1	Effects of Equine-Assisted Therapy on Recovery after Stroke –
2	A Systematic Review
3	
4	Bettina Hanna Trunk*, Alireza Gharabaghi*
5	
6	
7	Institute for Neuromodulation and Neurotechnology, University Hospital and
8	University of Tübingen, Tuebingen, Germany
9	
10	*Correspondence
11	Institute for Neuromodulation and Neurotechnology, University Hospital and
12	University of Tuebingen, Otfried-Mueller-Str.45, 72076 Tuebingen, Germany.
13	Telephone: +49 7071 29-85197. Email addresses: bettina.trunk@uni-tuebingen.de,
14	alireza.gharabaghi@uni-tuebingen.de

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

15 Abstract

Background Equine-Assisted Therapy (EAT) can boost well-being and recovery of
 patients with neurological or psychiatric disorders.

18 *Objective* The goal of this systematic review is to gain a better understanding of the 19 effects of EAT on recovery after stroke.

Methods A systematic literature search was performed in the following databases:
PubMed, Web of Science and Scopus. Furthermore, reference lists from the articles
included were screened. English-written articles published between 2000-2023 that
reported on health-related effects of EAT (applied with both horses and riding
simulators) on stroke recovery in patients aged between 18 and 85 were included.
Methodological quality was assessed by the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool.

Results Following the screening of 2030 and retrieval of 33 articles respectively, 14 26 studies were included in this systematic review (437 patients, mean age range: 40 -27 70 years). Since several of these studies lacked important methodological information, 28 29 the overall methodological quality varied. Thirteen studies reported physical findings (balance, gait, postural coordination, activities of daily living, lower extremity motor 30 impairment, motor function and hand strength), and seven studies reported further 31 health-related outcomes (cognition, quality of life, depression and perception of the 32 intervention, muscle thickness and trunk muscle activity). The findings suggest positive 33 effects of EAT on stroke recovery in different health-related outcomes, whereas the 34 most consistent beneficial effects were reported for balance and gait. 35

36 *Conclusion* EAT appears to be a promising multimodal intervention for the recovery of 37 different functions after stroke. However, evidence is sparse and methodological

- 38 quality limited. Future research should investigate the effects of EAT on stroke
- 39 recovery more systematically.

- 41 Key words (max. 6)
- 42 Equine-Assisted Therapy, Hippotherapy, Therapeutic Horse Riding, Stroke, Recovery,
- 43 Multimodal Intervention

44 Introduction

One out of four people over the age of 25 are expected to suffer from a stroke within 45 their lifetime. (Feigin et al., 2022) Stroke is a devastating disease which can lead to 46 47 various, severe, and persistent symptoms, such as hemiparesis of the upper and lower extremity, spasticity, aphasia, and other cognitive impairments. (Brewer et al., 2013) 48 Due to natural reorganization processes, patients can, to some extent, recover lost 49 functions within the first six months following a stroke. However, after this period, no 50 further recovery is expected with current therapies. (Murphy and Corbett, 2009; 51 Grefkes and Ward, 2014) Persistent disabilities have a drastic impact on the patients' 52 guality of life, as they are often dependent on caregivers, even for simple activities of 53 daily life. (Kim et al., 1999; Feigin et al., 2015) Thus, novel interventions are required. 54 (Achten *et al.*, 2012) 55

Multimodal interventions, such as Equine-Assisted Therapy (EAT), have been 56 proposed to engage patients in concurrent physical, sensory, cognitive and social 57 activities, therefore supporting recovery from multiple symptoms. (Pekna et al., 2012, 58 Bunketorp-Käll et al., 2017b) While riding a horse at walking speed, the three-59 dimensional movement of the horse's back leads to a rhythmic sensorimotor 60 stimulation of the patients that is comparable to human gait. (Uchiyama et al., 2011; 61 Garner and Rigby, 2015, Bunketorp-Käll et al., 2017b; Guindos-Sanchez et al., 2020) 62 At around 70-100 steps/minute, the rider is passively moved. (Uchiyama et al., 2011) 63 Patients must therefore constantly adjust to small postural changes. (Rigby and 64 Grandjean, 2016) EAT can be performed with both horses and riding simulators. (Baek 65 and Kim, 2014, Bunketorp-Käll et al., 2017b) The former in particular provides an 66 enriched environment, ultimately leading to a higher training motivation and improved 67

68 psychological outcome. (Bunketorp-Käll *et al.*, 2017*b*; Vive *et al.*, 2022; Ward *et al.*,

69 2022)

While the exact mechanisms of action have not been understood yet, several theories 70 71 have been suggested in this regard. (Lewis, 2020) For example, the similarity of sensorimotor stimulation during EAT and human gait has been suggested to 72 strengthen the muscles of the rider, ultimately leading to improvements in gait. (Beinotti 73 et al., 2013; Lewis, 2020) Furthermore, the rider needs to continuously adjust to the 74 horses' movement (McGibbon et al., 2009; Uchiyama et al., 2011; Garner and Rigby, 75 2015, Bunketorp-Käll et al., 2017b; Guindos-Sanchez et al., 2020) which may train 76 their vestibular system and postural control, ultimately improving their balance. (de 77 Mello et al., 2022) Moreover, the horses' girth may lead to a stretch of adductor 78 muscles of hips and legs and decrease spasticity. (McGibbon et al., 2009) 79 Furthermore, horses have a higher body temperature than humans which may also 80 lead to decreased spasticity and hypertonicity. (Lewis, 2020) 81

Benefits of EAT following severe neurological disability or illness have previously been 82 reported (Viruega et al., 2022); usually in children with cerebral palsy (Deutz et al., 83 2018; Guindos-Sanchez et al., 2020; Heussen and Häusler, 2022), but also in patients 84 with multiple sclerosis (Stergiou et al., 2017), spinal cord injury (Lechner et al., 2007), 85 ADHD (Hyun et al., 2016; Yoo et al., 2016), chronic pain (Collado-Mateo et al., 2020), 86 Down syndrome (Portaro et al., 2020), cancer (Viruega et al., 2023), or stroke (Beinotti 87 et al., 2013, Bunketorp-Käll et al., 2017b). EAT was found to benefit physical function, 88 i.e., improved gait, balance, or gross motor function, as well as to decrease spasticity. 89 (Guindos-Sanchez et al., 2020; Badin et al., 2022) In addition, psychological factors, 90 such as quality of life and depression were found to be improved in various cohorts. 91 (Badin et al., 2022; Viruega et al., 2023) 92

Consequently, EAT appears to be a promising multimodal intervention that may 93 facilitate recovery of multiple symptoms in stroke patients. (Bunketorp-Käll et al., 94 2017b) In addition, EAT provides a much higher training intensity than other 95 interventions. This has been proposed to be vital for boosting further recovery in 96 chronic stroke patients (Krakauer et al., 2012; Lohse et al., 2014; Solomonow-Avnon 97 and Mawase, 2019; Ward et al., 2019). However, previous research of EAT in stroke 98 patients is sparse and, to the best of our knowledge, no systematic review has yet 99 synthesized the effects of EAT on different domains of stroke recovery yet. Moreover, 100 it remains unclear whether the effects differ when EAT is applied with horses or riding 101 102 simulators.

