence in the
127 128 129 130	Moderate qualit the estimate of e Low quality: Fu estimate of effect	ffect and ma inther researc	y change the estin h is very likely to y to change the es	nate. have an important impact on o timate.	our confidence in the
127 128 129 130	Moderate qualit the estimate of e Low quality: Fu estimate of effect	ffect and magnetic field of the second	y change the estir h is very likely to y to change the es	nate. have an important impact on o timate.	our confidence in the
 127 128 129 130 131 	Moderate qualit the estimate of e Low quality: Fu estimate of effect Very low qualit	ffect and magnetic field of the second secon	y change the estin h is very likely to y to change the es ry uncertain abou	nate. have an important impact on o timate. t the estimate.	our confidence in the
127 128 129 130 131	Moderate qualit the estimate of e Low quality: Fu estimate of effect Very low qualit	ffect and magnetic field of the second secon	y change the estin h is very likely to y to change the es ry uncertain abou	nate. have an important impact on o stimate. t the estimate.	our confidence in the
 127 128 129 130 131 132 	Moderate qualit the estimate of e Low quality: Fu estimate of effect Very low qualit	ffect and may inther researc of and is likely y: We are ve d personnel v	y change the estin h is very likely to y to change the es ry uncertain abou vere not blinded	nate. have an important impact on o stimate. t the estimate.	our confidence in the
127 128 129 130 131 132	Moderate qualit the estimate of e Low quality: Fu estimate of effect Very low qualit ^a Participants and	ffect and magnetic ffect and magnetic field of the second	y change the estin h is very likely to y to change the es ry uncertain abou vere not blinded	nate. have an important impact on o timate. t the estimate.	our confidence in the
127 128 129 130 131 132 133	Moderate qualit the estimate of e Low quality: Fu estimate of effect Very low qualit ^a Participants and ^b Number of part	ffect and mag rther researc at and is likely y: We are ve d personnel w ticipants was	y change the estin h is very likely to y to change the es ry uncertain abou vere not blinded small.	nate. have an important impact on o stimate. t the estimate.	our confidence in the
127 128 129 130 131 132 133	Moderate qualit the estimate of e Low quality: Fu estimate of effect Very low qualit ^a Participants and ^b Number of part	ffect and mag in ther researc at and is likely y: We are ve d personnel v ticipants was	y change the estin h is very likely to y to change the es ry uncertain abou vere not blinded small.	nate. have an important impact on o stimate. t the estimate.	our confidence in the
127 128 129 130 131 132 133 134	Moderate qualit the estimate of e Low quality: Fu estimate of effect Very low qualit ^a Participants and ^b Number of part ^c The outcome d	ffect and may inther researc at and is likely y: We are ve d personnel w ticipants was ata were inco	y change the estin h is very likely to y to change the es ry uncertain abou vere not blinded small.	nate. have an important impact on o stimate. t the estimate. of participants.	our confidence in the
127 128 129 130 131 132 133 134	Moderate qualit the estimate of e Low quality: Fu estimate of effect Very low qualit ^a Participants and ^b Number of part ^c The outcome d	ffect and may inther researc at and is likely y: We are ve d personnel v ticipants was ata were inco	y change the estin h is very likely to y to change the es ry uncertain abou vere not blinded small.	nate. have an important impact on o stimate. t the estimate.	our confidence in the
127 128 129 130 131 132 133 134 135	Moderate qualit the estimate of e Low quality: Fu estimate of effect Very low qualit ^a Participants and ^b Number of part ^c The outcome d	ffect and may inther researc at and is likely y: We are ve d personnel w ticipants was ata were inco	y change the estin h is very likely to y to change the es ry uncertain abou vere not blinded small.	nate. have an important impact on o stimate. t the estimate.	our confidence in the
127 128 129 130 131 132 133 134 135	Moderate qualit the estimate of e Low quality: Fu estimate of effect Very low qualit ^a Participants and ^b Number of part ^c The outcome d	ffect and mag rther researc at and is likely y: We are ve d personnel w ticipants was ata were inco	y change the estin h is very likely to y to change the es ry uncertain abou vere not blinded small.	nate. have an important impact on o timate. t the estimate. of participants.	our confidence in the

136 <u>Results</u>

The process of identifying eligible studies is outlined in Fig. 1. Amongst 2,319 identified records (including titles and abstracts) from MEDLINE, EMBASE, CENTRAL, ICTRP, PEDro, and a manual search, 23 potentially eligible studies were included. After a review of the full text of 23 potential articles, three papers⁸⁻¹⁰ fulfilled the inclusion criteria. Nineteen of the remaining 20 papers were excluded because their studies included intervention with several other forms of walking training (e.g., circuit class training and task-oriented training). One study⁷ was excluded because both groups participated in obstacle avoidance training (in the water vs. on the ground). There was no ongoing study.

Insert Figure 1 (PRISMA flow)

Three studies⁸⁻¹⁰ with a total 81 participants met the inclusion criteria, and three studies with a total of 67 participants were used as data sources for the meta-analysis (Fig. 1). The characteristics of each study included are presented in **Table 2**. The risk of bias assessment is outlined in Table 3. In both studies, participants were not blinded to the intervention. Also, the studies had incomplete outcomes. One study⁸ reported an unknown risk of bias from published data, and so we contacted the authors. According to the authors, they had planned to measure the three-axis accelerometer and QOL. However, considering several circumstances and the patients' condition, they did not measure above outcomes.

Table 2. Characteristics of included studies.

2 3									
4 5 7 8	Author, Year, Country	Setting	Number of participants	Study type	Intervention (contents	, frequency)	Control (standard ca	Outcom re)	es
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Lord SE et al., 2006, New Zealand	Subjects were assessed in 1 of 3 setting: 2 in the community and 1 clinic environment	27 (control (no task): 9, intervention (motor task): 9) Other intervention (cognitive task): 9	2×3 randomized factorial design	2 main factors: task (n environment (clinic, s For the single task cor walk at a comfortable of 3 environment: (1) suburban street, (3) th For the dual task cond participants were aske task, or the participant numbers spoken by th cognitive task.	to task, motor task uburban street, sho ndition, the partici speed for 6 minut the clinic environ e shopping mall. lition, in addition t d to step over a w ts were asked to re e researchers were	, cognitive task) a opping mall) pants were asked es without taking ment, (2) the o the above task, ooded block as m spond whether th e even or odd as	and Gait spe (obtaine to 6MWT) in 1 cadence. step leng the otor e	ed d during , , and gth
20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	Yang YR et al., 2008, Taiwan	Exercise laboratory	24 (intervention: 12, control:12)	Pilot RCT	Virtual reality based ti the scenarios consister street crossing, obstac and park stroll. Intervention for 20 mi sessions a week for 3	readmill training: d of lane walking, les striding across nutes/session, 3 weeks.	Treadmill training	Gait spe (10MW' commur walking walking question (WAQ), ABC	ed T), hity time, ability naire and
27 28 29 30	Jeong YG et al., 2016, Korea	Exercise laboratory	30 (intervention: 15, control: 15)	Pilot RCT	Treadmill walking with Intervention for 30 mit times/week, for 4 week	th obstacle-crossin n/day, 5 ks.	ig. Treadmill walking	10MWT 6MWT, TUG, ar	, BBS, nd ABC
31 32 33 34	159 160	Table 3. A	Assessment of ris	k of bias in i	ncluded trials				
35 36 37 38 39	Trial		Random sequence generation	Allocation concealment	Blinding of participants and personnel	Blinding of outcome assessment	Incomplete outcome data	Selective reporting	
40 41	Lord e	et al. 2006 ⁹	Unclear	Unclear	High	Unclear	Low	Unclear	
42	Yang	et al. 2008 ¹⁰	Unclear	Low	High	Low	High	Unclear	
43 44	Jeong	et al. 2016 ⁸	Low	Low	High	Low	High	Low	
45	161								
46 47	162	Primary	outcomes						
40 49 50	163	Рос	oling revealed th	at the group	that underwent of	bstacle avoida	ance training	was not	
51 52	164	superior t	to the control gro	oup in terms	of gait speed [M	D -0.06, 95%	CI (-0.16, 0.0	04), P =	
53 54 55	165	0.67] (Fig	g. 2). For gait sp	eed, no heter	rogeneity was obs	served (Tau ² =	$= 0.00, I^2 = 0$	%). The	
56 57	166	results of	f the sensitivity	analysis we	ere also the same	e as the origi	nal results. I	Data on	
58 59 60	167	composit	e gait ability an	d objective	balance ability v	vere available	in one of th	ne three	

BMJ Open

168	studies. The MDs (05% CI) of the TUG and BRS scores were 0.15 (1.0 , 0.7) and 0.03
	studies. The MDs (9570 CI) of the 100 and DDs scores were -0.15 (-1.0 , 0.7) and 0.05
169	(-0.6, 0.7), respectively.
170	
171	Secondary outcomes
172	Subjective balance ability (ABC scale) also showed no significant difference
173	between the intervention group and the control group [MD 6.65, 95% CI (-7.59, 20.89),
174	P = 0.36] (Fig. 3). Substantial heterogeneity was observed (Tau ² = 89.28, I ² = 83%). Data
175	on gait endurance were available in one of the three studies, while data on fall incidence
176	were not available in any of the studies. The MD (95% CI) of 6MWT was 5.4 (2.9, 7.9).
177	There were no reports of adverse events during intervention in any of the three
178	studies.
179	
180	Insert Figure 2
181	Insert Figure 3
182	
183	Discussion
183 184	<u>Discussion</u> We found three RCT studies based on our criteria. The certainty of the evidence
183 184 185	Discussion We found three RCT studies based on our criteria. The certainty of the evidence was low or very low because of serious study limitations and imprecision. The meta-
183 184 185 186	Discussion We found three RCT studies based on our criteria. The certainty of the evidence was low or very low because of serious study limitations and imprecision. The meta- analysis showed that there was no improvement in gait speed or subjective balance ability
183 184 185 186 187	Discussion We found three RCT studies based on our criteria. The certainty of the evidence was low or very low because of serious study limitations and imprecision. The meta- analysis showed that there was no improvement in gait speed or subjective balance ability in the intervention group with obstacle avoidance training.
183 184 185 186 187 188	Discussion We found three RCT studies based on our criteria. The certainty of the evidence was low or very low because of serious study limitations and imprecision. The meta- analysis showed that there was no improvement in gait speed or subjective balance ability in the intervention group with obstacle avoidance training. There are at least two reasons we failed to find the effectiveness of obstacle
183 184 185 186 187 188 189	Discussion We found three RCT studies based on our criteria. The certainty of the evidence was low or very low because of serious study limitations and imprecision. The meta- analysis showed that there was no improvement in gait speed or subjective balance ability in the intervention group with obstacle avoidance training. There are at least two reasons we failed to find the effectiveness of obstacle avoidance training alone. First, for all three of the selected studies, the amount of training
183 184 185 186 187 188 189 190	Discussion We found three RCT studies based on our criteria. The certainty of the evidence was low or very low because of serious study limitations and imprecision. The meta- analysis showed that there was no improvement in gait speed or subjective balance ability in the intervention group with obstacle avoidance training. There are at least two reasons we failed to find the effectiveness of obstacle avoidance training alone. First, for all three of the selected studies, the amount of training was small. According to the systematic review of the circuit class training, the duration

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

of intervention was approximately 60 minutes in a single session, and various walking-related training tasks were continuously performed.⁵ In contrast, the duration of the obstacle avoidance training was only 20-30 minutes (see Table 2). The frequency of intervention (3-5 times per week) did not change. A previous RCT showed that training of lower limbs, such as walking in addition to normal training, significantly improved walking ability as compared to the group that added 30 minutes of upper limb training or did not do any additional training.²⁰ In the meta-analysis, increasing the momentum of the lower limbs has been reported to improve gait speed and endurance. ⁶²¹ Therefore, an insufficient trial period could lead to a failure to show the effectiveness of obstacle avoidance training alone.

A second reason would be an insufficient amount of training in the intervention, as well as the lack of well-designed studies that measured relevant outcomes such as fall incidence or composite gait ability. Indeed, no research has examined the occurrence rate of falling, and only one study has examined the composite gait ability. In addition, the obstacle avoidance ability (e.g., success rates, avoidance reaction time, and foot clearance) was not measured in the selected RCT studies for individuals with stroke. A previous systematic review for the elderly showed that the effect of physical training was evaluated by obstacle avoidance ability.²² A previous observational studies of individuals with stroke reported that obstacle crossing training led to improvement in obstacle avoidance ability as one aspect of the gait adaptability training of individuals with stroke.²³ However, in this systematic review and meta-analysis, no outcome from the obstacle avoidance performance was reported. For these reasons, the present study suggests that obstacle avoidance training alone may have little or no effect.

215 Study Limitations

The limitation on the conclusion of this research is that most studies had a high or unclear risk of bias. Another limitation was the small number of RCT studies. Although a well-designed study⁸ showed an improvement in gait endurance and objective balance ability, the obstacle avoidance training group was not superior to the control group in this systematic review and meta-analysis. From these results, it is difficult to determine whether there is an influence on the improvement of walking ability and balance ability. In the future, trials with a low risk of bias need to be accumulated to verify our findings. Since the purpose of rehabilitation is to improve walking ability under various environmental constraints, it is necessary to confirm the effect of obstacle avoidance training other than step over training. Recently, an observational study reported that the participants walked through narrow apertures.²⁴ In the future, it is desirable to conduct RCT studies of the obstacle avoidance training of walking through apertures, including the occurrence rate of falling, and obstacle avoidance ability in the outcomes.

As a clinical limitation, obstacle avoidance training as a single task is not useful from best available evidence, and it is better to consider other interventions, such as using combinations or increasing the amount of walking training. Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

233 Conclusions

This review shows that obstacle avoidance training, when tested alone, in individuals with stroke may have little or no effect. The reasons for failure to find the effectiveness of obstacle training alone would be the insufficient amount of training in the intervention and the lack of well-designed studies that measured relevant outcomes such as fall incidence, composite gait abilities, and obstacle avoidance abilities. Further research is required to identify the effect of obstacle avoidance training alone.

241 Acknowledgment

We are grateful to Mr. Yeon-Gyu Jeong and Prof. Jung-Wan Koo (Department of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, the Catholic University of Korea), the authors of the included study, for providing detailed information. We would also like to thank Dawn Brandon for English-language editing.

Contributors: DM, YK, MB, YT, and YH conceived the study. The protocol manuscript was drafted by DM, and revised by all authors. DM and YK designed the search strategies, and DM and SO will perform the search. DM and SO will screen studies for inclusion, extract data and assess the risk of bias of included studies. YK will arbitrate disagreements between reviewers. DM, SO and YK will analyze and interpret the data. All authors have provided conceptual and/or methodological expertise. All authors have contributed to the critical revision of this manuscript for important intellectual content. All authors agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work and have read and approved the final manuscript. Funding: This work was supported by Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (KAKENHI Grant Number 18K17317). Competing interests: None declared.

Patient consent: Not required.

Provenance and peer review: Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

Data sharing statement: Additional data from this study are available upon request to
corresponding authors via e-mails.