We therefore aim to 1) provide an overview of the existing literature on EAT in stroke patients; 2) evaluate the methodological quality of these studies; 3) synthesize the effects of EAT on health-related outcomes during recovery after stroke and; 4) assess the differences in outcome when applying EAT with horses or riding simulators.

107 Methods

This systematic review was conducted in accordance with the Physiotherapy Evidence Database (PRISMA) guidelines (Page *et al.*, 2021) as well as the guidelines for synthesis without meta-analysis (SWiM) (Campbell *et al.*, 2020). This review was not registered. Data search, extraction, synthesis, and quality assessment were done by one reviewer (BHT).

113 Eligibility criteria

Inclusion criteria were defined based on the PICO approach (population, intervention,control, outcome).

The patient population of interest were stroke patients between 18 and 80 years of 116 age. We included intervention studies published between 2000 and 2023 in which EAT 117 had been applied (independent of the precise intervention) in both horses and riding 118 simulators. Furthermore, studies that included different patient cohorts were taken into 119 120 consideration only if they were mainly comprised of stroke patients. Moreover, we took 121 only those studies into account in which health-related outcomes (i.e., in physical, psychological, and physiological domains) were investigated. We did not consider 122 manuscripts in any language other than English, conference work, theses, case 123 reports, and study protocols. 124

125 Search strategy

A search between January 1, 2000, and May 2, 2023 was conducted in the PubMed, Web of Science and Scopus databases. Furthermore, reference lists were crosschecked for potentially missed studies. Our search included search terms related to EAT and stroke and were connected using Boolean operators. The complete syntax for each library can be found in Supplemental Material.

131 Selection process

All search results were downloaded to Mendeley with title, authors and abstract.
Duplicates were then removed. Titles and abstracts were screened for eligibility. Fulltext copies of the relevant studies were then downloaded and screened for eligibility.

135 Data extraction

The following data were extracted from the studies selected: publication characteristics (authors, year, and location), aim of the study, study characteristics (age, sample size, time since stroke), intervention (details of experimental and control group, and dose of treatment), outcome measures, general findings. The data was organized in an Excel spreadsheet and labelled according to the health domain of interest.

141 Data Synthesis

Results were then qualitatively synthesized. For synthesis, data was sorted regarding the study design (RCT and NRT) and then sorted regarding studies that applied the intervention in horses and in simulators. We furthermore investigated and synthesized results of physical and other health-related effects. If there was sufficient data for specific outcomes, harvest plots were created in order to assess heterogeneity of the data and to synthesize findings.

Within- and between group effects were furthermore described. For this, Cohen's d effect sizes and respective 95% Confidence Intervals (CI) were computed (see Table 1). For within-group effects, i.e., changes over time (pre- to post-intervention), the timepoints immediately before and after the intervention or the nearest post timepoint were chosen. To account for differences in the direction of the scales, mean differences were multiplied by -1 for scales in which a higher number represents a better outcome. Therefore, positive effect sizes describe either favorable within-effects over time or

between-effects for the experimental group (EG) compared to the control group (CG). Effects sizes (ES) of d = 0.10 - 0.30 were interpreted as small, of d = 0.30 - 0.50 as moderate, and of greater than 0.5 as large (Goulet-Pelletier and Cousineau, 2020).

158 **Quality assessment**

The guality of the included studies was assessed using the Mixed Methods Appraisal 159 Tool (MMAT) version 2018. (Hong et al., 2018) This tool was designed for evaluating 160 the quality of studies that used mixed methods (randomized controlled trials, non-161 randomized trials, quantitative descriptive studies, and mixed methods studies) to be 162 163 included in systematic reviews based on five quality criteria. (Hong et al., 2018) Criteria that were met were scored by a "Y", whereas those that were not met were scored with 164 a "N" or a "U" in the event of missing information. No studies were excluded based on 165 their methodological quality. 166

167 **Results**

168 Study selection

- 169 Our systematic literature yielded 3107 articles. Then, 1077 duplicates were removed. 170 After screening, 1996 articles were excluded, and 33 articles were retrieved and
- 171 checked for eligibility. 17 articles met the inclusion criteria. As four reports reported
- outcomes from the same study (Bunketorp-Käll et al., 2017b, 2019, 2020), we included
- 173 14 studies in this review (Fig. 1). The studies involved are summarized in Tab. 1.



Fig. 1. Flow diagram of enrolment based on PRISMA guidelines.

All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Tab. 1. Overview of the studies included. This overview was sorted regarding the study design (RCT, NRT and Qualitative Study) and whether the intervention was applied with a horse or riding simulator. For each study, outcomes are sorted regarding the health-domain, i.e., physical, and other health-related outcomes.

¹Findings from data of one study. ²Study included a second experimental condition. *Significant effect reported in paper.

Abbreviations: A = Affected, ADL = Activities of daily living, BBS = Berg Balance Scale, BDL-BS = Bäckstrand, Dahlberg and Liljenäs Balance Scale, BDI = Becks Depression Inventory, BDL-BS = Bäckstrand, Dahlberg and Lilienäs Balance Scale, B-POMA = Balance Part of Performance Oriented Mobility Assessment, CG = control group, CNSD = Central Nervous System Developmental, COP = Center of Pressure, DRP = Discrete relative phases, EAT = Equine-Assisted Therapy, EC = eyes closed, EG = experimental group, EMG = Electromyography, EO = eyes open, EO muscle = External Oblique muscle, FAC = Functional Ambulation Category Scale, FGA = Functional Gait Assessment, FMLE = Fugl-Mever Lower Extremity Scale, G-POMA = Gait part of Performance Oriented Mobility Assessment, HAM = Hamilton Depression Rating Scale, KAT = Kinesthetic Ability Trainer, IO = Internal Oblique, LE = Lower Extremity, LH = Left Hand, MBI = Modified Barthel Index, M-MAS = Modified Motor Assessment Scale according to Uppsala University Hospital, NA = Non-Affected, NRT = Nonrandomized Trial, POMA = Performance-Oriented Mobility Assessment, QoL = Quality of Life, RCT = Randomized Controlled, RH = Right Hand, SF-36 = Medical Outcomes Study 36-item Short-Form health survey. SIS-9 = Stroke Impact Scale - Item 9, TIS = Trunk Impairment Scale, TrA = Transversus Abdominis, TUGT = Timed Up and Go Test, 10 mWT = Timed 10meter walk test, 6 MWT = The six-minute walk test

Study, Location and	Patient		Intervention		Outcome	Assessed	Outcome Measure	ES (95% CI) - within	ES (95% CI) - between	
Study Design	population				domain	Function				
RCT, Horse	Age Time si stroke	nce	N Experimental Dose	N Control Dose						
Beinotti <i>et al.</i> , 2013 Brazil	al., 2013 59 years (EG and 52 year (CG) >1 year pos stroke		N=12 Conventional therapy + EAT 3 times/week, 16 weeks, 50min/session plus 30min EAT/week	N=12 Conventional therapy alone 3 times/week, 16 weeks, 50min/session	Other	QoL	SF-36	ES could not be calculated for complete scale (data not available) *Significant between- group difference reported	ES could not be calculated for complete scale (data not available) *Significant between-group difference reported	
Bunketorp-Käll <i>et al.</i> , 2017 ¹ Sweden	 4., 62.6±6.5 years (EG) and 63.7±6.7 years (CG) ≥10 months and ≤5 years after stroke 		N=41 Horse-riding + interaction with horse 2 times/week, 12 weeks, 240min/session	N=41 Continuation of standard therapy ²	Physical Physical Physical Physical Physical Physical Physical Other Other	Balance Balance Gait Hand Strength RH Hand Strength RH Hand Strength LH Hand Strength LH Hand Strength LH Perception of Recovery Cognitive Level	BBS BDL-BS TUGT Grippit max Grippit mean Grippit final Grippit mean Grippit mean Grippit final SIS-9 Barrow Neurological Institute screen for higher cerebral functions Letter-number sequencing test	$0.78 (0.33 - 1.23)^*$ $0.89 (0.44 - 1.35)^*$ $0.48 (0.04 - 0.91)^*$ 0.16 (-0.27 - 0.60) 0.25 (-0.19 - 0.68) 0.26 (-0.17 - 0.70) 0.16 (-0.27 - 0.60) 0.20 (-0.23 - 0.64) 0.08 (-0.36 - 0.51) $0.78 (0.33 - 1.23)^*$ 0.30 (-0.13 - 0.74)	$\begin{array}{l} 0.63 \ (0.18 - 1.07)^{*} \\ 0.11 \ (-0.33 - 0.55)^{*} \\ 0.39 \ (-0.06 - 0.82)^{*} \\ 0.24 \ (-0.19 - 0.68) \\ 0.18 \ (-0.25 - 0.62) \\ 0.13 \ (-0.25 - 0.62) \\ 0.13 \ (-0.30 - 0.56) \\ 0.19 \ (-0.24 - 0.63) \\ 0.23 \ (-0.20 - 0.67) \\ 0.07 \ (-0.36 - 0.51) \\ 0.95 \ (0.49 - 1.40)^{*} \\ 0.16 \ (-0.27 - 0.60) \\ \end{array}$	
Bunketorp-Kall <i>et al.</i> , 2019 ¹					Physical Physical Physical Physical Physical	Gait Gait Gait Gait Motor function	10 mWT [sec] 10 mWT [n steps] 10 mWT [m] 6 MWT M-MAS AUS	0.31 (-0.13 - 0.74)* 0.45 (0.00 - 0.88)* 0.47 (0.02 - 0.90) 0.68 (0.19 - 1.15) 0.34 (-0.10 - 0.77)*	0.08 (-0.36 - 0.51)* 0.27 (-0.17 - 0.70)* 0.42 (-0.02 - 0.85) 0.43 (-0.05 - 0.89) 0.23 (-0.20 - 0.66)*	

Study, Location and	Patient	Intervention		Outcome	Assessed	Outcome Measure	ES (95% CI) - within	ES (95% CI) - between		
Study Design	population			domain	Function					
Study Design Bunketorp-Käll <i>et al.</i> , 2020 ¹ Lee <i>et al.</i> , 2014 Korea	63.8±6.2 (EG) and 64.3±4.8 (CG) Not specified	N=15N=15Horse riding trainingTreadmill Training3 days/week, 83 days/week, 830min/session3 days/week, 8		domain Other Physical Physical Physical	Association perceived recovery and actual recovery (Correlation: changes of clinical scales and SIS-9) Balance Gait (Gait Analyzer) Gait (Gait Analyzer)	M-MAS UAS BBS TUGT 10 mWT (self-selected) 10 mWT (fast) BBS Gait velocity Step length asymmetry	Spearman-correlation r = 0.13, $p = .40r = 0.25$, $p = .12r = -0.04$, $p = .81r = -0.41$, $p = .001r = -0.38$, $p = .020.92 (0.17 - 1.67)*2.06 (1.17 - 2.94)*2.60 (1.63 - 3.57)*$	N/A 0.34 (-0.38 - 1.07) 1.42 (0.62 - 2.22)* 1.98 (1.11 - 2.85)*		
RCT, Simulator										
Baek and Kim, 2014 Korea	55.1±6.1 years (EG) 56.5±7.5 years	N=15 CNDS + horse riding training	N=15 CNDS + trunk exercises with Swiss balls	Physical Physical	Balance (BioRescue System) Balance (BioRescue System)	CoP - Path Length [cm] CoP - Travel Speed	0.78 (0.04 - 1.53)* 0.39 (-0.33 - 1.11)*	0.68 (-0.06 - 1.41)* 0.39 (-0.33 - 1.11)*		
	(CG) Not specified	3 times/week, 8 weeks, 30min CNSD therapy + 30min horse riding training	3 times/week, nin 8 weeks, 30min Other + CNSD therapy + Other ing 30min trunk Other exercises Other		Muscle Thickness Muscle Thickness Muscle Thickness Muscle Thickness Muscle Thickness Muscle Thickness	[mm/sec] TrA - A TrA - NA IO - A IO - NA FO muscle - A	0.23 (-0.50 - 0.94) 0.17 (-0.56 - 0.87) 0.00 (-0.72 - 0.72) 0.08 (-0.64 - 0.79) 0.33 (-0.39 - 1.05)*	N/A N/A N/A N/A		
				Other		EO muscle - NA	0.00 (-0.72 - 0.72)	N/A		
Baillet <i>et al.</i> , 2019 France	51.1±13.0 years (EG)	N=10 Horse riding therapy	N=8 Conventional	Physical Physical	Trunk/horse coordination - 30%	Relative Phase	3.74 (2.29 - 5.20)*	2.31 (1.11 - 3.51)*		
	39.9±18.6 years	2 times/week for 12	therapy Physical eek for 12 Physical		Trunk/horse coordination - 40%	Relative Phase	1.52 (0.52 - 2.51)*	0.80 (-0.16 - 1.77)*		
	(CG)	weeks, 30min/session	2 times/week for 12 weeks,		Trunk/horse coordination - 50%	Relative Phase	1.04 (0.10 - 1.97)	0.14 (-0.79 - 1.07)		
			30min/session			Relative Phase	1.53 (0.53 - 2.52)	1.67 (0.59 - 2.75)		