2		
3 4		
5		
6	263	
7 8 9	264	References
10 11	265	1. Hyndman D, Ashburn A, Stack E. Fall events among people with stroke living in the
12 13	266	community: circumstances of falls and characteristics of fallers. Arch Phys Med
14 15 16	267	Rehabil 2002;83(2):165-70. doi: 10.1053/apmr.2002.28030
10 17 18	268	2. Simpson LA, Miller WC, Eng JJ. Effect of stroke on fall rate, location and predictors:
19 20	269	a prospective comparison of older adults with and without stroke. PLoS One
21 22	270	2011;6(4):e19431. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0019431.g001
23 24 25	271	3. Harris JE, Eng JJ, Marigold DS, et al. Relationship of balance and mobility to fall
26 27	272	incidence in people with chronic stroke. Phys Ther 2005;85(2):150-58.
28 29	273	4. French B, Thomas L, Leathley M, et al. Does repetitive task training improve functional
30 31 32	274	activity after stroke? A Cochrane systematic review and meta-analysis. J Rehabil
33 34	275	Med 2010;42(1):9-14. doi: 10.2340/16501977-0473
35 36	276	5. Wevers L, van de Port I, Vermue M, et al. Effects of Task-Oriented Circuit Class
37 38	277	Training on Walking Competency After Stroke: A Systematic Review. Stroke
39 40 41	278	2009;40(7):2450-59. doi: 10.1161/strokeaha.108.541946
42 43	279	6. Veerbeek JM, Koolstra M, Ket JC, et al. Effects of augmented exercise therapy on
44 45	280	outcome of gait and gait-related activities in the first 6 months after stroke: a meta-
46 47 48	281	analysis. Stroke 2011;42(11):3311-5. doi: 10.1161/STROKEAHA.111.623819
49 50	282	7. Jung J, Lee J, Chung E, et al. The effect of obstacle training in water on static balance
51 52	283	of chronic stroke patients. Journal of Physical Therapy Science 2014;26(3):437-
53 54 55	284	40.
55 56 57	285	8. Jeong YG, Koo JW. The effects of treadmill walking combined with obstacle-crossing
58 59 60	286	on walking ability in ambulatory patients after stroke: a pilot randomized

3 4		
4 5	00 7	
6 7	287	controlled trial. <i>Topics in Stroke Rehabilitation</i> 2016;23(6):406-12.
7 8 9	288	9. Lord SE, Rochester L, Weatherall M, et al. The effect of environment and task on gait
10 11	289	parameters after stroke: A randomized comparison of measurement conditions.
12 13	290	Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2006;87(7):967-73. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2006.03.003
14 15 16	291	10. Yang YR, Tsai MP, Chuang TY, et al. Virtual reality-based training improves
16 17 18	292	community ambulation in individuals with stroke: a randomized controlled trial.
19 20	293	Gait Posture 2008;28(2):201-6. doi: 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2007.11.007
21 22	294	11. Muroi D, Ohtera S, Banno M, et al. A systematic review of obstacle avoidance
23 24 25	295	exercises in patients with stroke. 2017 Aug 17 ed: PROSPERO International
26 27	296	prospective register of systematic reviews, 2017.
28 29	297	12. Higgins J, Green S. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions,
30 31 32	298	version 5.1.02011.
33 34	299	13. Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, et al. The PRISMA Statement for Reporting
35 36	300	Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses of Studies That Evaluate Health Care
37 38 20	301	Interventions: Explanation and Elaboration. <i>PLOS Medicine</i> 2009;6(7):e1000100.
40 41	302	doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1000100
42 43	303	14. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, et al. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic
44 45 46	304	Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLOS Medicine
40 47 48	305	2009;6(7):e1000097. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097
49 50	306	15. Steiner T, Al-Shahi Salman R, Beer R, et al. European Stroke Organisation (ESO)
51 52	307	guidelines for the management of spontaneous intracerebral hemorrhage. Int J
53 54 55	308	Stroke 2014;9(7):840-55. doi: 10.1111/ijs.12309
56 57	309	16. Winstein CJ, Stein J, Arena R, et al. Guidelines for Adult Stroke Rehabilitation and
58 59 60	310	Recovery: A Guideline for Healthcare Professionals From the American Heart

1 ว		
3		
4 5		
6	311	Association/American Stroke Association. Stroke 2016;47(6):e98-e169. doi:
7 8 9	312	10.1161/STR.000000000000098
10 11	313	17. NICE guidelines: Stroke rehabilitation in adults e rehabilitation in adults 2013
12 13	314	[Available from: https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg162.
14 15 16	315	18. Guyatt G, Oxman A, Akl E, et al. GRADE guidelines: 1. Introduction-GRADE
17 18	316	evidence profiles and summary of findings tables. J Clin Epidemiol
19 20	317	2011;64(4):383-94.
21 22 23	318	19. Guyatt G, Oxman A, Vist G, et al. GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality
24 25	319	of evidence and strength of recommendations. BMJ 2008;Apr 26;336(7650):924-
26 27	320	26. doi: 10.1136/bmj.39489.470347.AD.
28 29 30	321	20. Kwakkel G, Wagenaar RC, Twisk JW, et al. Intensity of leg and arm training after
31 32	322	primary middle-cerebral-artery stroke: a randomised trial. Lancet
33 34 25	323	1999;354(917):191-96.
35 36 37	324	21. French B, Thomas LH, Leathley MJ, et al. Repetitive task training for improving
38 39	325	functional ability after stroke. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2007(4)
40 41	326	doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD006073.pub2
42 43 44	327	22. Guadagnin E, Da Rocha E, Duysens J, et al. Does physical exercise improve obstacle
45 46	328	negotiation in the elderly? A systematic review. Archives of Gerontology and
47 48	329	Geriatrics 2016;64:138-45. doi: 10.1016/j.archger.2016.02.008
49 50 51	330	23. van Ooijen MW, Heeren A, Smulders K, et al. Improved gait adjustments after gait
52 53	331	adaptability training are associated with reduced attentional demands in persons
54 55	332	with stroke. <i>Experimental Brain Research</i> 2015;233(3):1007-18. doi:
56 57 58	333	10.1007/s00221-014-4175-7
59 60	334	24. Muroi D, Hiroi Y, Koshiba T, et al. Walking through Apertures in Individuals with

1

33	35	Stroke. PLoS One 2017;12(1):e0170119. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0170119
33	36	
)		
2		
,		
3))		
,		
5 -		
5		
/ 8 9		
) 		
<u>2</u> 3		
+ 5 5		
7 3		
))		
1 2 2		
, 1 5		
) 7		
})		
- 3 1		
5		
3		

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

1 2 3		
4 5 6	337	Figure Legends
7 8	338	Fig. 1. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses
9 10	339	(PRISMA) flow diagram
11 12 13	340	Fig. 2. Effect of training with obstacle avoidance on gait speed
14 15	341	Fig. 3. Effect of training with obstacle avoidance on subjective balance ability (ABC
16 17	342	scale)
18 19 20	343	
21 22	344	
23 24 25	345	
25 26 27		
28 29		
30 31		
32 33 34		
35 36		
37 38		
39 40		
41 42 43		
44 45		
46 47		
48 49 50		
51 52		
53 54		
55 56		
57 58 59		
60		

Fig 1.



					Ensu Protected by copyright, including for uses
	Experimental Control		Mean Difference	Mean Difference	s rela
Jeong 2016 Load 2006 Yang 2008 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:	0.91 0.23 15 0.95 0.14 0.61 0.17 9 0.71 0.18 0.85 0.31 11 0.73 0.73 35 0.00; Chi ² = 0.79, df = 2 (P = 0.67); I ² Z = 1.10 (P = 0.27)	14 55.7% 9 40.3% 9 4.0% 32 100.0%	-0.04 [-0.18, 0.10] -0.10 [-0.26, 0.06] 0.12 [-0.39, 0.63] -0.06 [-0.16, 0.04]	-2 -1 0 1 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]	ment Superieur (ABES) . of to text and data mining, Al training, and
	For poor rouiou only 4	******* (//b-mail.com	n hmi com (cito (cho	ut/auidalinas utat	l similar technologies.
	Study or Subgroup Jeong 2016 Load 2006 Yang 2008 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:	Experimental Control Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total Nean SD Notation Notation	Experimental Control Megno Subgroup Megno Subgroup November Subgroup	Experimental Control Mean Difference 10000 101 102 100	Experimental Control Mean Difference Mean Difference Jacog 2016 0.91 0.22 15 0.50 0.14 16 50.7% 0.01 (0.24,0.10) Jacog 2016 0.81 0.31 0.71 0.71 0.43 0.01 (0.24,0.10) 0.01 (0.24,0.10) Jacog 2016 0.81 0.31 0.71 0.71 0.43 0.01 (0.24,0.10) 0.01 (0.24,0.10) Jacog 2016 0.83 0.31 11 0.73 0.73 0.40 0.01 (0.24,0.10) 0.01 (0.24,0.10) Jacog 2016 0.03 0.05 0.11 (0.24,0.05)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24							En: Protected by copyright, including for use
25 26		Experimental	Control		Mean Difference	Mean Difference	s rela
27	Study or Subgroup	Mean SD Tot	al Mean SD	Total Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	I IV, Random, 95% CI	ted
28 20	Jeong 2016 Yang 2008	63.02 3.01 ²	5 62.58 4.45	14 57.8% 9 42.2%	0.44 [-2.34, 3.22] 15 15 [3 42 26 88]	₹	ent (
30		07.00 0.01	11 72.20 10.00	5 42.270	10.10 [0.42, 20.00]		ext a
31 32 33 34	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:	2 89.28; Chi² = 5.72, Z = 0.91 (P = 0.36)	2 6 df = 1 (P = 0.02); I	23 100.0% I ² = 83%	6.65 [-7.59, 20.89]	-50 -25 0 25 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]	erieur (ABE and data mi ⁵⁰
35							nin
36							g, ≻
37							⊻ tr
38 38							aini
39 40							ing,
41							an
42							d si
43							mi
44 15							ar t
45 46							ech
47							nol
48							ogi
49							es.
50 51							
51 52							
53							
54							
55							
56							
5/ 50							
50 59							
60		For pee	r review only - ł	nttp://bmjope	n.bmj.com/site/abo	out/guidelines.xhtml	

PRISMA 2009 Checklist

age 25 of 33		BMJ Open	
PRISMA	2009	O Checklist	
Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Reported on page #
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.	#1
ABSTRACT	•	s m a s s m s s t	
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: background; objectives; data southess study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; study appraisal and synthesis methods; results; light abons; conclusions and implications of key findings; systematic review registration number.	#2-4
		ext Sup t	
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.	#5-6
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants with eventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).	#5-6
METHODS		ning S).	
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate if a review protocol exists, if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address), and if available, provide registration information including registration number.	#6
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics to get years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale.	#7
Information sources	7	Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date last searched.	#6-7
9 Search	8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used is used that it could be repeated.	supplementar material
Study selection	9	State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable, included in the meta-analysis).	#7
Data collection process	10	Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	#7-8
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and and simplifications made.	#7-8
Risk of bias in individual studies	12	Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), and how this information is to be used in any data so the study of outcome level.	#8
Summary measures	13	State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means).	#8
Synthesis of results	14	Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (e.g., I ²) for each meta-analysis.	#8-9



PRISMA 2009 Checklist

		BMJ Open BMJ Open	Page 26 o
PRISMA 2	009	Checklist	
		Page 1 of 2	
Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Reported on page #
Risk of bias across studies	15	Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., pulອີໄເລຍີກ bias, selective reporting within studies).	#9
Additional analyses	16	Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified.	#9
RESULTS		eme ed e	
Study selection	17	Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram.	#10-11
Study characteristics	18	For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, Ptobe, follow-up period) and provide the citations.	#11
Risk of bias within studies	19	Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessme there item 12).	#11-12
Results of individual studies	20	For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple sum	#12-13
Synthesis of results	21	Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency.	#12-13
Risk of bias across studies	22	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).	#12
Additional analysis	23	Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-	#12
DISCUSSION		sin S	
Summary of evidence	24	Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; doing der their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers).	#13-14
Limitations	25	Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., in complete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).	#14-15
Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research.	#15
FUNDING			
Funding	27	Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data role of funders for the systematic review.	#16
<i>From:</i> Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaf doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097	f J, Altm	an DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The gravity of the Prisma-Statement. PLoS M For more information, visit: www.prisma-statement.org.	led 6(7): e1000097
		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	

MEDLINE	Search Date: Dec/18/2018	No. trials
via PubMed		
#1	cerebrovascular disorders[mh]	340098
#2	stroke [tiab]	214501
#3	poststroke[tiab]	4481
#4	post-stroke[tiab]	7607
#5	cva[tiab]	2562
#6	apoplex* [tiab]	3051
#7	apoplexy* [tiab]	2951
#8	SAH	11418
#9	#1 OR #2 OR #3 OR #4 OR #5 OR #6 OR #7 OR #8	447589
#10	obstacle*[tiab]	42292
#11	avoidance*[tiab]	63634
#12	task*[tiab]	326509
#13	circuit*[tiab]	111076
#14	#10 OR #11 OR #12 OR #13	526921
#15	Exercise[mh]	172629
#16	Exercise therapy[mh]	44691
#17	rehabilitation[mh]	280813
#18	Physical Fitness[mh]	26565
#19	physical therapy modalities[mh]	140062
#20	#15 OR #16 OR #17 OR #18 OR #19	450023
#21	rehabilitation[tiab]	148672
#22	physical fitness[tiab]	8980
#23	training[tiab]	358168
#24	mobilization[tiab]	48140
#25	mobilisation[tiab]	5339
#26	physical therapy[tiab]	18559
#27	physiotherapy[tiab]	17248
#28	treadmill[tiab]	29617
#29	#21 OR #22 OR #23 OR #24 OR #25 OR #26 OR #27 OR #28	593233
#30	#20 OR #29	916879
#31	#14 AND #30	58502
#32	#9 AND #31	3671
#33	randomized controlled trial[pt]	473479
#34	controlled clinical trial[pt]	561431
#35	randomized[tiab]	463598

2			
3 4	#36	placebo[tiab]	199269
5	#37	clinical trials as topic[mesh: noexp]	185546
6 7	#38	randomly[tiab]	302662
8	#39	trial[ti]	191297
9 10	#40	#33 OR #34 OR #35 OR #36 OR #37 OR #38 OR #39	1195880
11	#41	animals[mh] NOT humans[mh]	4525626
12 13	#42	#40 NOT #41	1100461
14 15	#43	#32 AND #42	794

to peet eviewony

Embase via	Dec/18/2018	No. trials
Elsevier		
S 1	(EMB.EXACT.EXPLODE("cerebrovascular disease"))	610770
S2	(ab(stroke) OR ti(stroke))	338926
S 3	(ab(poststroke) OR ti(poststroke))	5825
S4	(ab(post-stroke) OR ti(post-stroke))	14810
S5	(ab(cva) OR ti(cva))	5705
S6	(ab(apoplex*) OR ti(apoplex*))	4311
S7	(ab(SAH) OR ti(SAH))	14060
S8	S7 OR S6 OR S5 OR S4 OR S3 OR S2 OR S1	733656
S9	(ab(obstacle*) OR ti(obstacle*))	53177
S10	(ab(avoidance*) OR ti(avoidance*))	84655
S11	(ab(task*) OR ti(task*))	401172
S12	(ab(circuit*) OR ti(circuit*))	133632
S13	S12 OR S11 OR S10 OR S9	651421
S14	EMB.EXACT("physiotherapy")	91246
S15	EMB.EXACT.EXPLODE("exercise")	367581
S16	EMB.EXACT.EXPLODE("kinesiotherapy")	79363
S17	EMB.EXACT("rehabilitation")	273604
S18	(EMB.EXACT("occupational therapy"))	23582
S19	(EMB.EXACT.EXPLODE("feedback system"))	131460
S20	(EMB.EXACT("joint mobilization"))	1212
S21	S20 OR S19 OR S18 OR S17 OR S16 OR S15 OR S14	830974
S22	(ab(rehabilitation) OR ti(rehabilitation))	213069
S23	(ab("physical fitness") OR ti("physical fitness"))	11052
S24	(ab(training) OR ti(training))	483139
S25	(ab(mobili*ation) OR ti(mobili*ation))	73822
S26	(ab("physical therapy") OR ti("physical therapy"))	25118
S27	(ab(physiotherapy) OR ti(physiotherapy))	31310
S28	(ab(treadmill) OR ti(treadmill))	38903
S29	S28 OR S27 OR S26 OR S25 OR S24 OR S23 OR S22	812943
S30	S29 OR S21	1348815
S31	S30 AND S13 AND S8	5748
S32	(EMB.EXACT("double blind procedure"))	162431
S33	(ab(double NEAR/1 blind*) OR ti(double NEAR/1 blind*))	198715
S34	(ab(placebo*) OR ti(placebo*))	287000
S35	(ab(blind*) OR ti(blind*))	394051

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open

1	
2 3	
4	2
5 6	S
7	
8 9	
10	
11 12	
12	
14	
15 16	
17	
18 19	
20	
21 22	
22	
24	
25 26	
27	
28 29	
30	
31 32	
33	
34 25	
35 36	
37	
38 39	
40	
41 42	
43	
44 45	
46	
47	
48 49	
50	
51 52	
53	
54	
55 56	
57	

36	S35 OR S34 OR S33 OR S32	566534
37	S36 AND S31	433

to peet term only

CENTRAL	Nov/27/2017	No. trials
#1	cerebrovascular disease	7564
#2	stroke	5449
#3	poststroke	336
#4	post-stroke	313
#5	cva	509
#6	apoplex*	50:
#7	SAH	90
#8	#1 or #2 or #3 or #4 or #5 or #6 or #7	57849
#9	obstacle*	1374
#10	avoidance*	499
#11	task*	2921
#12	circuit*	377.
#13	#9 or #10 or #11 or #12	3805
#14	physiotherapy	1087
#15	exercise	7070′
#16	kinesiotherapy	2422
#17	rehabilitation	4679
#18	occupational therapy	508
#19	feedback system	503
#20	joint mobilization	91
#21	#14 or #15 or #16 or #17 or #18 or #19 or #20	11487
#22	rehabilitation	4679
#23	"physical fitness'	674
#24	training	6285
#25	mobilisation	1
#26	"physical therapy"	4247
#27	physiotherapy	1087
#28	treadmill	645
#29	#22 or #23 or #24 or #25 or #26 or #27 or #28	13189
#30	#21 or #29	16704
#31	#8 and #13 and #30	201
#32	(double next/1 blind*) or placebo*:ab.ti or blind*:ab.ti	37179
#33	#31 and #32	79
	Trials	15