Study, Location and	Patient	Intervention		Outcome	Assessed	Outcome Measure	ES (95% CI) - within	ES (95% CI) - between
Study Design	population			domain	Function			
	>1 year post stroke				Trunk/horse coordination - 60%			
Cho and Cho, 2015 Korea	54.20±9.21 (EG) and 54.00±8.79 (CG) ≥6 months post stroke	N=15 Therapeutic exercise + horse riding 7 times/week, 6 weeks, 30min/session Plus 3 times/week, 6 weeks, 20min/session horse-riding training	N=15 Therapeutic exercise 7 times/week, 6 weeks, 30min/session	Physical Physical	Balance (BioRescue System) Balance (BioRescue System)	CoP - EO Moving Distance [cm] CoP - EC Moving Distance [cm]	0.33 (-0.39 - 1.05) 0.63 (-0.10 - 1.37)*	0.01 (-0.71 - 0.73) 0.31 (-0.41 - 1.03)
Kim and Lee, 2015 Korea	71.1±3.0 (EG) and 69.2±3.4 (CG) ≥6 months post stroke	N=10 Horse riding training 5 days/week, 6 weeks, 30min/session	N=10 NDT 5 days/week, 6 weeks, 30min/session	Physical Physical Physical	Balance Gait ADL	BBS 10 mWT MBI	2.23 (1.32 - 3.14)* 1.55 (0.55 - 2.54)* 1.96 (0.89 - 3.03)*	0.81 (-0.10 - 1.72)* 1.31 (0.35 - 2.28)* 1.41 (0.43 - 2.39)*
Sung <i>et al.</i> , 2013 Korea	48.2±8.2 (EG) and 54.2±10.4 (CG) Not specified, on average 1-1.5 years post stroke	N=10 Therapeutic exercise + horse- riding 5 times/week, 4 weeks, 45min/session Plus 5 times/week, 4 weeks, 15min/session	N=10 Therapeutic exercise 5 times/week, 4 weeks, 60min/session	Physical Physical Physical Physical Physical Physical Physical	Gait (OptoGait System) Gait (OptoGait System) Gait (OptoGait System) Gait (OptoGait System) Gait (OptoGait System) Gait (OptoGait System)	Step length [cm] Stance phase [%] Swing phase [%] Load response [%] Single support [%] Total double support [%] Pre-swing [%]	-0.01 (-0.89 - 0.89) 0.13 (-0.74 - 1.01) 0.49 (-0.40 - 1.38) 1.61 (0.60 - 2.62)* 2.34 (1.20 - 3.48)* 1.07 (0.13 - 2.00)* 1.76 (0.72 - 2.79)*	0.11 (-0.77 - 0.98) -0.06 (-0.94-0.82) 0.57 (-0.32- 1.46) 0.64 (-0.26 - 1.54)* 1.86 (0.81 - 2.91)* 0.56 (-0.33 - 1.45) 0.86 (-0.06 - 1.78)*

Study, Location and	Patient	Intervention		Outcome	Assessed	Outcome Measure	ES (95% CI) - within	ES (95% CI) - between
Study Design	population			domain	Function			
				Physical Other Other	Gait (OptoGait System) Gait (OptoGait System) Trunk Muscle Activity	Cadence [step/sec] EMG - Erector Spinae [µV] EMG - Rectus	0.00 (-0.88 - 0.88) 0.91 (-0.01 - 1.83)* -0.49 (-1.38 - 0.40)	0.0 (-0.88 - 0.88) 1.20 (0.25 - 2.16)* 0.61 (-0.29 - 1.51)*
					Trunk Muscle Activity	Abdominis [µV]		
NRT, Horse								
Beinotti <i>et al.</i> , 2010 Brazil	59 years (EG) and 52 years (CG) >1 year post stroke	N=10 Conventional therapy + EAT 2 times/week plus 1 time/ week, 16 weeks, session length unknown	N=10 Conventional therapy alone 3 times/week, 16 weeks, session length unknown	Physical Physical Physical Physical Physical	LE Motor Impairment Balance Balance Gait Gait	FMLE BBS FMLE-Balance FAC Cadence	1.03 (0.09 - 1.96)* 0.22 (-0.66 - 1.10)* 0.14 (-0.74 - 1.01) 0.23 (-0.64 - 1.11) -0.16 (-1.03 - 0.72)	0.66 (-0.24 - 1.56)* 0.16 (-0.72 - 1.04) 0.07 (-0.81 - 0.95) 0.00 (-0.88 - 0.88) -0.35 (-1.24 - 0.53)
Sunwoo <i>et al.</i> , 2012 Korea	42.4±16.6 years ≥6 months post stroke	N=8 Horse riding 2times/week, 8 weeks, 30min/session	No CG	Physical Physical Physical Physical Physical Other Other	Balance Gait Gait Mobility ADL Depression Depression	BBS 10 mWT FAC POMA MBI BDI HAM	0.26 (-0.72 - 1.24)* 0.26 (-0.72 - 1.25)* 0.00 (-0.98 - 0.98) 0.44 (-0.55 - 1.43)* 0.12 (-0.86 - 1.10) 0.09 (-0.89 - 1.07) 0.21 (-0.77 - 1.20)	N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A
NRT, Simulator								
Han <i>et al.</i> , 2012 Korea	61.1±6.3 (EG) and 62.2±6.9 (CG) Early chronic stroke patients, on average 12 months post stroke	N=19 Conventional physiotherapy (NDT) + horse-riding therapy 2 times/week, 12 weeks, 30min/session Plus	N=18 Conventional physiotherapy (NDT) 2 times/week, 12 weeks, 30min/session	Physical Physical Physical Physical	Balance Balance Gait Gait	BBS B-POMA FAC G-POMA	1.10 (0.42 - 1.78)* 0.93 (0.26 - 1.60)* 0.11 (-0.32 - 0.75) 0.00 (-0.64 - 0.64)	1.24 (0.54 - 1.94) 0.95 (0.27 - 1.63) 0.00 (-0.64 - 0.64) -0.13 (-0.78 - 0.51)

Study, Location and	Patient	Intervention		Outcome	Assessed	Outcome Measure	ES (95% CI) - within	ES (95% CI) - between
Study Design	population			domain	Function			
		2 times/week, 12 weeks, 20min/session horse-riding						
Kim <i>et al.</i> , 2014	63.9 ± 8.7 years	N=20	No CG	Physical	Trunk Impairment	TIS	1.43 (0.73 - 2.12)*	N/A
Korea	≥6 months post	Horse riding training		Physical	Balance (BioRescue System)			
	stroke			Dhusiaal	Balance (BioRescue	EO - Sway area [cm]	0.35 (-0.27 - 0.98)*	N/A
		5 times/week, 6 weeks.		Physical	System) Balance (BioRescue			
		30min/session			System)	EO - Sway length [mm2]	0.67 (0.04 - 1.31)*	N/A
				Physical	Balance (BioRescue	50 Output on a stations (-1)		
					System) Balance (BioRescue	EO - Sway speed [cm/s]	0 46 (-0 16 - 1 09)*	N/A
				Physical	System)	EC - Sway area [cm]		
					Balance (BioRescue			N1/A
					System) Gait	FC - Sway length [mm2]	0.50 (-0.13 - 1.12)*	N/A
					Gait (Gaitrite)			
				Physical	Gait (Gaitrite)		1.13 (0.46 - 1.79)*	N/A
					Gait (Gaitrite)	EC - Sway speed [cm/s]		
				Physical	Gait (Gaitrite)	Velocity [cm/s]		
					Gait (Gaitrite)	Cadence [steps/min] Stride – A [cm]	1.13 (0.46 - 1.79)*	N/A
				Physical		Stride – NA [cm]	1.62 (0.90 – 2.33)*	N/A
				Physical		Double Support – A [%]	0.59 (-0.04 – 1.22)*	N/A
				Physical		Double Support – NA	0.33 (-0.30 – 0.95)* 0.35 (-0.28 – 0.97)*	N/A N/A
				Physical		[,0]	0.29 (-0.34 – 0.91)*	N/A
				Physical			0.59 (-0.05 - 1.22)*	N/A
				Physical			0.31 (-0.32 – 0.93)*	N/A
Lee and Kim, 2015	68.4±2.1 (EG)	N=15	N=15	Physical	Balance	BBS	2.23 (1.32 - 3.14)*	1.66 (0.83 - 2.49)*
Korea	and 67.0±3.2	Conventional	Conventional	Physical	Gait	TUGT	1.84 (0.98 - 2.69)*	1.85 (1.00 - 2.71)*
	(CG)	therapy + horse- riding	therapy	Other	Depression	BDI	1.58 (0.76 - 2.40)*	1.25 (0.47 - 2.04)*

Study, Location and	Patient	Intervention		Outcome	Assessed	Outcome Measure	ES (95% CI) - within	ES (95% CI) - between
Study Design	population			domain	Function			
	Early chronic stage, on average 12 months post stroke	5 days/week, 6 weeks, 30min/session Plus 5 times/ week, 6 weeks, 30min/session horse-riding	5 days/week, 6 weeks, 30min/session					
Park <i>et al.</i> , 2013 Korea	56.09±7.22 years (EG) and 51.55±8.27 years (CG) ≥7 months post stroke	N=34 Physical therapy + horse riding 6 times/ week, 8 weeks, session duration unknown Plus 3 times/week, 8 weeks, 35min/session horse riding	N=33 Physical therapy + mat exercise 6 times/ week, 8 weeks, session duration unknown Plus 3 times/week, 8 weeks, 35min/session mat exercise	Physical Physical Physical	Balance Balance (KAT balance system) Balance (KAT balance system)	BBS EOB (BI) ECB (BI)	1.26 (0.74 - 1.78)* 0.08 (-0.40 - 0.56)* 0.71 (0.22 - 1.20)*	0.57 (0.09 - 1.06)* -0.04 (-0.52 - 0.44) 0.31 (-0.17 - 0.80)*
Qualitative Study, H	lorse	'				'		'
Pohl <i>et al.</i> , 2018 Sweden	N=18 (selected from larger sample in ⁵ Mean age: 62 years ≥10 months and ≤5 years after stroke	See Bunketorp-Käll et al., 2017	See Bunketorp- Käll <i>et al.</i> , 2017	Other	Perception of Intervention	Semi-structured interview	Identification of four broad themes: transformative experience; human- horse interaction; togetherness and belonging; and the all- in-one solution	N/A

174 Subject characteristics

175 In total, data from 437 patients (mean age range: 40 – 70 years) were included in this systematic review. Sample sizes ranged from 8 to 123 patients. With the exception of 176 177 two studies (Baek and Kim, 2014, Lee et al., 2014a), the stroke stage was specified. In one study, the minimum time since stroke was not reported, but the patients had 178 suffered a stroke on average about one year earlier. (Sung et al., 2013) All other 179 studies included patients at the chronic stage of stroke (i.e., > 6 months post stroke). 180 In two studies (Sunwoo et al., 2012; Baillet et al., 2019), the majority of patients were 181 stroke patients, although, a small number of traumatic brain injury and cerebral palsy 182 patients were also included. All other studies involved stroke patients only. 183

184 Study characteristics and methodological quality

The included studies were conducted in Brazil (Beinotti *et al.*, 2010, 2013), France
(Baillet *et al.*, 2019), Korea (Han *et al.*, 2012; Sunwoo *et al.*, 2012; Park *et al.*, 2013;
Sung *et al.*, 2013, Kim *et al.*, 2014*a*, Lee *et al.*, 2014*a*; Cho and Cho, 2015; Kim and
Lee, 2015; Lee and Kim, 2015), and Sweden (Bunketorp-Käll *et al.*, 2017*b*; Pohl *et al.*,
2018; Bunketorp-Käll *et al.*, 2019, 2020).