ICTRP	Dec/18/2018	No. trials
#1	obstacle* OR avoidance*	538
#2	task oriented OR circuit training	153
Total		691

to beet teries only

PEDro		Dec/18/2018	No. trials
#1	tiab	obstacle*	80
#2	tiab	avoidance*	220
#3	tiab	circuit*	221
Total			521

to occurrences

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Obstacle avoidance training in individuals with stroke: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-028873.R1
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	29-Oct-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Muroi, Daisuke; Kameda Medical Center; Department of Health Promotion Science, Tokyo Metropolitan University Ohtera, Shosuke; Division of Medical Information Technology and Administration Planning, Kyoto University Hospital Kataoka, Yuki; Hyogo Prefectural Amagasaki Hospital, Banno, Masahiro; Seichiryo Hospital, Department of Psychiatry; Nagoya University Graduate School of Medicine, Department of Psychiatry Tsujimoto, Yasushi ; School of Public Health in the Graduate School of Medicine, Kyoto University, Healthcare Epidemiology; Kyoritsu Hospital, Nephrology and Dialysis Tsujimoto, Hiraku; Hospital Care Research Unit, Hyogo Prefectural Amagasaki General Medical Center Higuchi, Takahiro; Department of Health Promotion Science, Tokyo Metropolitan University
Primary Subject Heading :	Rehabilitation medicine
Secondary Subject Heading:	Rehabilitation medicine, Cardiovascular medicine, Medical education and training
Keywords:	Stroke < NEUROLOGY, REHABILITATION MEDICINE, MEDICAL EDUCATION & TRAINING

SCHOLARONE[™] Manuscripts
Obstacle avoidance training in individuals with stroke: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Daisuke Muroi, PhD, PT^{1,2}, Shosuke Ohtera, PhD, PT³, Yuki Kataoka, MPH, MD^{4,5}, Masahiro Banno, PhD, MD^{6,7}, Yasushi Tsujimoto, MPH, MD^{8,9}, Hiraku Tsujimoto, MD⁴, Takahiro Higuchi, PhD²

¹ Department of Rehabilitation, Kameda Medical Center, Chiba, Japan

² Department of Health Promotion Science, Tokyo Metropolitan University, Tokyo, Japan

³ Division of Medical Information Technology and Administration Planning, Kyoto University Hospital, Kyoto, Japan

⁴ Hospital Care Research Unit, Hyogo Prefectural Amagasaki General Medical Center,

Hyogo, Japan

⁵ Department of Respiratory Medicine, Hyogo Prefectural Amagasaki General Medical

Center, Hyogo, Japan

⁶Department of Psychiatry, Seichiryo Hospital, Nagoya, Aichi, Japan

⁷ Department of Psychiatry, Nagoya University Graduate School of Medicine, Nagoya,

Aichi, Japan

⁸ Department of Health care Epidemiology, School of Public Health in the Graduate

School of Medicine, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan

⁹ Department of Nephrology and Dialysis, Kyoritsu Hospital, Hyogo, Japan

Correspondence to Daisuke Muroi, PhD, PT, Kameda Medical Center, 929 Higashicho,

Kamogawa, Chiba 296-8602, Japan, Phone: +81-4-7093-1400, e-mail: mutyon88@hotmail.com relien.

(2867 words)

Abstract

Objectives: To determine evidence that obstacle avoidance training alone is effective in helping improve the locomotor ability of individuals with stroke.

Design: Systematic review and meta-analysis.

Setting: MEDLINE, EMBASE, CENTRAL, ICTRP, and PEDro were searched until December 2018. Two independent reviewers extracted data. Outcome measurement data were subjected to meta-analyses using random-effects models. Data syntheses were

BMJ Open

conducted using RevMan 5.3. The certainty of evidence was determined using the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation (GRADE) approach.

Participants: Papers that focused on participants with stroke and performed the usual gait training and those that included the adaptive locomotor training.

Primary and secondary outcome measures: Primary outcomes were gait speed, composite gait ability, and objective balance ability. Secondary outcomes were subjective balance ability, gait endurance, and fall incidence.

Results: Two studies with a total of 49 participants were used as data sources for the meta-analysis. The gait speed in the obstacle avoidance training was not higher than that in the control group (mean difference [MD] 0.03, 95% confidence interval [CI] [-0.11, 0.16], P = 0.51). The certainty of evidence was very low. Moreover, the subjective balance ability (activities-specific balance confidence scale) showed no significant difference between the intervention and control groups (MD 6.65, 95% CI [-7.59, 20.89], P = 0.36), but with extreme certainty of evidence.

Conclusions: This study suggests that obstacle avoidance training may have little or no effect on individuals with stroke. The failure to find the effectiveness of obstacle avoidance training alone would be caused by the insufficient amount of training in the

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

intervention, as well as the lack of well-designed studies that measured relevant outcomes.

PROSPERO registration number: CRD42017060691

Keywords: stroke, obstacle avoidance, systematic review, meta-analysis

Strengths and limitations of this study

This is a systematic review and meta-analysis of evidence on the effects of obstacle avoidance training in individuals who have suffered stroke.

This systematic review was conducted based on the Cochrane Handbook and the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) guidelines.

The literature search and study selection, data extraction, and risk of bias assessment were conducted by two independent reviewers.

This study is limited due to the insufficient amount of training in the intervention, and the lack of well-designed studies that measured relevant outcomes.

1 Introduction

Individuals with stroke often have impaired walking abilities, primarily due to motor paralysis on one side of the body.¹⁻³ They also have difficulty maintaining balance, particularly when adaptive locomotor adjustments in response to environmental properties are necessary (e.g., obstacle avoidance).⁴ In fact, the risk of falling is likely increased when individuals with stroke avoid an obstacle.⁵⁻⁷ Therefore, their walking ability should be improved under various environmental constraints through rehabilitation.

Rehabilitation after a stroke involves correct recognition of both lost and retained functions. It is also designed to reprogram the brain by relearning through repetitive task training.⁸ The mixed task-oriented circuit class training, including obstacle avoidance training, may promote relearning of gait.⁹ A previous study demonstrated that walking and task-oriented training related to walking, such as obstacle avoidance training, improved both the step distance and walking speed,⁹ thus reducing the length of hospital stay.¹⁰ Obstacle avoidance training has been performed as part of the circuit class training, and its effect was reported in this systematic review.9

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Gait training with adaptive locomotion training, such as obstacle avoidance, is usually selected in a clinical setting. Several studies supporting the effectiveness of obstacle avoidance training were conducted for participants with chronic stroke without combining with any other types of training, using a randomized controlled design.¹¹⁻¹⁴ Furthermore, a systematic review study also showed the effectiveness of obstacle avoidance training combined with other circuit training.⁹ However, the effects produced in the absence of adaptive locomotion training (i.e., the intervention effect produced from the usual gait training) are controversial. To eliminate this issue, whether the sole adaptive

locomotion training would lead to improved gait ability is investigated in this study. The search for randomized controlled trials (RCTs) on obstacle avoidance training for individuals with stroke was conducted to examine its efficacy by comparison with the usual approaches. Based on these results, obstacle avoidance training was found effective in helping individuals with stroke improve their locomotor ability.

 31 Methods

The protocol in this study was registered in PROSPERO (CRD42017060691).¹⁵ The systematic review was conducted based on the Cochrane Handbook^{16 17} and the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) guidelines.¹⁸ The systematic review and meta-analysis were assessed in accordance with the PRISMA checklist (see supplementary table).¹⁹

The following research question was used: "In participants with stroke, does obstacle avoidance training result in an improved, clinically relevant outcome compared with the usual care without obstacle avoidance training?"

- - 41 Data sources and searches

Systematic searches were conducted in four academic databases: MEDLINE, EMBASE, CENTRAL, and PEDro (all searched on December 18, 2018). Trials in the ICTRP were searched on December 18, 2018. These processes are presented in more detail in online supplementary file 1. References were also searched in accordance with the guidelines of the following organizations: the European Stroke Organization, the American Heart Association/American Stroke Association, and the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence.²⁰⁻²²

50 Study selection

Two independent reviewers (D.M. and S.O.) selected and reviewed the papers, and independently screened the titles and abstracts for the study selection, to determine whether each citation met the inclusion criteria. They assessed eligibility based on a fulltext review. The reviewers compared their lists, and any differences in opinion between them were resolved through discussion.

To be eligible for inclusion in this systematic review, papers should (1) focus on participants with various types of strokes (brain ischemia, intracranial hemorrhages, or subarachnoid hemorrhage) and all phases of stroke (acute, subacute, or chronic) individuals and (2) performed the usual gait training and those that included adaptive locomotor training in addition to usual gait training (interventions of any type, intensity, duration, and frequency). Studies with subjects with a disease other than stroke, or who underwent five types of training related to walking, such as circuit class training, were excluded from the study. The control condition was a physical therapy intervention, such as normal walking training for participants with stroke. The exclusion criteria of control conditions were as follows: the control group underwent interventions other than physical therapy if the intervention group did not undergo the intervention. References of extracted articles were also searched, and the authors of each study were conducted to obtain necessary data. The search was limited to published and unpublished RCTs. Crossover trials, cluster randomized trials, non-randomized trials, and observational studies were excluded.

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

The following primary outcomes were measured: (1) gait speed, measured in a 10m walking test (10MWT) or during a 6-minute walking test (6MWT); (2) composite gait

ability, measured in a Timed Up and Go test (TUG);²³ and (3) objective balance ability,
evaluated by researchers and measured according to the Berg Balance Scale (BBS).
Secondary outcomes were subjective balance ability evaluated by participants and
measured according to the Activities-specific Balance Confidence scale (ABC); gait
endurance, measured in a 6-minute walking test (6MWT); and fall incidence (at six
months or one year post-intervention).

80 Data extraction and quality assessment

Data extraction was performed using a standardized form that included participant characteristics (number of participants, number of patients excluded from the analysis, and settings), the intervention environment setup (obstacle avoidance, other rehabilitation training, and using a virtual reality system), types of outcomes (fall incidence, activities of daily living, gait ability, and balance ability), and training program details (types of exercises, duration, and frequency).

Standard data extraction forms were used by the two reviewers independently. Disagreement over data extraction was resolved through discussion. When the information was inadequate, the study authors were conducted to gather sufficient information.

The risk of bias of the included studies were also evaluated using the Cochrane Risk of Bias Tool.^{16 17} Each domain was assessed as high risk, low risk or unclear. Assessments were compared by two reviewers, and any differences in opinion between them were resolved through discussion and arbitration by a third reviewer (Y.K.) if consensus is not met. During the publication bias evaluation, funnel plot asymmetry was not evaluated because the number of studies was <10; rather, publication bias was evaluated by

י ר	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
10	
10	
19	
∠∪ 21	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
27	
20	
20	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
50	
5/	
58	
59	
60	

97 searching the clinical trial registry.

98

99 Data synthesis and analysis

For continuous outcomes (gait speed, TUG, BBS, ABC, and 6MWT), the mean difference (MD) with 95% confidence interval (CI) was calculated. The MD was used when data, including meta-analyses, were derived from the same indicators. We originally planned to use SMD in PROSPERO because the outcomes could be on a different scale; however, MD was adopted because the outcomes were on the same scale. Adverse events were summarized narratively, since the definition of these outcomes varied among studies.

Heterogeneity was assessed by visual inspection of forest plots and calculated Isquared statistic (I-squared values of 0%–40%: might not be important; 30%–60%: may
represent moderate heterogeneity; 50%–90%: may represent substantial heterogeneity;
75%–100%: considerable heterogeneity).^{16 17} The heterogeneity reason was investigated
whenever identified (I-squared statistic> 50%).

Data syntheses were conducted using RevMan 5.3 (RevMan 2014). A metaanalysis was conducted using the random-effects model. MD with 95% CI was calculated in continuous variables. All adverse events were excluded from the meta-analysis. An analysis of exercise versus any other controls was carried out.

A sensitivity analysis was conducted to determine the robustness of the findings. The sensitivity analysis of the primary outcome was planned in the following three ways: (1) restricting the analysis studies to those with a low risk of selection bias, (2) excluding trials with missing data, and (3) converting the random-effects model to a fixed-effects model. Selection bias that may have the largest effect on our research question was

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

identified; therefore, other risk of bias did not need to be assessed. Participant and public involvement No participants will be involved in this study. Summary of findings table The "Summary of findings table" was created using outcomes including gait speed, composite gait ability, objective balance scale, subjective balance scale, and gait endurance (Table 1). The five GRADE considerations (study limitations, consistency of effect, imprecision, indirectness, and publication bias) were used to assess the certainty of evidence as it related to studies contributing data to the review of outcomes.^{16 17 24 25} N.C.

Table 1. Summary of findings.

Outcome (time frame)	No. of patientsCertainty of evidence(studies)(GRADE)		Comparator	Intervention vs. comparator mean difference (95% CI)		
Gait speed (m/s) (3 to 4 weeks)	49 (2 RCT)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ Very low ^{abc}	The mean gait speed after treadmill walking training without obstacle-crossing in real-life situations ranged from 0.71 to 0.95 m/s.	0.03 m/s (95% CI: -0.11, 0.16) faster in intervention group.		
Composite gait ability29Image: Book abilityTUG (sec)(1 RCT)Low ability(4 weeks)(1 RCT)(1 RCT)		The mean time of TUG after treadmill walking training without obstacle- crossing in real-life situations was 15.37 s.	0.15 s (95% CI: -3.95, 4.25) faster in intervention group.			
Objective balance ability BBS score (4 weeks) Scale:0 to 56	29 (1 RCT)	⊕⊕⊝⊝ Low ^{ab}	The mean score of BBS after treadmill walking training without obstacle- crossing was 46.14.	-0.03 score (95% CI: -2.01, 1.95) higher in intervention group.		

BMJ Open

eliminated through the sensitivity analysis, as predefined. Finally, only two RCTs were

Page	1	1	of 35	
ruge		•	01.55	

Subjective balance ability ABC score (3 to 4 weeks) Scale: 0 to 100 Gait endurance 6MWT (m) (4 weeks)		49 (2 RCT)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ Very low ^{abc}	The mean score of ABC after treadmill walking training without obstacle- crossing in real-life situations ranged from 62,58 to 72,23	-6.67 score (95% CI: -20.97 7.58) higher in interventio group.					
		29 (1 RCT)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ Low ^{ab}	The mean walking distance after treadmill walking training without obstacle- crossing was 277.43 m.	-5.40 m (95% CI: -36.59, 25.79 longer distance in intervention group.					
135										
136	GRADE Workin	ng Group grad	es of evidence							
137	High quality : F	urther research	n is very unlikely	to change our confidence in t	he estimate of effect.					
138	Moderate quali	ity: Further re	search is likely t	o have an important impact of	on our confidence in					
139	the estimate of e	effect and may	change the estim	nate.						
140	Low quality : Fu	urther research	is very likely to l	have an important impact on	our confidence in the					
141	estimate of effect	et and is likely	to change the est	timate.						
142	Very low qualit	ty: The estima	te is very uncerta	in.						
143	^a Participants and	d personnel w	ere not blinded.							
144	^b The number of	participants v	vas small.							
145	^c The outcome d	ata were incor	mplete for 10% o	f participants.						
146										
147	<u>Results</u>									
148	The proc	cess of ident	ifying eligible	studies is outlined in Fig	. 1. Among 2,319					
149	identified paper	rs (including	titles and abstra	cts) from MEDLINE, EMI	BASE, CENTRAL,					
150	ICTRP, PEDro	ICTRP, PEDro, and manual search using the following search terms: stroke, obstacle,								
151	avoidance, task, exercise, rehabilitation, and training. Twenty-three potentially eligible									
152	studies were included. After reviewing the full text of 23 potential articles, two papers ¹³									
153	¹⁴ met the inclusion criteria. Nineteen of the remaining 21 papers were excluded because									
154	their studies in	cluded sever	al other forms c	of walking training (e.g., ci	ircuit class training					

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies

BMJ Open

and task-oriented training). One study¹¹ was excluded because obstacle avoidance training was not compared with regular training; however, both groups participated in obstacle avoidance training (in the water vs. on the ground). Another study¹² was excluded because of the wrong design (a cross-sectional study that assessed participants' characteristics in various environments including obstacle avoidance). There was no ongoing study.

Insert Figure 1 (PRISMA flow)

Two studies^{13 14} with a total of 54 participants met the inclusion criteria, and two studies with a total of 49 participants were used as data sources for the meta-analysis (Fig. 1). The discrepancy between the number of participants included in the meta-analysis and the total participants is due to some dropouts for the meta-analysis; four dropouts in Yang¹⁴ and one in the Jeong study.¹³ The characteristics of each study included are presented in **Table 2**. The risk of bias assessment is outlined in **Table 3**. In both studies, participants were not blinded to the intervention. Moreover, the studies had incomplete outcomes. One study¹³ reported an unknown risk of bias from published data; therefore, the authors were contacted. According to the authors, they had planned to measure the three-axis accelerometer and quality of life. However, considering several circumstances and patients' condition, they did not measure the above outcomes.

Table 2. Characteristics of included studies.