Study design and methodological quality, assessed by MMAT, are displayed in 190 Supplemental Material (Tab. 2). Data from eight Randomized Controlled Trial (RCT), 191 six Non-Randomized Trial (NRT). Moreover, one report referring to data of one RCT 192 reported qualitative outcome and was therefore assessed separately. The overall study 193 guality varied between the studies. Specifically, seven reported studies (Sunwoo et al., 194 2012; Beinotti et al., 2013, Kim et al., 2014a, Bunketorp-Käll et al., 2017b; Pohl et al., 195 2018; Bunketorp-Käll et al., 2019, 2020) fulfilled at least four out of the five quality 196 criteria. However, other studies were lacking in major methodological details, 197 198 suggesting that they had not been met. Major risks of bias include inappropriate

- randomization or insufficient information regarding randomization in five out of eight 199
- RCT. Other concerns include missing data, blinding and incomplete information about 200
- adherence to assigned intervention. 201

Tab. 2. Overview of study quality. Study quality was assessed by MMAT. Depending on the method of the study, quality was assessed using different questions.

Questions: S1: Are there clear research questions?, S2: Do the collected data allow to address the research questions?, 1.1: Is the qualitative approach appropriate to answer the research question?, 1.2: Are the qualitative data collection methods adequate to address the research question?, 1.3: Are the findings adequately derived from the data?, 1.4: Is the interpretation of results sufficiently substantiated by data?, 1.5: Is there coherence between qualitative data sources, collection, analysis and interpretation?, 2.1: Is randomization appropriately performed?, 2.2: Are the groups comparable at baseline?, 2.3: Are there complete outcome data? [at least 80% of data], 2.4: Are outcome assessors blinded to the intervention provided?, 2.5: Did the participants adhere to the assigned intervention?, 3.1: Are the participants representative of the target population?, 3.2: Are measurements appropriate regarding both the outcome and intervention (or exposure)?, 3.3: Are there complete outcome data?, 3.4: Are the confounders accounted for in the design and analysis?, 3.5: During the study period, is the intervention administered (or exposure occurred) as intended? (Hong et al., 2018)

Abbreviations: MMAT = Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool, N = criterion not met, NRT = Non-randomized Trial, RCT = Randomized Controlled Trial, U = unclear if criterion was met, Y = criterion met

Study	MMAT assessment																	
	Scree	ening	Quali	Qualitative				Quan	titative	RCT			Quant	Quantitative NRT				
	S1	S2	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.5	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.5	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.5	
(Baek and Kim, 2014)	Y	Y						U	Y	Y	Ν	U						
(Baillet <i>et al.</i> , 2019)	Y	Y						Y	Y	Y	Ν	U						
(Beinotti <i>et al.</i> , 2010)	Y	Y											Y	Y	U	Y	U	
(Beinotti <i>et al.</i> , 2013)	Y	Y						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y						

*Findings from data of same study.

Study	MMAT assessment																
	Scree	ening	Qualitative					Quantitative RCT					Quantitative NRT				
	S1 S2 1.1 1.2 1.3 1.4 1.5		2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.5	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.5					
(Bunketorp-Käll et al., 2017b)*	Y	Y															
(Bunketorp-Käll et al., 2019)*	Y	Y						Y	Y	Y	Y	U					
(Bunketorp-Käll et al., 2020)*		Y															
(Cho and Cho, 2015)	Y	Y						U	Y	Y	U	U					
(Han <i>et al.</i> , 2012)	Y	Y											Y	Y	U	Ν	U
(Kim <i>et al.</i> , 2014 <i>b</i>)	Y	Y											Y	Y	Y	Y	U
(Kim and Lee, 2015)	Y	Y						U	Y	U	U	U					
(Lee <i>et al.</i> , 2014 <i>a</i>)	Y	Y						U	Y	U	U	U					
(Lee and Kim, 2015)	Y	Y											Y	Ν	U	Ν	U
(Park <i>et al.</i> , 2013)	Y	Y											Y	Y	U	Y	U
(Pohl <i>et al.</i> , 2018)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y										
(Sung <i>et al.</i> , 2013)	Y	Y						U	Y	U	U	U					
(Sunwoo <i>et al.</i> , 2012)	Y	Y											Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

202 Intervention

Different forms of intervention and terminology were used. Four studies referred to their 203 intervention as hippotherapy (Beinotti et al., 2010; Sunwoo et al., 2012, Lee et al., 204 205 2014b) or hippotherapy simulator (Sung et al., 2013); four studies used horse-riding therapy (Bunketorp-Käll et al., 2017b, 2019, 2020) or horse-riding exercise (Kim and 206 Lee, 2015); two studies used horseback riding (Pohl et al., 2018) or horseback riding 207 208 therapy (Beinotti et al., 2013); two studies used horse riding simulation training (Baek and Kim, 2014, Kim et al., 2014a); one study used horseback riding simulator exercise 209 210 (Park et al., 2013), a further study used mechanical horse practice (Baillet et al., 2019); and three studies referred to their intervention as mechanical horseback riding (Han et 211 al., 2012; Cho and Cho, 2015; Lee and Kim, 2015). The exact protocol was not, or only 212 213 briefly described in most studies. In general, some studies included exercises during riding while other studies did not. 214

A short summary of the parameters of EG and CG applied in each study can be found 215 in Tab. 1. While eight studies applied EAT in addition to conventional therapy (Beinotti 216 et al., 2010; Han et al., 2012; Beinotti et al., 2013; Park et al., 2013; Sung et al., 2013; 217 218 Baek and Kim, 2014; Cho and Cho, 2015; Lee and Kim, 2015), the others applied EAT only. (Sunwoo et al., 2012, Kim et al., 2014a, Lee et al., 2014a; Kim and Lee, 2015, 219 220 Bunketorp-Käll et al., 2017b; Pohl et al., 2018; Baillet et al., 2019; Bunketorp-Käll et al., 2019, 2020) Total time of EAT varied between 300 and 5760min (1043 ± 1377min, 221 Mean ± SD). EAT was applied within four to 16 weeks, in 16 to 30 total sessions. 222

With the exception of two studies (Sunwoo *et al.*, 2012, Kim *et al.*, 2014*a*), all included a CG which consisted of treadmill training (Lee *et al.*, 2014*a*) or another form of conventional therapy in the other studies. While most of the studies had comparable doses for the EG and CG, in four studies, both groups performed the same training

and the EG did EAT in addition; thus resulting in different training doses. (Han *et al.*,

228 2012; Beinotti *et al.*, 2013; Cho and Cho, 2015; Lee and Kim, 2015)

In five studies, the intervention was applied with horses (Beinotti *et al.*, 2010; Sunwoo *et al.*, 2012; Beinotti *et al.*, 2013, Lee *et al.*, 2014*a*, Bunketorp-Käll *et al.*, 2017*b*; Pohl *et al.*, 2018; Bunketorp-Käll *et al.*, 2019, 2020), whereas the other studies used riding
simulators.