2 3 4												
5 6 7 8	Auth Year Cour	nor, -, ntry	Setting	Number of participants (Phases of stroke)	Study type	Intervention (frequency)	contents,	Control (standard care)	Outcomes			
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Yang et al 2008 Taiw	g YR ,, 3, van	Exercise laboratory	24 (Chronic) intervention: 12, control:12	Pilot RCT	Virtual reality treadmill train scenarios cons walking, stree obstacles strid and park stroll Intervention fo minutes/sessio a week for 3 w	-based ing: the sisted of lane t crossing, ing across, l. or 20 on, 3 sessions weeks	Treadmill training without virtual rea	g Gait speed ality. (10MWT), community walking time, walking ability questionnaire, and ABC			
18 19 20 21	Jeon et al. 2016 Kore	g YG , , ea	Exercise laboratory	30 (Chronic) intervention: 15, control: 15	Pilot RCT	Treadmill wal obstacle-cross situations. Intervention fo 5 times/week.	king with ing in real-life or 30 min/day, for 4 weeks.	Treadmill walking without obstacle crossing.	g 10MWT, 6MWT, BBS, TUG, and ABC			
22 23 24 25		177 178	Table 3. R	isk of bias asses	sment in inclue	led trials						
26 27 28 29 30		Trial Ra see ge		Random sequence generation	Allocation concealment	Blinding of participants and personnel	Blinding of outcome assessment	Incomplete outcome data	Selective reporting			
31 32		Yang	et al. 2008 ¹⁴	Unclear	Low	High	Low	High	Unclear			
33 34		Jeong	et al. 2016 ¹³	Low	Low	High	Low	High	Low			
35 36 37		179 180	Primary of	outcomes								
38 39 40		181	Pool	ing revealed th	at the group wl	ho underwent o	bstacle avoid	lance training	was not			
41 42		182	superior to	the control gr	oup in terms of	f gait speed [M	D 0.03, 95%	CI (-0.11, 0.1	16), P =			
43 44 45		183	0.51] (Fig	. 2a). For gait	speed, no hete	rogeneity was	observed (T	$au^2 = 0.00, I^2$	= 0%).			
46 47		184	Data on co	omposite gait a	nd objective ba	alance abilities	were availal	ole in one of th	he three			
48 49		185	studies. M	D (95% CI) of	the TUG was (0.15 (-3.95, 4.2	25) (Fig. 2b)	, and that (95%	% CI) of			
50 51 52		186	the BBS scores was -0.03 (-2.01, 1.95) (Fig. 2c). Sensitivity analysis results were									
53 54		187	approximately the same as the original results (Table 4).									
55 56		188										
57 58		189			Ir	nsert Figure 2						
60 59												

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

191 Table 4. Results of the sensitivity analysis for each primary outcome

	Analysis 1: restri	cting the	Analysis 2: exclu	iding trials	Analysis 3: converting random-		
	analyses on studi	es with low risk	imputed with mis	ssing data	effects model to fixed-effects		
	of selection bias				model		
Primary outcomes	N of trials	Result	N of trials	Result	N of trials	Result	
Gait speed	1 RCT (Jeong 2016)	0.04 [-0.10, 0.18]	2 RCTs (Yang 2008, Jeong 2016)	0.03 [-0.11, 0.16]	2 RCTs (Yang 2008, Jeong 2016)	0.03 [-0.11, 0.16]	
TUG	1 RCT (Jeong 2016)	0.15 [-3.95, 4.25]	1 RCT (Jeong 2016)	0.15 [-3.95, 4.25]	1 RCT (Jeong 2016)	0.15 [-3.95, 4.25]	
BBS	1 RCT (Jeong 2016)	-0.03 [-2.01, 1.95]	1 RCT (Jeong 2016)	-0.03 [-2.01, 1.95]	1 RCT (Jeong 2016)	-0.03 [-2.01, 1.95]	

194 Secondary outcomes

The subjective balance ability (ABC scale) also showed no significant difference between the intervention and control groups (MD –6.67, 95% CI [–20.92, 7.58], P = 0.36) (Fig. 3a). Substantial heterogeneity was observed (Tau² = 89.62, I ² = 83%). Data on gait endurance were available from one of the two studies,¹³ whereas data on fall incidence were not available from any study. The MD (95% CI) of 6MWT was –5.40 (–36.59, 25.79) (Fig. 3b).

There were no reports of adverse events during the intervention in any of the three studies.

202 studies

Discussion

Summary of findings

Insert Figure 3

Two RCT studies that met our criteria were found. The certainty of evidence was low or very low due to serious study limitations and imprecision. The meta-analysis showed that the obstacle avoidance training cannot improve the walking speed or subjective balance ability compared to the normal walking training.

Comparison with literature

There are at least two reasons for the failure to find the effectiveness of obstacle avoidance training alone. First, the amount of training is insufficient for both selected studies. According to a systematic review on circuit class training, the duration of intervention was approximately 60 minutes in a single session, and various walking-related training tasks were continuously performed.⁹ In contrast, the duration of obstacle avoidance training was only 20-30 minutes (see Table 2). No difference in training frequency (3–5 times per week) was observed between the intervention and training groups. A previous RCT showed that the lower limb training group (walking training in addition to normal training; upper and lower limb training on the functional recovery of activities of daily living or walking training), significantly differed from that of the control group (upper limb training or did not undergo any additional training in addition to normal training) in walking ability.²⁶ In the meta-analysis, the momentum of the lower limbs has been increased to improve gait speed and endurance.^{10 27} Therefore, an insufficient trial period may not show the effectiveness of obstacle avoidance training alone.

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

The second reason would be the lack of well-designed studies that measured relevant outcomes, such as fall incidence or composite gait ability. Indeed, no research has examined the occurrence rate of falling, and only one study has examined the

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

composite gait ability. In addition, the obstacle avoidance ability (e.g., success rates, avoidance reaction time, and foot clearance) was not measured in selected RCT for individuals with stroke. A previous systematic review for elderly individuals showed that the effect of physical training was evaluated by obstacle avoidance ability.²⁸ A previous observational study on individuals with stroke reported that obstacle-crossing training led to improved obstacle avoidance ability as one aspect of the gait adaptability training of individuals with stroke.²⁹ However, no outcome from the obstacle avoidance performance was reported in this systematic review and meta-analysis. Therefore, this study suggests that obstacle avoidance training alone may have little or no effect on improving walking or balance ability.

243 Strengths and limitations

The strengths of this study were as follows: the first systematic review and metaanalysis of the evidence on obstacle avoidance training effects in individuals with stroke and its careful and rigorous screening, extraction, and scoring process.

Its limitations were as follows: most studies had a high or unclear risk of bias and the number of RCT studies was small. Although a well-designed study¹³ showed an improvement in gait endurance and objective balance ability, the effects in the obstacle avoidance training group were not superior to those in the control group in this systematic review and meta-analysis. Based on these results, determining its influence on improved walking and balance abilities was difficult. Another limitation is that none of the two studies included in this study evaluated obstacle avoidance ability itself (e.g., toe clearance, success rate of obstacle-crossing). Therefore, the intervention effect of obstacle avoidance training may have been masked. In the future, trials with a low risk of bias,

BMJ Open

including an assessment of obstacle avoidance itself, should be accumulated to verify our findings. Since rehabilitation aimed to improve walking ability under various environmental constraints, the effect of obstacle avoidance training, other than step over training, should be confirmed. In the future, RCT studies on obstacle avoidance training of walking through apertures, including the occurrence rate of falling, and obstacle avoidance ability in the outcomes, should be conducted.

As a clinical limitation, the obstacle avoidance training as a single task is not useful from best available evidence, and other interventions, such as using combinations or increasing the amount of walking training, should also be considered.³⁰⁻³²

266 Clinical implications and recommendations

267 Confirming the effects of obstacle avoidance training in participants with stroke is 268 highly clinically important because participants are more likely to fall while avoiding an 269 obstacle. However, none of the outcomes was found to be significantly altered after 270 obstacle avoidance training. We currently recommend that rehabilitation workers allow 271 participants with stroke to practice other walking training as well as obstacle avoidance 272 training.

274 Conclusions

This review shows that obstacle avoidance training in addition to normal gait training, among individuals with stroke may have little or no effect. The failure of finding the effectiveness of the obstacle training alone may be due to the insufficient amount of training in the intervention and the lack of well-designed studies that measured relevant outcomes, such as fall incidence, composite gait abilities, and obstacle avoidance abilities.

280 Further research is required to identify the effects of obstacle avoidance training alone.

282 <u>Acknowledgment</u>

We are grateful to Mr. Yeon-Gyu Jeong and Prof. Jung-Wan Koo (Department of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, the Catholic University of Korea), the authors of the included study, for providing detailed information. We would also like to thank Dawn Brandon for English-language editing.

Contributors: DM, YK, MB, YT, and HT conceived the study. The protocol manuscript was drafted by DM, and revised by all authors. DM and YK designed the search strategies, and DM and SO performed the searches and screened studies for inclusion, extracted the data, and assessed the risk of bias of included studies. YK arbitrated disagreements between reviewers. DM, SO, and YK analyzed and interpreted the data. All authors have provided conceptual and/or methodological expertise. DM, YK, MB, YT, and TH have contributed to the critical revision of this manuscript for important intellectual content. All authors agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work and have read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding: This work was supported by Japan Society for the Promotion of Science
(KAKENHI Grant Number 18K17317 and 19K19845).

Competing interests: None declared.

Patient consent: Not required.

Provenance and peer review: Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

Data sharing statement: Our data is not in a repository. All data relevant to the study

303 are included in the article or uploaded as supplementary information. If you want to get

2		
4		
5 6 7	304	in touch, please contact: muroi.daisuke@kameda.jp.
7 8 9	305	References
10 11	306	1. Kim CM, Eng JJ. Symmetry in vertical ground reaction force is accompanied by
12 13	307	symmetry in temporal but not distance variables of gait in persons with stroke.
14 15 16	308	Gait Posture 2003;18(1):23-28. doi: 10.1016/s0966-6362(02)00122-4.
10 17 18	309	2. Jørgensen L, Crabtree NJ, Reeve J, et al. Ambulatory level and asymmetrical weight
19 20	310	bearing after stroke affects bone loss in the upper and lower part of the femoral
21 22	311	neck differently: bone adaptation after decreased mechanical loading. Bone
23 24 25	312	2000;27(5):701-07.
26 27	313	3. Patterson KK, Parafianowicz I, Danells CJ, et al. Gait asymmetry in community-
28 29	314	ambulating stroke survivors. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2008;89(2):304-10. doi:
30 31 32	315	10.1016/j.apmr.2007.08.142.
33 34	316	4. Den Otter AR, Geurts AC, de Haart M, et al. Step characteristics during obstacle
35 36	317	avoidance in hemiplegic stroke. Exp Brain Res 2005;161(2):180-92. doi:
37 38 20	318	10.1007/s00221-004-2057-0.
39 40 41	319	5. Hyndman D, Ashburn A, Stack E. Fall events among people with stroke living in the
42 43	320	community: circumstances of falls and characteristics of fallers. Arch Phys Med
44 45	321	Rehabil 2002;83(2):165-70. doi: 10.1053/apmr.2002.28030.
46 47 48	322	6. Simpson LA, Miller WC, Eng JJ. Effect of stroke on fall rate, location and predictors:
49 50	323	a prospective comparison of older adults with and without stroke. PLoS One
51 52	324	2011;6(4):e19431. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0019431.g001.
53 54 55	325	7. Harris JE, Eng JJ, Marigold DS, et al. Relationship of balance and mobility to fall
56 57	326	incidence in people with chronic stroke. <i>Phys Ther</i> 2005;85(2):150-58.
58 59 60	327	8. French B, Thomas L, Leathley M, et al. Does repetitive task training improve functional

activity after stroke? A Cochrane systematic review and meta-analysis. J Rehabil *Med* 2010;42(1):9-14. doi: 10.2340/16501977-0473. 9. Wevers L, van de Port I, Vermue M, et al. Effects of task-oriented circuit class training competency after stroke: a systematic on walking review. Stroke 2009;40(7):2450-59. doi: 10.1161/strokeaha.108.541946. 10. Veerbeek JM, Koolstra M, Ket JC, et al. Effects of augmented exercise therapy on outcome of gait and gait-related activities in the first 6 months after stroke: a meta-analysis. Stroke 2011;42(11):3311-5. doi: 10.1161/STROKEAHA.111.623819. 11. Jung J, Lee J, Chung E, et al. The effect of obstacle training in water on static balance of chronic stroke patients. J Phys Ther Sci 2014;26(3):437-40. 12. Lord SE, Rochester L, Weatherall M, et al. The effect of environment and task on gait parameters after stroke: a randomized comparison of measurement conditions. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2006;87(7):967-73. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2006.03.003. 13. Jeong YG, Koo JW. The effects of treadmill walking combined with obstacle-crossing on walking ability in ambulatory patients after stroke: a pilot randomized controlled trial. Top Stroke Rehabil 2016;23(6):406-12. 14. Yang YR, Tsai MP, Chuang TY, et al. Virtual reality-based training improves community ambulation in individuals with stroke: a randomized controlled trial. Gait Posture 2008;28(2):201-6. doi: 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2007.11.007. 15. Muroi D, Ohtera S, Banno M, et al. A systematic review of obstacle avoidance exercises in patients with stroke. 2017 Aug 17 ed: PROSPERO International prospective register of systematic reviews, 2017. 16. Higgins J, Green S. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions, version 5.1.02011.

BMJ Open

17. Higgins J, Thomas J. Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions.
2019(version 6).
18. Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting
systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate health care
interventions: explanation and elaboration. PLOS Medicine 2009;6(7):e1000100.
doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1000100.
19. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews
and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. PLOS Medicine 2009;6(7):e1000097.
doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097.
20. Steiner T, Al-Shahi Salman R, Beer R, et al. European Stroke Organisation (ESO)
guidelines for the management of spontaneous intracerebral hemorrhage. Int J
Stroke 2014;9(7):840-55. doi: 10.1111/ijs.12309.
21. Winstein CJ, Stein J, Arena R, et al. Guidelines for adult stroke rehabilitation and
recovery: a guideline for healthcare professionals from the American Heart
Association/American Stroke Association. Stroke 2016;47(6):e98-e169. doi:
10.1161/STR.000000000000098.
22. NICE guidelines: Stroke rehabilitation in adults e rehabilitation in adults 2013
[Available from: <u>https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg162]</u> .
23. Ng SS, Hui-Chan CW. The Timed up & go test: its reliability and association with
lower-limb impairments and locomotor capacities in people with chronic stroke.
Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2005;86(8):1641-47. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2005.01.011.
24. Guyatt G, Oxman A, Akl E, et al. GRADE guidelines: 1. Introduction-GRADE
evidence profiles and summary of findings tables. J Clin Epidemiol
2011;64(4):383-94.

A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting natic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate health care entions: explanation and elaboration. PLOS Medicine 2009;6(7):e1000100. 0.1371/journal.pmed.1000100. Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews eta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. PLOS Medicine 2009;6(7):e1000097. 0.1371/journal.pmed.1000097. Al-Shahi Salman R, Beer R, et al. European Stroke Organisation (ESO) ines for the management of spontaneous intracerebral hemorrhage. Int J 2014;9(7):840-55. doi: 10.1111/ijs.12309. CJ, Stein J, Arena R, et al. Guidelines for adult stroke rehabilitation and ery: a guideline for healthcare professionals from the American Heart iation/American Stroke Association. Stroke 2016;47(6):e98-e169. doi: 51/STR.000000000000098. idelines: Stroke rehabilitation in adults e rehabilitation in adults 2013 lable from: https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg162]. ui-Chan CW. The Timed up & go test: its reliability and association with

limb impairments and locomotor capacities in people with chronic stroke. *Phys Med Rehabil* 2005;86(8):1641-47. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2005.01.011.

, Oxman A, Akl E, et al. GRADE guidelines: 1. Introduction-GRADE nce profiles and summary of findings tables. J Clin Epidemiol 64(4):383-94.

376	25. Guyatt G, Oxman A, Vist G, et al. GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality
377	of evidence and strength of recommendations. BMJ 2008;Apr 26;336(7650):924-
378	26. doi: 10.1136/bmj.39489.470347.AD.
379	26. Kwakkel G, Wagenaar RC, Twisk JW, et al. Intensity of leg and arm training after
380	primary middle-cerebral-artery stroke: a randomised trial. Lancet
381	1999;354(917):191-96.
382	27. French B, Thomas LH, Leathley MJ, et al. Repetitive task training for improving
383	functional ability after stroke. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2007(4)
384	doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD006073.pub2.
385	28. Guadagnin E, Da Rocha E, Duysens J, et al. Does physical exercise improve obstacle
386	negotiation in the elderly? A systematic review. Arch Gerontol Geriatr
387	2016;64:138-45. doi: 10.1016/j.archger.2016.02.008.
388	29. van Ooijen MW, Heeren A, Smulders K, et al. Improved gait adjustments after gait
389	adaptability training are associated with reduced attentional demands in persons
390	with stroke. Exp Brain Res 2015;233(3):1007-18. doi: 10.1007/s00221-014-4175-
391	7.
392	30. Dean CM, Richards CL, Malouin F. Task-related circuit training improves
393	performance of locomotor tasks in chronic stroke: a randomized, controlled pilot
394	trial. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2000;81(4):409-417.
395	31. Blennerhassett J, Dite W. Additional task-related practice improves mobility and
396	upper limb function early after stroke: a randomised controlled trial. Aust J
397	<i>Physiother</i> 2004;50(4):219-24.
398	32. Salbach N, Mayo N, Wood-Dauphinee S, et al. A task-orientated intervention
399	enhances walking distance and speed in the first year post stroke: a randomized

BMJ Open

2 3		
4		
5 6	400	controlled trial. Clin Rehabil 2004; 18(5). 509-519.
/ 8 0	401	Figure Legends
10 11	402	Fig. 1. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses
12 13	403	(PRISMA) flow diagram
14 15 16	404	Fig. 2. Primary outcomes
16 17 18	405	a. Effects of training with obstacle avoidance on gait speed
19 20	406	b. Effects of training with obstacle avoidance on composite gait ability (TUG)
21 22	407	c. Effects of training with obstacle avoidance on objective balance ability (BBS
23 24 25	408	score)
26 27	409	Fig. 3. Secondary outcomes
28 29 20	410	a. Effects of training with obstacle avoidance on subjective balance ability (ABC
31 32	411	scale)
33 34	412	b. Effects of training with obstacle avoidance on gait endurance (6MWT)
35 36 37	413	
38 39	414	
40 41		
42 43		
44		
45		
46 47		
48		
49		
50		
51		
52 52		
55 54		
55		
56		
57		
58		
59		
60		

Fig 1.