233 Outcome measures

234 Physical measures

Thirteen studies evaluated the effects of EAT on physical outcome measures.^{14,40,42–} ^{52,55} The domains evaluated included balance, gait, postural coordination, activities of daily living (ADL), lower extremity motor impairment, motor function and hand strength.

Balance was measured in eleven studies.^{8,14,42,45–52} It was assessed by the Berg
Balance Scale (BBS), Balance Part of the Performance Oriented Mobility Assessment
(B-POMA, POMA), Balance systems, Balance Items of the Fugl-Meyer Lower
Extremity Scale (FMLE), and Bäckstrand, Dahlberg and Liljenäs Balance Scale (BDLBS) and the Trunk Impairment Scale (TIS).

Gait was assessed in nine studies.^{8,40,42,43,45–47,49–51} It was investigated by the Functional Ambulation Category Scale (FAC), Functional Gait Assessments (FGA; part cadence), Timed Up and Go Test (TUGT), Timed 10-meter walk test (10 mWT), the six-minute walk test (6 MWT), Gait part of Performance Oriented Mobility Assessment (G-POMA), and Gait analyzer (measures: Cadence, Double Support, Load Response, Pre-Swing, Single Support, Stance Phase, Step Length Asymmetry, Step Length, Stride, Swing Phase, Velocity).

²⁵⁰ In one study, an optical tracking system was used to assess postural coordination.⁴⁴

ADL were investigated in two studies using the Modified Barthel Index (MBI).^{45,50}

In one study, general motor function was investigated using the Modified Motor Assessment Scale according to Uppsala University Hospital (M-MAS UAS) and hand strength was assessed using a dynamometer (Grippit)^{8,40} In another study, lower extremity motor impairment was investigated by the FMLE.⁴⁶

256 Further health-related measures

The effects on further health-related outcome measures were investigated in seven studies.^{8,14,18,41,43,45,51,53} The measures included depression, perception of the intervention and of recovery from stroke, cognition, quality of life (QoL), muscle thickness, as well as trunk muscle activity.

261 Depression was assessed in two studies by Becks Depression Inventory (BDI) and/or Hamilton Depression Rating Scale (HAM).^{45,51} Another study assessed different 262 domains of the patients' perception of EAT. Specifically, a qualitative assessment 263 using semi-structured interviews was performed in one report⁵³, and the correlation 264 between changes in different outcomes and the change in perceived recovery from 265 stroke was estimated in another report.^{41,53} Furthermore, the change in perceived 266 267 recovery from stroke (Stroke Impact Scale, Item 9; SIS-9) after EAT was also assessed in this study. Moreover, both the general cognitive level and the working memory were 268 examined using the Barrow Neurological Institute screen for higher cerebral functions 269 and the Letter-number sequencing test, respectively.⁸ QoL was investigated in one 270 study by the Medical Outcomes Study 36-item Short-Form health survey (SF-16).¹⁸ 271

272 One study examined muscle thickness using ultrasonic imaging.¹⁴ The other study 273 investigated trunk muscle activity by electromyography (EMG).⁴³

274

275 Effects of intervention on outcome measures

276 Effects of EAT on physical outcome

- 277 Our search revealed studies identifying effects of EAT on balance and gait. Therefore,
- an overview of within- and between-effects of EAT on both balance and gait is shown
- in Fig. 2 and Fig. 3, respectively. While different study designs (RCT and NRT) are
- indicated in these plots, results appeared to be independent of the study design.
- Therefore, in the following, findings are described for all included studies together.



Fig. 2. Harvest Plot: Effects of EAT on balance. A) shows within-effects of EAT on balance, and B) shows between-effects. Both in A) and B) each bar represents one outcome related to balance of one study (in case one study assessed balance using multiple outcome measures, each is represented in a separate bar; the study identification is indicated by a number below the bar). In the upper row, studies applying EAT with horses are shown, and in the lower row, studies applying EAT with simulators are show. The colour of the bars indicates the study design (RCT: black, NRT: grey). The height of the bar represents the study quality, assessed by the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool. The number in the box represents the sample size.

Studies are grouped according to a negative (left), no (middle), or a positive effect (right), based on the reported statistical test results in the respective papers.

Studies: 1: Baek and Kim 2014, 2: Bunketorp-Käll et al. 2017, 3: Cho and Cho 2015, 4: Kim and Lee 2015, 5: Lee et al. 2014, 6: Beinotti et al. 2010, 7: Han et al. 2012, 8: Kim et al. 2014, 9: Lee and Kim 2015, 10: Park et al. 2013, 11: Sunwoo et al. 2012



Fig. 3. Harvest Plot: Effects of EAT on gait. A) shows within-effects of EAT on gait, and B) shows between-effects. Both in A) and B) each bar represents one outcome related to gait of one study (in case one study assessed gait using multiple outcome measures, each is represented in a separate bar; the study identification is indicated by a number below the bar). In the upper row, studies applying EAT with horses are shown, and in the lower row, studies applying EAT with simulator are show. The colour of the bars indicates the study design (RCT: black, NRT: grey). The height of the bar represents the study quality, assessed by the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool. The number in the box represents the sample size.

Studies are grouped according to showing a negative (left), no (middle), or a positive effect (right), based on the reported statistical test results in the respective papers.

Studies: 1: Bunketorp-Käll et al. 2017, 2: Bunketorp-Käll et al. 2019, 3: Kim and Lee 2015, 4: Lee et al. 2014, 5: Sung et al. 2013, 6: Beinotti et al. 2010, 7: Han et al. 2012, 8: Kim et al. 2014, 9: Lee and Kim 2015, 10: Sunwoo et al. 2012

Balance was usually assessed by BBS, i.e., in eight out of eleven studies. All of these 282 reported significant within-effects (Cohen's d = 0.22 to 2.23) (Beinotti et al., 2010; Han 283 et al., 2012; Sunwoo et al., 2012; Park et al., 2013, Lee et al., 2014a; Kim and Lee, 284 2015; Lee and Kim, 2015, Bunketorp-Käll et al., 2017b). Moreover, significant within-285 effects in POMA (Sunwoo et al., 2012) (Cohen's d = 0.44), B-POMA (Han et al., 2012) 286 (Cohen's d = 0.93), BDL-BS (Cohen's d = 0.89) (Bunketorp-Käll et al., 2017b) and TIS 287 (Kim et al., 2014a) (Cohen's d = 1.43) were observed after EAT. With balance systems, 288 significant effects on balance could be identified, specifically on Center of Pressure 289 (COP) path length (Cohen's d = 0.78) and COP travel speed (Cohen's d = 0.39) (Baek 290 291 and Kim, 2014), EC moving distance of COP (Cohen's d = 0.63) (Cho and Cho, 2015), EO and EC sway length (Cohen's d = 0.67 and 1.13, respectively), EO and EC sway 292 speed (Cohen's d = 0.46 and 1.13, respectively) (Kim *et al.*, 2014*a*), and EO and EC 293 sway area (Cohen's d = 0.35 and 0.50, respectively) (Kim et al., 2014a); EO balance 294 (Cohen's d = 0.08) and EC balance (Cohen's d = 0.71) (Park et al., 2013). However, 295 no significant effect was found for EO moving distance of COP (Cohen's d = 0.33) (Cho 296 and Cho, 2015) or for the balance part of FMLE (Cohen's d = 0.14) (Beinotti et al., 297 2010). 298

299 Moreover, nine studies assessed between-effects of EAT on balance. Improvements in BBS were found to be significantly higher in EG than CG in four out of seven studies 300 (Cohen's d between 0.57 and 1.66) investigating between-effects on BBS. (Park et al., 301 2013; Kim and Lee, 2015; Lee and Kim, 2015, Bunketorp-Käll et al., 2017b) In addition, 302 significant between-effects on balance were found for COP Path Length and Travel 303 304 Speed (Cohen's d = 0.68 and 0.39, respectively) (Baek and Kim, 2014), the BDL-BS (Cohen's d = 0.11) (Bunketorp-Käll *et al.*, 2017*b*), EC balance (Cohen's d = 0.31) (Park 305 et al., 2013). However, no significant between-effects were found for FMLE-balance 306

307 (Cohen's d = 0.07) (Beinotti *et al.*, 2010), EO and EC COP Moving Distance (Cohen's
308 d = 0.01 and 0.31, respectively) (Cho and Cho, 2015), B-POMA (0.95) (Han *et al.*,
309 2012), or EO balance (Cohen's d = -0.04) (Park *et al.*, 2013).

310 For gait, positive within-effects of EAT were noted in the TUGT (Cohen's d between 0.48 and 1.84) (Lee and Kim, 2015, Bunketorp-Käll et al., 2017b) and the 10 mWT 311 (Cohen's d between 0.26 and 1.55) (Sunwoo et al., 2012; Kim and Lee, 2015; 312 Bunketorp-Käll et al., 2019). Moreover, with gait analyzer, positive effects were found 313 on velocity (Cohen's d = 0.59 - 2.06) (Kim et al., 2014a, Lee et al., 2014a), stride of 314 the affected and unaffected sides (Cohen's d = 0.35 and 0.29, respectively), Double 315 316 Support of the affected and unaffected sides (Cohen's d = 0.59 and 0.31, respectively) (Kim et al., 2014a), Step Length Asymmetry (Cohen's d = 2.60) (Lee et al., 2014a), 317 single support (Cohen's d = 2.34), load response (Cohen's d = 1.61), total double 318 support (Cohen's d = 1.07), and pre-swing (Cohen's d = 1.76) (Sung et al., 2013). 319 However, no effects of EAT on gait were detected in the 6 MWT (Cohen's d = 0.68) 320 321 (Bunketorp-Käll et al., 2019), the FAC (Cohen's d between 0.00 and 0.23) (Beinotti et *al.*, 2010; Han *et al.*, 2012; Sunwoo *et al.*, 2012), or on the G-POMA (Cohen's d = 0.00) 322 (Han et al., 2012). In addition, with gait analyzer, no effects of EAT were found on step 323 length (Cohen's d = -0.01), stance phase (Cohen's d = 0.13), or swing phase (Cohen's 324 d = 0.49) (Sung et al., 2013). For cadence, one study found a positive effect (Kim et 325 al., 2014a) (Cohen's d = 0.33; assessed by gait analyzer), while others reported a 326 negative effect (Beinotti et al., 2010; Sung et al., 2013) (Cohen's d = -0.16, assessed 327 by FGA; and Cohen's d = 0.00, gait analyzer). 328

Moreover, between-effects of EAT on gait were investigated for the following gait parameters: FAC, Cadence, TUGT, 10 mWT, 6 MWT, G-POMA as well as on gait velocity, step length asymmetry, step length, stance phase, swing phase, load

response, single support, total double support, pre-swing and cadence using Gait Analyzer. Significant between-effects were found for the 10 mWT (Cohen's d = 0.08 -1.31) (Kim and Lee, 2015; Bunketorp-Käll *et al.*, 2019), TUGT (Cohen's d = 1.85) (Lee and Kim, 2015), Gait velocity (Cohen's d = 1.42), Step Length Asymmetry (Cohen's d = 1.96) (Lee *et al.*, 2014*a*), Load Response (Cohen's d = 0.64), Single Support (Cohen's d = 1.86), and Pre-Swing (Cohen's d = 0.86) (Sung *et al.*, 2013).

In addition, benefits of EAT on posture were found within a pilot study (Cohen's d 1.04 -3.74). (Baillet *et al.*, 2019)

Of the two studies investigating changes in ADL after EAT, one study detected a significant improvement in ADL (Cohen's d = 1.96) (Kim and Lee, 2015), while the other study did not find an effect on ADL (Cohen's d = 0.12) (Sunwoo *et al.*, 2012).

In one study, lower extremity motor impairment improved significantly in the EG (Cohen's d = 1.03), and these improvements were also significantly larger than for CG (Cohen's d = 0.66). (Beinotti *et al.*, 2010)

Moreover, there was a significant improvement in overall motor function after EAT in one study, when comparing EG and CG (Cohen's d = 0.23). (Bunketorp-Käll *et al.*, 2019)

However, there was no significant effect of EAT on hand strength. (Bunketorp-Käll *et al.*, 2017*b*)

351 Effects of EAT on further health-related outcome

Findings for depression varied between studies. One study reported significant improvements in the BDI after EAT⁵¹, for the comparisons pre to post EAT, and EG to CG (Cohen's d = 1.58 and 1.25, respectively), while the other did not show any significant changes for the BDI or the HAM.⁴⁵

Two studies investigated the perception of the intervention itself, which was reported to have positive effects on different domains.⁵³ To summarize, stroke patients perceived the intervention as a rich and pleasurable experience that had a positive impact on their emotional and physical domains.⁵³ Furthermore, changes in perceived recovery were associated with improved aspects of gait.⁴¹

Perceived recovery from stroke increased significantly after EAT and persisted for
three- and six-months post intervention (Cohen's d = 0.78, 3-months post intervention).

This increase was furthermore significantly higher than for