Fig 2.

a.

	Co	ontrol		Tr	ainina			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subaroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV. Random, 95% CI	IV. Random, 95% CI
Jeong 2016	0.95	0.14	14	0.91	0.23	15	91.5%	0.04 [-0.10, 0.18]	
Yang 2008	0.73	0.63	9	0.85	0.31	11	8.5%	-0.12 [-0.57, 0.33]	—
-									
Total (95% CI)			23			26	100.0%	0.03 [-0.11, 0.16]	• • •
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0	.00; Chi	² = 0.4	4, df =	1 (P =	0.51);	l ² = 0%			-2 -1 0 1 2
Test for overall effect: Z	= 0.39	(P = 0	.69)						Favours [control] Favours [training]
h									
D.									
	C	ontro		t	raining	1		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Jeong 2016	15.37	6.77	14	15.22	4.06	15	100.0%	0.15 [-3.95, 4.25]	
									Т
Total (95% CI)			14			15	100.0%	0.15 [-3.95, 4.25]	🕈
Heterogeneity: Not app	olicable								-50 -25 0 25 50
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.07	7 (P =	0.94)						Favours [control] Favours [training]
с.									
	~	ontro		-	rainin	a		Moon Difforonce	Moon Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean		Tota	Weight	IV Random 95% Cl	IV Random 95% Cl
Jeong 2016	46 14	2 19	14	46.17	3 19	15	100.0%	-0.03 [-2.01 1.95]	IV, Kalidoli, 95% Cl
ocong 2010	40.14	2.15	1.4	40.17	0.15	10	100.070	0.00 [-2.01, 1.00]	
Total (95% CI)			14			15	100.0%	-0.03 [-2.01, 1.95]	♦
Heterogeneity: Not app	olicable								
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.03	8 (P =	0.98)						Favours [control] Favours [training]

Fig 3.

a.

Study or Subgroup	Contro	D Total	Tr	aining	Total	Woight	Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Joong 2010	CO SO 44		(2 ac	2.04	10101	67 70/	0.441.0.00.0.01	IV, Randolli, 95% Cl
Yang 2008	62.58 4.4 72.23 16.6	5 14 8 9	63.02 87.38	3.01 6.81	15 11	42.3%	-0.44 [-3.22, 2.34] -15.15 [-26.77, -3.53]	T
Total (95% CI)	90 62: Chi2 -	23	- 1 (D -	0 02)+ 12	26	100.0%	-6.67 [-20.92, 7.58]	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.92 (P =	0.36)	- I (P -	0.02), 1-	- 03%	b		-50 -25 0 25 50
	(.							Favours [control] Favours [training]
).								
	Contro	ol.	Т	raining			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean S	D Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Jeong 2016	277.43 41.0	1 14	282.83	44.68	15	100.0%	-5.40 [-36.59, 25.79]	
Total (95% CI)		14			15	100.0%	-5 40 1-36 59 25 791	
Heterogeneity: Not apr	olicable	14			10	100.070	-5.10 [-55.55, 25.16]	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.34 (P = 0	.73)						-100 -50 0 50 100 Favours [control] Favours [training]
								·

PRISMA 2009 Checklist

Page 27 of 35		BMJ Open BMJ Open	
PRISMA 2009 Checklist			
Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Reported on page #
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.	#1
ABSTRACT		ses es	
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: background; objectives; data sources; study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; study appraisal and synthesis methods; results; light constants; conclusions and implications of key findings; systematic review registration number.	#2-4
INTRODUCTION		ext Sup	
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.	#5-6
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants and eventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).	#5-6
METHODS		ning	
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate if a review protocol exists, if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address), and if available, provide registration information including registration number.	#6-7
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics e.g. years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale.	#7-8
Information sources	7	Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date last searched.	#6-7
Search	8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used to that it could be repeated.	supplementary material
Study selection	9	State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable, included in the meta-analysis).	#7-8
Data collection process	10	Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	#7-8
, Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and and simplifications made.	#7-9
Risk of bias in individual studies	12	Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), and how this information is to be used in any data so the study of outcome level.	#9-10
Summary measures	13	State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means).	#9-10
Synthesis of results	14	Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (e.g., I ²) for each meta-analysis.	#9-10
› 5 7		Page 1 of 2	



PRISMA 2009 Checklist

Page 28 of 35

—

		BMJ Open Grand	Page 28 of
PRISMA 2	009	Checklist	
Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Reported on page #
Risk of bias across studies	15	Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., put ication bias, selective reporting within studies).	#9-10
Additional analyses	16	Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-rearily and the second secon	#9-10
RESULTS		ar 20	
Study selection	17	Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with a flow diagram.	#11-12
Study characteristics	18	For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, P	#12-13
Risk of bias within studies	19	Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment stee item 12).	#12-13
Results of individual studies	20	For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple sum data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot	#10-11
Synthesis of results	21	Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measure of sonsistency.	#13-14
Risk of bias across studies	22	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).	#12-13
Additional analysis	23	Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-	#13-14
DISCUSSION			
Summary of evidence	24	Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; and be strength of evi	#14-15
Limitations	25	Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).	#16-17
Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research.	#17-18
FUNDING	1	<u>ې مې</u>	
Funding	27	Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data role of funders for the systematic review.	#18
9 0 <i>From:</i> Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaf 1 doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097	f J, Altn	nan DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The BRISMA Statement. PLoS M	1ed 6(7): e1000097.
2		Page 2 of 2	
3 4			
5		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	

1	
2	
3	
Δ	
5	
ر ء	
0	
/	
8	
9	_
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	י כ
2	2
2	ر ۸
2	4 7
2	2 2
2	0
2	/
2	8
2	9
3	0
3	1
3	2
3	3
3	4
3	5
3	6
3	7
3	, R
2	a
د ۸	פ ר
4	1
4	1
4	2
4	3
4	4

MEDLINE	Search Date: Dec/18/2018	No. trials
via PubMed		
#1	cerebrovascular disorders[mh]	340098
#2	stroke [tiab]	214501
#3	poststroke[tiab]	4481
#4	post-stroke[tiab]	7607
#5	cva[tiab]	2562
#6	apoplex* [tiab]	3051
#7	apoplexy* [tiab]	2951
#8	SAH	11418
#9	#1 OR #2 OR #3 OR #4 OR #5 OR #6 OR #7 OR #8	447589
#10	obstacle*[tiab]	42292
#11	avoidance*[tiab]	63634
#12	task*[tiab]	326509
#13	circuit*[tiab]	111076
#14	#10 OR #11 OR #12 OR #13	526921
#15	Exercise[mh]	172629
#16	Exercise therapy[mh]	44691
#17	rehabilitation[mh]	280813
#18	Physical Fitness[mh]	26565
#19	physical therapy modalities[mh]	140062
#20	#15 OR #16 OR #17 OR #18 OR #19	450023
#21	rehabilitation[tiab]	148672
#22	physical fitness[tiab]	8980
#23	training[tiab]	358168
#24	mobilization[tiab]	48140
#25	mobilisation[tiab]	5339
#26	physical therapy[tiab]	18559
#27	physiotherapy[tiab]	17248
#28	treadmill[tiab]	29617
#29	#21 OR #22 OR #23 OR #24 OR #25 OR #26 OR #27 OR #28	593233
#30	#20 OR #29	916879
#31	#14 AND #30	58502
#32	#9 AND #31	3671
#33	randomized controlled trial[pt]	473479
#34	controlled clinical trial[pt]	561431
#35	randomized[tiab]	463598

2			
3 4	#36	placebo[tiab]	199269
5	#37	clinical trials as topic[mesh: noexp]	185546
6 7	#38	randomly[tiab]	302662
8	#39	trial[ti]	191297
9 10	#40	#33 OR #34 OR #35 OR #36 OR #37 OR #38 OR #39	1195880
11	#41	animals[mh] NOT humans[mh]	4525626
12 13	#42	#40 NOT #41	1100461
14 15	#43	#32 AND #42	794

to peet terier only

Embase via	Dec/18/2018	No. trials
S1	(EMB.EXACT.EXPLODE("cerebrovascular disease"))	610
S2	(ab(stroke) OR ti(stroke))	3389
S3	(ab(poststroke) OR ti(poststroke))	58
S4	(ab(post-stroke) OR ti(post-stroke))	14
S5	(ab(cva) OR ti(cva))	5
S6	(ab(apoplex*) OR ti(apoplex*))	4.
S7	(ab(SAH) OR ti(SAH))	140
S8	S7 OR S6 OR S5 OR S4 OR S3 OR S2 OR S1	733
S9	(ab(obstacle*) OR ti(obstacle*))	53
S10	(ab(avoidance*) OR ti(avoidance*))	84
S11	(ab(task*) OR ti(task*))	401
S12	(ab(circuit*) OR ti(circuit*))	133
S13	S12 OR S11 OR S10 OR S9	6514
S14	EMB.EXACT("physiotherapy")	912
S15	EMB.EXACT.EXPLODE("exercise")	367:
S16	EMB.EXACT.EXPLODE("kinesiotherapy")	79
S17	EMB.EXACT("rehabilitation")	273
S18	(EMB.EXACT("occupational therapy"))	23
S19	(EMB.EXACT.EXPLODE("feedback system"))	1314
S20	(EMB.EXACT("joint mobilization"))	12
S21	S20 OR S19 OR S18 OR S17 OR S16 OR S15 OR S14	8309
S22	(ab(rehabilitation) OR ti(rehabilitation))	2130
S23	(ab("physical fitness") OR ti("physical fitness"))	110
S24	(ab(training) OR ti(training))	483
S25	(ab(mobili*ation) OR ti(mobili*ation))	73
S26	(ab("physical therapy") OR ti("physical therapy"))	25
S27	(ab(physiotherapy) OR ti(physiotherapy))	31
S28	(ab(treadmill) OR ti(treadmill))	38
S29	S28 OR S27 OR S26 OR S25 OR S24 OR S23 OR S22	812
S30	S29 OR S21	1348
S31	S30 AND S13 AND S8	5
S32	(EMB.EXACT("double blind procedure"))	162
S33	(ab(double NEAR/1 blind*) OR ti(double NEAR/1 blind*))	198
S34	(ab(placebo*) OR ti(placebo*))	287
S35	(ab(blind*) OR ti(blind*))	394

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open

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

S36	S35 OR S34 OR S33 OR S32	566534
S37	\$36 AND \$31	433

to beet teries only

CENTRAL	Nov/27/2017	No. trials
#1	cerebrovascular disease	7564
#2	stroke	54497
#3	poststroke	3367
#4	post-stroke	3131
#5	cva	509
#6	apoplex*	505
#7	SAH	906
#8	#1 or #2 or #3 or #4 or #5 or #6 or #7	57849
#9	obstacle*	1374
#10	avoidance*	4997
#11	task*	29218
#12	circuit*	3773
#13	#9 or #10 or #11 or #12	38053
#14	physiotherapy	10877
#15	exercise	70707
#16	kinesiotherapy	2422
#17	rehabilitation	46793
#18	occupational therapy	5089
#19	feedback system	5032
#20	joint mobilization	919
#21	#14 or #15 or #16 or #17 or #18 or #19 or #20	114870
#22	rehabilitation	46793
#23	"physical fitness'	6746
#24	training	62855
#25	mobili\$ation	10
#26	"physical therapy'	42478
#27	physiotherapy	10877
#28	treadmill	6453
#29	#22 or #23 or #24 or #25 or #26 or #27 or #28	131896
#30	#21 or #29	167041
#31	#8 and #13 and #30	2017
#32	(double next/1 blind*) or placebo*:ab.ti or blind*:ab.ti	371794
#33	#31 and #32	790
	Trials	157

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

ICTRP	Dec/18/2018	No. trials
#1	obstacle* OR avoidance*	538
#2	task oriented OR circuit training	153
Total		691

for occr terien only

PEDro		Dec/18/2018	No. trials
#1	tiab	obstacle*	80
#2	tiab	avoidance*	220
#3	tiab	circuit*	221
Total			521

to occurrences on the second

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

BMJ Open

Obstacle avoidance training for individuals with stroke: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-028873.R2
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	21-Nov-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Muroi, Daisuke; Kameda Medical Center; Department of Health Promotion Science, Tokyo Metropolitan University Ohtera, Shosuke; Division of Medical Information Technology and Administration Planning, Kyoto University Hospital Kataoka, Yuki; Hyogo Prefectural Amagasaki Hospital, Banno, Masahiro; Seichiryo Hospital, Department of Psychiatry; Nagoya University Graduate School of Medicine, Department of Psychiatry Tsujimoto, Yasushi ; School of Public Health in the Graduate School of Medicine, Kyoto University, Healthcare Epidemiology; Kyoritsu Hospital, Nephrology and Dialysis Tsujimoto, Hiraku; Hospital Care Research Unit, Hyogo Prefectural Amagasaki General Medical Center Higuchi, Takahiro; Department of Health Promotion Science, Tokyo Metropolitan University
Primary Subject Heading :	Rehabilitation medicine
Secondary Subject Heading:	Rehabilitation medicine, Cardiovascular medicine, Medical education and training
Keywords:	Stroke < NEUROLOGY, REHABILITATION MEDICINE, MEDICAL EDUCATION & TRAINING

SCHOLARONE[™] Manuscripts
Obstacle avoidance training for individuals with stroke: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Daisuke Muroi, PhD, PT^{1,2}, Shosuke Ohtera, PhD, PT³, Yuki Kataoka, MPH, MD^{4,5}, Masahiro Banno, PhD, MD^{6,7}, Yasushi Tsujimoto, MPH, MD^{8,9}, Hiraku Tsujimoto, MD⁴, Takahiro Higuchi, PhD²

¹ Department of Rehabilitation, Kameda Medical Center, Chiba, Japan

² Department of Health Promotion Science, Tokyo Metropolitan University, Tokyo, Japan

³ Division of Medical Information Technology and Administration Planning, Kyoto University Hospital, Kyoto, Japan

⁴ Hospital Care Research Unit, Hyogo Prefectural Amagasaki General Medical Center,

Hyogo, Japan

⁵ Department of Respiratory Medicine, Hyogo Prefectural Amagasaki General Medical

Center, Hyogo, Japan

⁶Department of Psychiatry, Seichiryo Hospital, Nagoya, Aichi, Japan

⁷ Department of Psychiatry, Nagoya University Graduate School of Medicine, Nagoya,

Aichi, Japan

⁸ Department of Health Care Epidemiology, School of Public Health in the Graduate

School of Medicine, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan

⁹ Department of Nephrology and Dialysis, Kyoritsu Hospital, Hyogo, Japan

Correspondence to Daisuke Muroi, PhD, PT; Kameda Medical Center, 929 Higashicho,

Kamogawa, Chiba 296-8602, Japan, Phone: +81-4-7093-1400, e-mail: mutyon88@hotmail.com review.

(2839 words)

Abstract

Objectives: To accumulate evidence that obstacle avoidance training alone is effective in improving the locomotor ability of individuals with stroke

Design: Systematic review and meta-analysis

Setting: MEDLINE, EMBASE, CENTRAL, ICTRP, and PEDro were searched for related information until December 2018. Two independent reviewers extracted data. Outcome measurement data were subjected to meta-analyses using random-effects

BMJ Open

models. Data syntheses were conducted using RevMan 5.3, and the certainty of evidence was determined using the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation approach.

Participants: Participants with various types and phases of stroke were included.

Intervention: The usual gait training including obstacle avoidance training (interventions of any type, intensity, duration, and frequency)

Primary and secondary outcome measures: Primary outcomes were gait speed, composite gait ability, and objective balance ability. Secondary outcomes were subjective balance ability, gait endurance, and fall incidence.

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

Results: Two randomized controlled trials with a total of 49 participants were used as data sources for this study. The obstacle avoidance training (training) group had lower gait speed than the control group [mean difference (MD) 0.03, 95% confidence interval (CI) (-0.11, 0.16), P = 0.51]. Further, the certainty of evidence was very low. The subjective balance ability (Activities-specific Balance Confidence scale) was not significantly different between the training and control groups [MD 6.65, 95% CI (-7.59, 20.89), P = 0.36], and it showed very low certainty of evidence.

Conclusions: Obstacle avoidance training may have little or no effect on individuals with stroke. The failure to find the effectiveness of obstacle avoidance training alone is

possibly attributable to the insufficient amount of training in the intervention and the lack

of well-designed studies that measured relevant outcomes.

PROSPERO registration number: CRD42017060691

Keywords: stroke, obstacle avoidance, systematic review, meta-analysis

Strengths and limitations of this study

This is a systematic review and meta-analysis on evidence of the effects of obstacle avoidance training on individuals with stroke.

This study was conducted based on the Cochrane Handbook and the Preferred

Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis guidelines.

Literature search and study selection, data extraction, and risk of bias assessment were conducted by two independent reviewers.

This study is limited due to the insufficient amount of training in the intervention,

and the lack of well-designed studies that measured relevant outcomes.

1 Introduction

Individuals with stroke often have impaired gait abilities primarily due to motor paralysis of one side of the body.¹⁻³ They also have difficulty in maintaining balance, particularly when adaptive locomotor adjustments are necessary in response to environmental properties (e.g., obstacle avoidance).⁴ In fact, the risk of falling likely increases when individuals with stroke avoid an obstacle.⁵⁻⁷ Therefore, their gait ability should be improved under various environmental constraints through rehabilitation.

Stroke rehabilitation involves correct recognition of both lost and retained functions. It is also designed to reprogram the brain by relearning through repetitive task training.⁸ The mixed task-oriented circuit class training, including obstacle avoidance training, may promote gait relearning.⁹ A previous study demonstrated that gait training and task-oriented training related to gait, such as obstacle avoidance training, improved step distance and gait speed,⁹ thus reducing the length of hospital stay.¹⁰ Obstacle avoidance training has been performed as part of the circuit class training, and its effect has been reported in a systematic review.9

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies

Gait training with adaptive locomotor training, such as obstacle avoidance training, is usually selected in a clinical setting. Several randomized controlled trials (RCTs) supporting the effectiveness of obstacle avoidance training have been conducted on participants with chronic stroke without combining with any other type of training.¹¹⁻¹⁴ Furthermore, a systematic review showed the effectiveness of obstacle avoidance training combined with other circuit training.⁹ However, the effects produced in the absence of adaptive locomotor training (i.e., the intervention effect of the usual gait training) are controversial. To eliminate this issue, whether adaptive locomotor training alone can lead to improved gait ability was investigated in this study. The search for RCTs on obstacle

avoidance training for individuals with stroke was conducted to examine its efficacy
compared with that of the usual gait training approaches. This review aimed to collect
evidence on whether obstacle avoidance training alone is effective in improving the
locomotor ability of individuals with stroke.

 30 Methods

The study protocol has been registered in PROSPERO (CRD42017060691).¹⁵ This systematic review and meta-analysis was conducted based on the Cochrane Handbook¹⁶ and the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) guidelines.¹⁸ This study was performed in accordance with the PRISMA checklist (online supplementary table).¹⁹

The following research question was used: "Regarding individuals with stroke, does obstacle avoidance training alone result in an improved, clinically relevant outcome compared with the usual care without obstacle avoidance training?"

40 Data sources and searches

Systematic searches were conducted using four academic databases: MEDLINE,
EMBASE, CENTRAL, and PEDro (all searched on December 18, 2018). RCTs in ICTRP
were searched on December 18, 2018. These processes are presented in more detail in
online supplementary file 1. The references of the extracted studies were also searched in
accordance with the guidelines of the following organizations: European Stroke
Organization, American Heart Association/American Stroke Association, and National
Institute for Health and Care Excellence.²⁰⁻²²

49 Study selection

50 Two independent reviewers (DM and SO) selected and reviewed studies, and they 51 independently screened the titles and abstracts for study selection to determine whether 52 each citation met the inclusion criteria. They assessed eligibility based on a full-text 53 review. The reviewers compared their lists, and any differences in opinion between them 54 were resolved through discussion.

To be eligible for inclusion in this systematic review, studies had to (1) focus on participants with various types of strokes (brain ischemia, intracranial hemorrhage, or subarachnoid hemorrhage) and on all phases of stroke in affected individuals (acute, subacute, or chronic) and (2) perform the usual gait training and include adaptive locomotor training in addition to the usual gait training (interventions of any type, intensity, duration, and frequency; training group). Studies with participants with a disease other than stroke or who underwent multiple gait-related training other than obstacle avoidance training, such as circuit class training, were excluded from the study.

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

The control criterion was a physical therapy intervention such as usual gait training for participants with stroke (control group). The exclusion criteria for the control group were as follows. The control group underwent interventions other than physical therapy if the training group did not undergo the study intervention. The references of extracted articles were also searched, and the authors of each study were contacted to obtain necessary data. The search was limited to published and unpublished RCTs. Crossover trials, cluster randomized trials, nonrandomized trials, and observational studies were excluded.

The following primary outcomes were measured: (1) gait speed, measured using
the 10-m walk test (10MWT) or 6-min walk test (6MWT); (2) composite gait ability,

measured using the Timed Up and Go test (TUG);²³ and (3) objective balance ability, evaluated by researchers and measured according to the Berg Balance Scale (BBS). Secondary outcomes were subjective balance ability, evaluated by participants and measured according to the Activities-specific Balance Confidence scale (ABC); gait endurance, measured using 6MWT; and fall incidence, measured at postintervention 6 months or 1 year.

.

80 Data extraction and quality assessment

Data extraction was performed using a standardized form that included participant characteristics (number of participants, number of patients excluded from the analysis, and setting), the intervention environment setup (obstacle avoidance, other rehabilitation training, and using a virtual reality system), types of outcomes (fall incidence, activities of daily living, gait ability, and balance ability), and training program details (types of exercises, duration, and frequency).

Standard data extraction forms were used by the two independent reviewers. Disagreement over data extraction was resolved through discussion. When the information was inadequate, the study authors were contacted to gather sufficient information.

The risk of bias of the included studies was also evaluated using the Cochrane Risk of Bias Tool.¹⁶ ¹⁷ Each domain was assessed as high risk, low risk, or unclear. Assessments were compared by the two independent reviewers, and any differences in opinion between them were resolved through discussion and arbitration by a third reviewer (YK) if consensus was not met. During publication bias evaluation, funnel plot asymmetry was not evaluated because the number of studies was <10; rather, publication 97 bias was evaluated by searching the clinical trial registry.

99 Data synthesis and analysis

For continuous outcomes (gait speed, TUG, BBS, ABC, and 6MWT), the mean difference (MD) with 95% confidence interval (CI) was calculated. MD was used when data, including meta-analysis data, were derived from the same indicators. We originally planned to use SMD in PROSPERO because the outcomes could be measured on a different scale; however, MD was adopted because the outcomes were measured on the same scale. Adverse events are summarized narratively because the definition of these outcomes varied among studies.

Heterogeneity was assessed by visual inspection of forest plots and calculated using I-squared statistic (I-squared values of 0%–40%: might not be important; 30%–60%: may represent moderate heterogeneity; 50%–90%: may represent substantial heterogeneity; and 75%–100%: considerable heterogeneity).¹⁶ ¹⁷ Reasons for heterogeneity were investigated whenever identified (I-squared statistic > 50%). Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Data syntheses were conducted using RevMan 5.3 (RevMan 2014). A metaanalysis was conducted using a random-effects model. All adverse events were excluded from the meta-analysis. Further, an analysis of intervention versus any other controls was conducted.

Sensitivity analysis was conducted to determine the robustness of the findings. The sensitivity analysis of the primary outcome was planned in the following ways: (1) restricting analysis studies to those with a low risk of selection bias, (2) excluding trials with missing data, and (3) converting the random-effects model to a fixed-effects model. Selection bias that may have the largest effect on our research question was eliminated

through sensi	itivity analysis as	s predefined. F	inally, only 2 RCTs were	identified; therefore,
2 other risks of bias did not have to be assessed.				
Participant a	and public invo	lvement		
No parti	cipants were inv	volved in this s	tudy.	
Ethical cons	ideration			
Instituti	ional review boa	ard approval v	vas not necessary becaus	e all the data were
retrieved fror	n public databas	es.		
<u>Results</u>				
Summary of	findings			
The "S	ummary of findi	ngs table" was	created using outcomes in	ncluding gait speed,
composite ga	ait ability, objec	ctive balance	ability, subjective balance	ce ability, and gait
endurance (T	Table 1). The five	e GRADE cor	siderations (study limitation	ions, consistency of
effect, impre-	cision, indirectn	ess, and publi	cation bias) were used to	assess the certainty
of evidence	because they an	re related to	studies contributing data	for the review of
outcomes. ¹⁶¹	7 24 25			
Table 1. Sum	mary of findings			
2	Number of	Certainty of	Comparator	Training vs. control
me)	participants (studios)	evidence	F	Mean difference (95% CI)
	(studies)	(ORADE)		
ed (m/s)	49 (2 RCT)	0000 Very low abc	The mean gait speed after treadmill gait training	0.03 m/s (95% CI: -0.11, 0.16)
	through sensitions of the sensition of t	through sensitivity analysis as other risks of bias did not hav Participant and public invo No participants were inv Ethical consideration Institutional review boa retrieved from public databas <u>Results</u> Summary of findings The "Summary of findings The "Summary of finding composite gait ability, object endurance (Table 1). The fiv effect, imprecision, indirection of evidence because they ar outcomes. ^{16 17 24 25} Table 1. Summary of findings et (m/s) 49 eeks) (2 RCT)	through sensitivity analysis as predefined. F other risks of bias did not have to be assess Participant and public involvement No participants were involved in this s Ethical consideration Institutional review board approval of retrieved from public databases. Results Summary of findings The "Summary of findings table" was composite gait ability, objective balance endurance (Table 1). The five GRADE cor effect, imprecision, indirectness, and public of evidence because they are related to outcomes. ^{16 17 24 25} Table 1. Summary of findings. et (m/s) 49 evee eks) (2 RCT) Very low ^{abc}	through sensitivity analysis as predefined. Finally, only 2 RCTs were in other risks of bias did not have to be assessed. Participant and public involvement No participants were involved in this study. Ethical consideration Institutional review board approval was not necessary because retrieved from public databases. Results Summary of findings The "Summary of findings table" was created using outcomes in composite gait ability, objective balance ability, subjective balance endurance (Table 1). The five GRADE considerations (study limitate effect, imprecision, indirectness, and publication bias) were used to of evidence because they are related to studies contributing data outcomes. ^{16,17,24,25} Table 1. Summary of findings. e Mumber of Certainty of Comparator (studies) Q RCT) Very low ^{abs} The mean gait speed after evidence (gradDE) The mean gait speed after

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

without obstacle crossing

				in real-life situations ranged from 0.71 to 0.95	
Compos TUG ((4 wee	site gait ability s) ks)	29 (1 RCT)	⊕⊕⊝⊝ Low ^{ab}	The mean time of TUG after treadmill gait training without obstacle crossing in real-life situations was	0.15 s (95% CI: -3.95, 4.25 faster in the training group
Objectiv BBS so (4 wee Scale:	ve balance ability core ks) 0–56	29 (1 RCT)	⊕⊕⊖⊝ Low ^{ab}	The mean score of BBS after treadmill gait training without obstacle crossing was 46.14.	-0.03 score (95% CI: -2.0 1.95) higher in the training grou
Subjecti ABC s (3–4 w Scale:	ive balance ability core veeks) 0–100	49 (2 RCT)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ Very low ^{abc}	The mean score of ABC after treadmill gait training without obstacle crossing in real-life situations ranged from 62.58 to	-6.67 score (95% CI: -20.9 7.58) higher in the training grou
Gait end 6MWT (4 wee	durance [(m) ks)	29 (1 RCT)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ Low ^{ab}	The mean gait distance after treadmill gait training without obstacle crossing was 277 43 m	-5.40 m (95% CI: -36.59, 25.79 longer distance in the trainin group
141				was 277.45 III.	
142	GRADE Workir	ng Group grad	es of evidence		
142 143	GRADE Workir High quality : Fr	ng Group grad urther research	es of evidence n is very unlikely	to change our confidence in t	he estimate of effect.
142 143 144	GRADE Workir High quality: Fu Moderate quali	ng Group grad urther research i ty : Further re	es of evidence n is very unlikely search is likely t	to change our confidence in t o have an important impact o	he estimate of effect. on our confidence in
142 143 144 145	GRADE Workin High quality : For Moderate quali the estimate of e	ng Group grad urther research i ty : Further re ffect and may	es of evidence is very unlikely search is likely t change the estim	to change our confidence in t o have an important impact o nate.	he estimate of effect. on our confidence in
142 143 144 145 146	GRADE Workin High quality: Fu Moderate quality the estimate of e Low quality: Fu	ng Group grad urther research ity: Further re ffect and may urther research	es of evidence is very unlikely search is likely t change the estim is very likely to l	to change our confidence in t o have an important impact o nate. have an important impact on o	he estimate of effect. on our confidence in our confidence in the
142 143 144 145 146 147	GRADE Workin High quality: For Moderate quality the estimate of e Low quality: For estimate of effect	ng Group grad urther research i ty : Further re ffect and may urther research et and is likely	es of evidence is very unlikely search is likely t change the estim is very likely to b to change the est	to change our confidence in to have an important impact on the second se	he estimate of effect. on our confidence in our confidence in the
142 143 144 145 146 147 148	GRADE Workin High quality: Fu Moderate qualit the estimate of e Low quality: Fu estimate of effect Very low qualit	ng Group grad urther research ity: Further re ffect and may urther research et and is likely ty: The estimat	es of evidence is very unlikely search is likely t change the estim is very likely to l to change the est te is very uncerta	to change our confidence in t o have an important impact on nate. have an important impact on timate.	he estimate of effect. on our confidence in our confidence in the
142 143 144 145 146 147 148 149	GRADE Workin High quality: For Moderate quality the estimate of e Low quality: For estimate of effect Very low quality ^a Participants and	ng Group grad urther research ity: Further re ffect and may urther research et and is likely y: The estimat d personnel we	es of evidence is very unlikely search is likely t change the estim is very likely to b to change the est te is very uncerta ere not blinded.	to change our confidence in t o have an important impact on hate. have an important impact on timate. in.	he estimate of effect. on our confidence in our confidence in the
142 143 144 145 146 147 148 149 150	GRADE Workin High quality: For Moderate qualit the estimate of e Low quality: For estimate of effect Very low qualit ^a Participants and ^b The number of	ng Group grad urther research ity: Further re- ffect and may urther research et and is likely ty: The estimat d personnel we participants w	es of evidence n is very unlikely search is likely t change the estim is very likely to l to change the est te is very uncerta ere not blinded.	to change our confidence in t o have an important impact on hate. have an important impact on timate. in.	he estimate of effect. on our confidence in our confidence in the
142 143 144 145 146 147 148 149 150 151	GRADE Workin High quality: For Moderate qualit the estimate of e Low quality: For estimate of effect Very low qualit ^a Participants and ^b The number of ^c The outcome d	ng Group grad urther research ity: Further re ffect and may urther research et and is likely ey: The estimat d personnel we participants w ata were incor	es of evidence n is very unlikely search is likely t change the estim is very likely to l to change the est te is very uncerta ere not blinded. vas small. nplete for 10% o	to change our confidence in to o have an important impact of hate. have an important impact on of timate. hin.	he estimate of effect. on our confidence in our confidence in the
142 143 144 145 146 147 148 149 150 151 152	GRADE Workin High quality: For Moderate qualit the estimate of e Low quality: For estimate of effect Very low qualit ^a Participants and ^b The number of ^c The outcome d	ng Group grad urther research ity: Further re iffect and may irther research et and is likely ty: The estimat d personnel wo participants w ata were incor	es of evidence n is very unlikely search is likely t change the estim is very likely to l to change the est te is very uncerta ere not blinded. vas small. nplete for 10% o	to change our confidence in to o have an important impact on hate. have an important impact on to timate. in.	he estimate of effect. on our confidence in our confidence in the
 142 143 144 145 146 147 148 149 150 151 152 153 	GRADE Workin High quality : Fit Moderate qualit the estimate of effect Low quality : Fit estimate of effect Very low qualit ^a Participants and ^b The number of ^c The outcome d PRISMA flow	ng Group grad urther research ity: Further re ffect and may urther research et and is likely ty: The estimat d personnel we participants w ata were incor diagram	es of evidence n is very unlikely search is likely t change the estim is very likely to l to change the est te is very uncerta ere not blinded. vas small. nplete for 10% o	to change our confidence in to o have an important impact of hate. have an important impact on of timate. hin.	he estimate of effect. on our confidence in our confidence in the
142 143 144 145 146 147 148 149 150 151 152 153 154	GRADE Workin High quality: For Moderate qualit the estimate of e Low quality: For estimate of effect Very low qualit ^a Participants and ^b The number of ^c The outcome d PRISMA flow The proc	ng Group grad urther research ity: Further re- ffect and may urther research et and is likely ty: The estimat d personnel wo participants w ata were incor diagram ess of identi	es of evidence n is very unlikely search is likely t change the estim is very likely to l to change the est te is very uncerta ere not blinded. vas small. nplete for 10% o	to change our confidence in to have an important impact of the formate. have an important impact on the formate. timate. in. f participants. tudies is outlined in Fig.	he estimate of effect. on our confidence in our confidence in the 1. A total of 2,319

BMJ Open

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies

CENTRAL, ICTRP, PEDro, and manual search using the following search terms: stroke, obstacle, avoidance, task, exercise, rehabilitation, and training. Twenty-three potentially eligible articles were included. After reviewing the full text of these 23 potential articles, 2 articles¹³ ¹⁴ met the inclusion criteria. Nineteen of the remaining 21 articles were excluded because their studies included several other forms of gait training (e.g., circuit class training and task-oriented training). From the remaining 2 studies, 1¹¹ was excluded because obstacle avoidance training was not compared with the usual gait training; however, both groups participated in obstacle avoidance training (in water vs. on the ground). The other study¹² was excluded because of a wrong design (a cross-sectional study that assessed participant characteristics in various environments including obstacle avoidance). Moreover, there was no related ongoing study.

Insert Figure 1 (PRISMA flow)

Two articles¹³¹⁴ with a total of 54 participants met the inclusion criteria, and 2 articles with a total of 49 participants were used as data sources for the present meta-analysis (Fig. 1). The discrepancy between the number of participants included in the meta-analysis and the total number of participants is due to some dropouts from the meta-analysis: 4 dropouts from the study by Yang¹⁴ and 1 from the study by Jeong.¹³ The characteristics of each included study are presented in **Table 2**. The details of the risk of bias assessment are outlined in Table 3. In both studies, participants were not blinded to the intervention. Moreover, the studies had incomplete outcomes. One study¹³ reported an unknown risk of bias from published data; therefore, the authors were contacted. According to the authors, they had planned to measure the three-axis accelerometer and

51 52

53 54

55 56 57

58 59 60

1							
2							
3							
4							
5 6	180	quality of	of life. However, c	onsidering sev	veral circumstances an	nd patient conditions,	they
7							
8	181	did not i	measure these outco	omes.			
9							
10	182						
11							
12	183	Table 2	Characteristics of t	he included tr	ials		
13	100	1 4010 21					
14	Author,	Setting	Number of	Study type	Training (contents,	Control (standard	Outcomes
15	Year,	C	participants	5 51	frequency)	care)	
16	Country		(phases of stroke)				
17							

17 18									
19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Yang et al., 2008, ¹⁴ Taiwan	Exercise laboratory	24 (chronic) training: 12, control: 12	Pilot RCT	Virtual reality treadmill train comprised lan crossing, obst across, and pa Intervention f min/session, 3 week for 3 we	r-based ing: scenarios le gait, street acles striding lrk stroll. for 20 d sessions/ beks	Treadmill training without virtual re	g Gait spec ality (10MWT commun time, Walking Questior and ABC	ed Γ), ity gait ; Ability maire, C
26 27 28 29 30	Jeong et al., 2016, ¹³ Korea	Exercise laboratory	30 (chronic) training: 15, control: 15	Pilot RCT	Treadmill gait crossing in rea situations. Intervention for 5 times/week,	t with obstacle al-life or 30 min/day, for 4 weeks.	Treadmill gait wi obstacle crossing	thout 10MWT 6MWT, TUG, an	, BBS, Id ABC
31 32 33 34	184 185	Table 3. R	isk of bias ass	essment in the in	cluded trials				
35 36 37 38 39	Trial		Random sequence generation	Allocation concealment	Blinding of participants and personnel	Blinding of outcome assessment	Incomplete outcome data	Selective reporting	
40	Yang	et al., 2008 ¹⁴	Unclear	Low	High	Low	High	Unclear	
41 42	Jeong	g et al., 2016 ¹³	Low	Low	High	Low	High	Low	
43 44	186								
45 46 47	187	Primary	outcomes						

Pooling revealed that the group that underwent obstacle avoidance training (training group) was not superior to the control group in terms of gait speed [MD 0.03, 95% CI (-0.11, 0.16), P = 0.51] (**Fig. 2a**). Regarding gait speed, no heterogeneity was observed (Tau² = 0.00, I ² = 0%). Data on composite gait and objective balance abilities were available in 1 of the 3 RCTs. MD (95% CI) for TUG was 0.15 (-3.95, 4.25) (**Fig. 2b**) and

193 that (95% CI) for the BBS scores was -0.03 (-2.01, 1.95) (Fig. 2c). Sensitivity and	lysis
--	-------

- results were approximately the same as the original results (Table 4).

198 Table 4. Results of the sensitivity analysis for each primary outcome

	Analysis 1: restrictin	ng the	Analysis 2: excluding trials		Analysis 3: converting a random-	
	analyses on studies v	with low risk	imputed with missing data		effects model to a fixed-effects	
	of selection bias				model	
Primary	Number of	Result	Number of	Result	Number of	Result
outcomes	RCTs		RCTs		RCTs	
Gait speed	1 RCT	0.04	2 RCTs	0.03	2 RCTs	0.03
_	(Jeong, 2016 ¹³)	(-0.10,	(Yang, 2008 ¹⁴ ,	(-0.11,	(Yang, 2008 ¹⁴ ,	(-0.11,
		0.18)	Jeong, 2016 ¹³)	0.16)	Jeong, 2016 ¹³)	0.16)
TUG	1 RCT	0.15	1 RCT	0.15	1 RCT	0.15
	(Jeong, 2016 ¹³)	(-3.95,	(Jeong, 2016 ¹³)	(-3.95,	(Jeong, 2016 ¹³)	(-3.95,
		4.25)		4.25)		4.25)
BBS	1 RCT	-0.03	1 RCT	-0.03	1 RCT	-0.03
	(Jeong, 2016 ¹³)	(-2.01,	(Jeong, 2016 ¹³)	(-2.01,	(Jeong, 2016 ¹³)	(-2.01,
		1.95)		1.95)		1.95)

Insert Figure 2

201 Secondary outcomes

The subjective balance ability (ABC scale) was not significantly different between the training and control groups (MD –6.67, 95% CI [–20.92, 7.58], P = 0.36) (**Fig. 3a**), and substantial heterogeneity was observed (Tau² = 89.62, I ² = 83%). Data on gait endurance were available for 1 of the 2 studies,¹³ whereas data on fall incidence were not available from any study. MD (95% CI) for 6MWT was –5.40 (–36.59, 25.79) (**Fig. 3b**). There were no reports of adverse events during the intervention in any of the 3 studies.

3 4		
5 6 7	210	Insert Figure 3
, 8 9	211	
10 11	212	Discussion
12 13 14	213	Summary of findings
15 16	214	Two RCTs that met the inclusion criteria were found. Their certainty of evidence
17 18 19	215	was low or very low due to serious study limitations and imprecision. The present meta-
20 21	216	analysis showed that obstacle avoidance training alone cannot improve gait speed or
22 23	217	subjective balance ability compared with the usual gait training.
24 25 26	218	
27 28	219	Comparison with the literature
29 30	220	There are at least two reasons for the failure to determine the effectiveness of
31 32 22	221	obstacle avoidance training alone. First, the amount of training was insufficient for both
33 34 35	222	included RCTs. According to a systematic review on circuit class training, the duration
36 37	223	of the training was approximately 60 min in a single session, and various gait-related
38 39	224	training tasks were continuously performed.9 In contrast, the duration of obstacle
40 41 42	225	avoidance training was only 20-30 min in the present study (Table 2). No difference was
43 44	226	observed in training frequency (3-5 times/week) was observed between the circuit class
45 46	227	training and obstacle avoidance training groups. A previous RCT showed that their lower
47 48 49	228	limb training group (gait training in addition to usual gait training; upper and lower limb
50 51	229	training for the functional recovery of activities of daily living or gait training)
52 53	230	significantly differed from their control group (upper limb training or no training in
54 55 56	231	addition to the usual gait training) in terms of gait ability. ²⁶ In the meta-analysis, the
50 57 58	232	momentum of the lower limbs increased to improve gait speed and endurance. ^{10 27}
59 60	233	Therefore, an insufficient trial period may not be able to demonstrate the effectiveness of

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

234 obstacle avoidance training alone.

The second reason would be the lack of well-designed studies that measured relevant outcomes such as fall incidence and composite gait ability. Indeed, to date, no study has examined fall incidence, whereas only 1 study has examined composite gait ability. In addition, obstacle avoidance ability (e.g., success rate, avoidance reaction time, and foot clearance) was not measured in the included RCTs for individuals with stroke. A previous systematic review on elderly individuals showed that the effect of physical training was evaluated based on obstacle avoidance ability.²⁸ A previous observational study on individuals with stroke reported that obstacle-crossing training led to improved obstacle avoidance ability as one aspect of the gait adaptability training for individuals with stroke.²⁹ However, no outcome related to obstacle avoidance ability is reported in this systematic review and meta-analysis. Therefore, this study suggests that obstacle avoidance training alone has little or no effect on improving gait or balance ability.

248 Strengths and limitations

The strengths of this study are (1) that, to the best of our knowledge, this is the first systematic review and meta-analysis on the evidence of effects of obstacle avoidance training on individuals with stroke and (2) its careful and rigorous screening, extraction, and scoring.

253 This study has certain limitations. Most studies had a high or unclear risk of bias, 254 and the number of RCTs was small. Although a well-designed study¹³ showed an 255 improvement in gait endurance and objective balance ability, the effects of the 256 intervention on these parameters in the training group were not superior to those in the 257 control group in the present systematic review and meta-analysis. Based on these results,

BMJ Open

determining the influence of the intervention on improved gait and balance abilities wasdifficult.

Another limitation is that none of the 2 included RCTs evaluated obstacle avoidance ability itself (e.g., toe clearance and success rate of obstacle-crossing training). Therefore, the intervention effect of obstacle avoidance training may have been masked. In the future, RCTs with a low risk of bias, including an assessment of obstacle avoidance ability, should be accumulated to verify our findings. Because stroke rehabilitation aimed to improve gait ability under various environmental constraints, the effect of obstacle avoidance training (other than those of step over training) should be confirmed. In the future, RCTs on obstacle avoidance training including gait through apertures (including the fall incidence and obstacle avoidance ability) should be conducted.

As a clinical limitation, obstacle avoidance training as a single task is not useful according to the best available evidence; accordingly, other interventions such as using combinations of training and increasing the amount of gait training should be considered.³⁰⁻³² Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

274 Clinical implications and recommendations

275 Confirming the effects of obstacle avoidance training on individuals with stroke is 276 highly clinically important because these individuals are more likely to fall while 277 avoiding an obstacle. However, none of the outcomes was found to be significantly 278 altered after obstacle avoidance training. We currently recommend that rehabilitation 279 workers should allow individuals with stroke to practice other gait training and obstacle 280 avoidance training.

Conclusions

This systematic review and meta-analysis showed that obstacle avoidance training in addition to the usual gait training for individuals with stroke may have little or no effect. The failure to determine the effectiveness of obstacle avoidance training alone may be due to the insufficient amount of training in the intervention and the lack of welldesigned studies that measured relevant outcomes, such as fall incidence, composite gait ability, and obstacle avoidance ability. Further research is required to identify the effects of obstacle avoidance training alone.

291 Acknowledgment

We are grateful to Mr. Yeon-Gyu Jeong and Prof. Jung-Wan Koo (Department of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, the Catholic University of Korea), the authors of the included study, for providing detailed information. We would also like to thank Dawn Brandon and enago (<u>https://www.enago.jp/</u>) for English-language editing.

Contributors: DM, YK, MB, YT, and HT conceived the study. DM drafted the protocol manuscript, and all authors revised it. DM and YK designed the search strategies, and DM and SO performed the searches and screened studies for inclusion, extracted the data, and assessed the risk of bias of included studies. YK arbitrated disagreements between reviewers. DM, SO, and YK analyzed and interpreted the data. All authors have provided conceptual and/or methodological expertise. DM, YK, MB, YT, and TH have contributed to the critical revision of this manuscript for important intellectual content. All authors agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work and have read and approved the final manuscript.

BMJ Open

-	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
U 7	
/	
8	
9	
10	
11	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
10	
17	
18	
19	
20	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
25	
20	
27	
28	
29	
30	
21	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
20	
36	
37	
38	
39	
10	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
15	
40	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
54	
22	
56	
57	
58	
50	
59	

Funding: This work was supported by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science

- 308 (KAKENHI Grant Number 18K17317 and 19K19845).
- 309 **Competing interests**: None declared.
- 310 **Patient consent**: Not required.
- 311 **Provenance and peer review**: Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

312 **Data sharing statement**: Our data is not in a repository. All data relevant to the study 313 are included in the article or uploaded as supplementary information. If you want to get

- in touch, please contact: muroi.daisuke@kameda.jp.
 - 315 **<u>References</u>**
 - Kim CM, Eng JJ. Symmetry in vertical ground reaction force is accompanied by
 symmetry in temporal but not distance variables of gait in persons with stroke.
 Gait Posture 2003;18(1):23-8. doi: 10.1016/s0966-6362(02)00122-4.
- 319 2. Jørgensen L, Crabtree NJ, Reeve J, et al. Ambulatory level and asymmetrical weight
 320 bearing after stroke affects bone loss in the upper and lower part of the femoral
 321 neck differently: bone adaptation after decreased mechanical loading. *Bone*322 2000;27(5):701-07.
 - 323 3. Patterson KK, Parafianowicz I, Danells CJ, et al. Gait asymmetry in community324 ambulating stroke survivors. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2008;89(2):304-10. doi:
 325 10.1016/j.apmr.2007.08.142.
- 4. Den Otter AR, Geurts AC, de Haart M, et al. Step characteristics during obstacle
 avoidance in hemiplegic stroke. *Exp Brain Res* 2005;161(2):180-92. doi:
 10.1007/s00221-004-2057-0.
- 329 5. Hyndman D, Ashburn A, Stack E. Fall events among people with stroke living in the

Page 20 of 35

BMJ Open

330	community: circumstances of falls and characteristics of fallers. Arch Phys Med
331	Rehabil 2002;83(2):165-70. doi: 10.1053/apmr.2002.28030.
332	6. Simpson LA, Miller WC, Eng JJ. Effect of stroke on fall rate, location and predictors:
333	a prospective comparison of older adults with and without stroke. PLoS One
334	2011;6(4):e19431. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0019431.g001.
335	7. Harris JE, Eng JJ, Marigold DS, et al. Relationship of balance and mobility to fall
336	incidence in people with chronic stroke. <i>Phys Ther</i> 2005;85(2):150-8.
337	8. French B, Thomas L, Leathley M, et al. Does repetitive task training improve functional
338	activity after stroke? A Cochrane systematic review and meta-analysis. J Rehabil
339	Med 2010;42(1):9-14. doi: 10.2340/16501977-0473.
340	9. Wevers L, van de Port I, Vermue M, et al. Effects of task-oriented circuit class training
341	on walking competency after stroke: a systematic review. Stroke
342	2009;40(7):2450-9. doi: 10.1161/strokeaha.108.541946.
343	10. Veerbeek JM, Koolstra M, Ket JC, et al. Effects of augmented exercise therapy on
344	outcome of gait and gait-related activities in the first 6 months after stroke: a meta-
345	analysis. Stroke 2011;42(11):3311-5. doi: 10.1161/STROKEAHA.111.623819.
346	11. Jung J, Lee J, Chung E, et al. The effect of obstacle training in water on static balance
347	of chronic stroke patients. J Phys Ther Sci 2014;26(3):437-40. doi:
348	10.1589/jpts.26.437.
349	12. Lord SE, Rochester L, Weatherall M, et al. The effect of environment and task on gait
350	parameters after stroke: a randomized comparison of measurement conditions.
351	Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2006;87(7):967-73. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2006.03.003.
352	13. Jeong YG, Koo JW. The effects of treadmill walking combined with obstacle-crossing
353	on walking ability in ambulatory patients after stroke: a pilot randomized

BMJ Open

2 3		
4 5	254	controlled trial Ton Stroka Rahahil 2016:23(6):406.12 doi:
6 7	004	10 1000/107/0257 2016 11 (0502
8 9	355	10.1080/10/4935/.2016.1168592.
10 11	356	14. Yang YR, Tsai MP, Chuang TY, et al. Virtual reality-based training improves
12 13	357	community ambulation in individuals with stroke: a randomized controlled trial.
14 15 16	358	Gait Posture 2008;28(2):201-6. doi: 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2007.11.007.
10 17 18	359	15. Muroi D, Ohtera S, Banno M, et al. A systematic review of obstacle avoidance
19 20	360	exercises in patients with stroke. 2017 Aug 17 ed: PROSPERO International
21 22	361	prospective register of systematic reviews, 2017.
23 24	362	16. Higgins J, Green S. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions,
25 26	363	(version 5.1.02011).
27 28	364	17 Higgins J. Thomas J. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions
29 30 21	265	2010 (version 6)
32 33	000	19. Libereti A. Alteren DC. Tet-leff L. et al. The DDISMA statement for reporting
34 35	366	18. Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetziali J, et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting
36 37	367	systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate health care
38 39	368	interventions: explanation and elaboration. <i>PLOS Med</i> 2009;6(7):e1000100. doi:
40 41	369	10.1371/journal.pmed.1000100.
42 43	370	19. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews
44 45	371	and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. PLOS Med 2009;6(7):e1000097. doi:
46 47	372	10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097.
48 49 50	373	20. Steiner T, Al-Shahi Salman R, Beer R, et al. European Stroke Organisation (ESO)
50 51 52	374	guidelines for the management of spontaneous intracerebral hemorrhage. Int J
53 54	375	Stroke 2014;9(7):840-55. doi: 10.1111/ijs.12309.
55 56	376	21. Winstein CJ, Stein J, Arena R, et al. Guidelines for adult stroke rehabilitation and
57 58 59 60	377	recovery: a guideline for healthcare professionals from the American Heart

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open

5 4		
5 6 7	378	Association/American Stroke Association. Stroke 2016;47(6):e98-e169. doi:
8	379	10.1161/STR.000000000000098.
9 10 11	380	22. NICE guidelines: Stroke rehabilitation in adults e rehabilitation in adults 2013
12 13	381	[Available from: https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg162].
14 15	382	23. Ng SS, Hui-Chan CW. The Timed up & go test: its reliability and association with
16 17 18	383	lower-limb impairments and locomotor capacities in people with chronic stroke.
19 20	384	Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2005;86(8):1641-47. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2005.01.011.
21 22	385	24. Guyatt G, Oxman A, Akl E, et al. GRADE guidelines: 1. Introduction-GRADE
23 24	386	evidence profiles and summary of findings tables. J Clin Epidemiol
25 26 27	387	2011;64(4):383-94.
27 28 29	388	25. Guyatt G, Oxman A, Vist G, et al. GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality
30 31	389	of evidence and strength of recommendations. <i>BMJ</i> 2008;336(7650):924-6. doi:
32 33	390	10.1136/bmj.39489.470347.AD.
34 35 36	391	26. Kwakkel G, Wagenaar RC, Twisk JW, et al. Intensity of leg and arm training after
37 38	392	primary middle-cerebral-artery stroke: a randomised trial. Lancet
39 40 41	393	1999;354(917):191-6.
41 42 43	394	27. French B, Thomas LH, Leathley MJ, et al. Repetitive task training for improving
44 45	395	functional ability after stroke. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2007(4) doi:
46 47	396	10.1002/14651858.CD006073.pub2.
48 49 50	397	28. Guadagnin E, Da Rocha E, Duysens J, et al. Does physical exercise improve obstacle
50 51 52	398	negotiation in the elderly? A systematic review. Arch Gerontol Geriatr
53 54	399	2016;64:138-45. doi: 10.1016/j.archger.2016.02.008.
55 56 57	400	29. van Ooijen MW, Heeren A, Smulders K, et al. Improved gait adjustments after gait
58 59 60	401	adaptability training are associated with reduced attentional demands in persons

BMJ Open

2 3		
4 5 6	402	with stroke. Exp Brain Res 2015;233(3):1007-18. doi: 10.1007/s00221-014-4175-
7 8	403	7.
9 10 11	404	30. Dean CM, Richards CL, Malouin F. Task-related circuit training improves
12 13	405	performance of locomotor tasks in chronic stroke: a randomized, controlled pilot
14 15	406	trial. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2000;81(4):409-17.
16 17 18	407	31. Blennerhassett J, Dite W. Additional task-related practice improves mobility and
19 20	408	upper limb function early after stroke: a randomised controlled trial. Aust J
21 22	409	<i>Physiother</i> 2004;50(4):219-24.
23 24 25	410	32. Salbach N, Mayo N, Wood-Dauphinee S, et al. A task-orientated intervention
25 26 27	411	enhances walking distance and speed in the first year post stroke: a randomized
28 29	412	controlled trial. Clin Rehabil 2004;18(5):509-19.
30 31 32	413	Figure Legends
32 33 34	414	Fig. 1. Flow diagram for Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and
35 36	415	Meta-Analysis
37 38	416	Fig. 2. Primary outcomes
39 40 41	417	a. Effects of obstacle avoidance training on gait speed
42 43	418	b. Effects of obstacle avoidance training on composite gait ability (TUG)
44 45	419	c. Effects of obstacle avoidance training on objective balance ability (BBS score)
46 47 48	420	Fig. 3. Secondary outcomes
49 50	421	a. Effects of obstacle avoidance training on subjective balance ability (ABC scale)
51 52	422	b. Effects of obstacle avoidance training on gait endurance (6MWT)
53 54	423	
55 56 57	424	
58 59		
60		

Fig 1.



Fig 2.

a.

	Co	ontrol		Tr	ainina			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subaroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV. Random, 95% CI	IV. Random, 95% CI
Jeong 2016	0.95	0.14	14	0.91	0.23	15	91.5%	0.04 [-0.10, 0.18]	
Yang 2008	0.73	0.63	9	0.85	0.31	11	8.5%	-0.12 [-0.57, 0.33]	—
-									
Total (95% CI)			23			26	100.0%	0.03 [-0.11, 0.16]	• • •
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0	.00; Chi	² = 0.4	4, df =	1 (P =	0.51);	l ² = 0%			-2 -1 0 1 2
Test for overall effect: Z	= 0.39	(P = 0	.69)						Favours [control] Favours [training]
h									
D.									
	C	ontro		t	raining	1		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Jeong 2016	15.37	6.77	14	15.22	4.06	15	100.0%	0.15 [-3.95, 4.25]	
									Т
Total (95% CI)			14			15	100.0%	0.15 [-3.95, 4.25]	🕈
Heterogeneity: Not app	olicable								-50 -25 0 25 50
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.07	7 (P =	0.94)						Favours [control] Favours [training]
с.									
	~	ontro		-	rainin	a		Moon Difforonce	Moon Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean		Tota	Weight	IV Random 95% Cl	IV Random 95% Cl
leong 2016	46 14	2 19	14	46.17	3 19	15	100.0%	-0.03 [-2.01 1.95]	IV, Kalidoli, 95% Cl
ocong 2010	40.14	2.15	1.4	40.17	0.15	10	100.070	0.00 [-2.01, 1.00]	
Total (95% CI)			14			15	100.0%	-0.03 [-2.01, 1.95]	
Heterogeneity: Not app	olicable								
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.03	8 (P =	0.98)						Favours [control] Favours [training]

Fig 3.

a.

Study or Subgroup	Contro	D Total	Tr	aining	Total	Woight	Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Joong 2010	CO SO 44		(2 ac	2.04	10101	67 70/	0.441.0.00.0.01	IV, Randolli, 95% Cl
Yang 2008	62.58 4.4 72.23 16.6	5 14 8 9	63.02 87.38	3.01 6.81	15	42.3%	-0.44 [-3.22, 2.34] -15.15 [-26.77, -3.53]	T
Total (95% CI)	90 62: Chi2 -	23	- 1 (D -	0 02)+ 12	26	100.0%	-6.67 [-20.92, 7.58]	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.92 (P =	0.36)	- I (P -	0.02), 1-	- 03%	b		-50 -25 0 25 50
	(.							Favours [control] Favours [training]
).								
	Contro	ol.	Т	raining			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean S	D Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Jeong 2016	277.43 41.0	1 14	282.83	44.68	15	100.0%	-5.40 [-36.59, 25.79]	
Total (95% CI)		14			15	100.0%	-5 40 1-36 59 25 791	
Heterogeneity: Not apr	olicable	14			10	100.070	-5.10 [-55.55, 25.16]	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.34 (P = 0	.73)						-100 -50 0 50 100 Favours [control] Favours [training]
								·

PRISMA 2009 Checklist

	BMJ Open E S	
009	Checklist	
#	Checklist item	Reported on page #
1	Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.	#1
	ses es es	
2	Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: background; objectives; data sources; study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; study appraisal and synthesis methods; results; light conclusions and implications of key findings; systematic review registration number.	#2-4
3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.	#5-6
4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants we wentions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).	#5-6
	ning	
5	Indicate if a review protocol exists, if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address), and if available, provide registration information including registration number.	#6-7
6	Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics to get years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale.	#7-8
7	Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date last searched.	#6-7
8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used such that it could be repeated.	supplementary material
9	State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable, included in the meta-analysis).	#7-8
10	Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in dublicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	#7-8
11	List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and and simplifications made.	#7-9
12	Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), and how this information is to be used in any data somethies is.	#9-10
13	State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means).	#9-10
14	Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (e.g., I ²) for each meta-analysis.	#9-10
	009 # 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 11 12 13 14	BNU Open BNU Open Checklist // Checklist // Checklist // Checklist // Checklist // Checklist // Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both. // Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both. // Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both. // Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: background; objectives; data south fight the systematic review registration number. // Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known. // Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants and wentions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS). // Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants and wentions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS). // Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known. // Describe question information including registration number. // Describe an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants and wentions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS). // Describe an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants and favailable, provide registration information including registration number. // Describe all information sources (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics of y years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationals. // Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with study editions is to identify additional studies) in the search and date last searched. // Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators. // List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, fun



PRISMA 2009 Checklist

Page 28 of 35

		BMJ Open Ge by op	Page 28
PRISMA 2	009	Checklist	
Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Reported on page #
Risk of bias across studies	15	Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies).	#9-10
Additional analyses	16	Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-re research and the second s	#9-10
RESULTS		ate	
Study selection	17	Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with seasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram.	#11-12
Study characteristics	18	For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, Pickov, follow-up period) and provide the citations.	#12-13
Risk of bias within studies	19	Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment see item 12).	#12-13
Results of individual studies	20	For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple sum	#10-11
Synthesis of results	21	Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measure a feature intervals a feature intervals and measure a feature intervals and measure a feature intervals a feature intervals and measure a feature intervals a featu	#13-14
Risk of bias across studies	22	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).	#12-13
Additional analysis	23	Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-egression [see Item 16]).	#13-14
DISCUSSION			
Summary of evidence	24	Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; and der their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers).	#15-16
Limitations	25	Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).	#16-17
Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and impligations for future research.	#18
FUNDING		<u>ප</u> ුදු	
Funding	27	Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data role of funders for the systematic review.	#19
From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaft	f J, Altm	an DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The RISMA Statement. PLoS M	1ed 6(7): e10000§
doi. 10.1371/journal.pmed1000097		For more information, visit: <u>www.prisma-statement.org</u> .	
		Page 2 of 2	
		ि For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml हि	

1	
י ר	
2	
כ ⊿	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	γ Ω
1	0 0
י ר	9 0
2	1
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4
2	5
2	6
2	7
2	8
2	9
3	0
3	1
3	2
3	- २
2	л Л
ר כ	- -
с 2	с С
3	0
3	/
3	8
3	9
4	0
4	1
4	2
4	3
4	4

MEDLINE	Search Date: Dec/18/2018	No. trials
via PubMed		
#1	cerebrovascular disorders[mh]	340098
#2	stroke [tiab]	214501
#3	poststroke[tiab]	4481
#4	post-stroke[tiab]	7607
#5	cva[tiab]	2562
#6	apoplex* [tiab]	3051
#7	apoplexy* [tiab]	2951
#8	SAH	11418
#9	#1 OR #2 OR #3 OR #4 OR #5 OR #6 OR #7 OR #8	447589
#10	obstacle*[tiab]	42292
#11	avoidance*[tiab]	63634
#12	task*[tiab]	326509
#13	circuit*[tiab]	111076
#14	#10 OR #11 OR #12 OR #13	526921
#15	Exercise[mh]	172629
#16	Exercise therapy[mh]	44691
#17	rehabilitation[mh]	280813
#18	Physical Fitness[mh]	26565
#19	physical therapy modalities[mh]	140062
#20	#15 OR #16 OR #17 OR #18 OR #19	450023
#21	rehabilitation[tiab]	148672
#22	physical fitness[tiab]	8980
#23	training[tiab]	358168
#24	mobilization[tiab]	48140
#25	mobilisation[tiab]	5339
#26	physical therapy[tiab]	18559
#27	physiotherapy[tiab]	17248
#28	treadmill[tiab]	29617
#29	#21 OR #22 OR #23 OR #24 OR #25 OR #26 OR #27 OR #28	593233
#30	#20 OR #29	916879
#31	#14 AND #30	58502
#32	#9 AND #31	3671
#33	randomized controlled trial[pt]	473479
#34	controlled clinical trial[pt]	561431
#35	randomized[tiab]	463598

2			
3 4	#36	placebo[tiab]	199269
5	#37	clinical trials as topic[mesh: noexp]	185546
6 7	#38	randomly[tiab]	302662
8	#39	trial[ti]	191297
9 10	#40	#33 OR #34 OR #35 OR #36 OR #37 OR #38 OR #39	1195880
11	#41	animals[mh] NOT humans[mh]	4525626
12 13	#42	#40 NOT #41	1100461
14 15	#43	#32 AND #42	794

to peet terier only

Embase via	Dec/18/2018	No. trials
S1	(EMB.EXACT.EXPLODE("cerebrovascular disease"))	610
S2	(ab(stroke) OR ti(stroke))	3389
S3	(ab(poststroke) OR ti(poststroke))	58
S4	(ab(post-stroke) OR ti(post-stroke))	14
S5	(ab(cva) OR ti(cva))	5
S6	(ab(apoplex*) OR ti(apoplex*))	4.
S7	(ab(SAH) OR ti(SAH))	140
S8	S7 OR S6 OR S5 OR S4 OR S3 OR S2 OR S1	733
S9	(ab(obstacle*) OR ti(obstacle*))	53
S10	(ab(avoidance*) OR ti(avoidance*))	84
S11	(ab(task*) OR ti(task*))	401
S12	(ab(circuit*) OR ti(circuit*))	133
S13	S12 OR S11 OR S10 OR S9	6514
S14	EMB.EXACT("physiotherapy")	912
S15	EMB.EXACT.EXPLODE("exercise")	367:
S16	EMB.EXACT.EXPLODE("kinesiotherapy")	79
S17	EMB.EXACT("rehabilitation")	273
S18	(EMB.EXACT("occupational therapy"))	23
S19	(EMB.EXACT.EXPLODE("feedback system"))	1314
S20	(EMB.EXACT("joint mobilization"))	12
S21	S20 OR S19 OR S18 OR S17 OR S16 OR S15 OR S14	8309
S22	(ab(rehabilitation) OR ti(rehabilitation))	2130
S23	(ab("physical fitness") OR ti("physical fitness"))	110
S24	(ab(training) OR ti(training))	483
S25	(ab(mobili*ation) OR ti(mobili*ation))	73
S26	(ab("physical therapy") OR ti("physical therapy"))	25
S27	(ab(physiotherapy) OR ti(physiotherapy))	31
S28	(ab(treadmill) OR ti(treadmill))	38
S29	S28 OR S27 OR S26 OR S25 OR S24 OR S23 OR S22	812
S30	S29 OR S21	1348
S31	S30 AND S13 AND S8	5
S32	(EMB.EXACT("double blind procedure"))	162
S33	(ab(double NEAR/1 blind*) OR ti(double NEAR/1 blind*))	198
S34	(ab(placebo*) OR ti(placebo*))	287
S35	(ab(blind*) OR ti(blind*))	394

BMJ Open

1	
2	
3 4	
5 6	
7 8	
9 10	
11	
12 13	
14 15	
16 17	
18 10	
20	
21 22	
23 24	
25 26	
27 28	
29 30	
31	
32 33	
34 35	
36 37	
38 39	
40 41	
42	
44	
45 46	
47 48	
49 50	
51 52	
53 54	
55	
56 57	

58 59 60

S36	S35 OR S34 OR S33 OR S32	566534
S37	S36 AND S31	433

to beet teries only

CENTRAL	Nov/27/2017	No. trials
#1	cerebrovascular disease	7564
#2	stroke	54497
#3	poststroke	3367
#4	post-stroke	3131
#5	cva	509
#6	apoplex*	505
#7	SAH	906
#8	#1 or #2 or #3 or #4 or #5 or #6 or #7	57849
#9	obstacle*	1374
#10	avoidance*	4997
#11	task*	29218
#12	circuit*	3773
#13	#9 or #10 or #11 or #12	38053
#14	physiotherapy	10877
#15	exercise	70707
#16	kinesiotherapy	2422
#17	rehabilitation	46793
#18	occupational therapy	5089
#19	feedback system	5032
#20	joint mobilization	919
#21	#14 or #15 or #16 or #17 or #18 or #19 or #20	114870
#22	rehabilitation	46793
#23	"physical fitness'	6746
#24	training	62855
#25	mobili\$ation	10
#26	"physical therapy'	42478
#27	physiotherapy	10877
#28	treadmill	6453
#29	#22 or #23 or #24 or #25 or #26 or #27 or #28	131896
#30	#21 or #29	167041
#31	#8 and #13 and #30	2017
#32	(double next/1 blind*) or placebo*:ab.ti or blind*:ab.ti	371794
#33	#31 and #32	790
	Trials	157

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

ICTRP	Dec/18/2018	No. trials
#1	obstacle* OR avoidance*	538
#2	task oriented OR circuit training	153
Total		691

for occr terien only

PEDro		Dec/18/2018	No. trials
#1	tiab	obstacle*	80
#2	tiab	avoidance*	220
#3	tiab	circuit*	221
Total			521

to occurrences on the second

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml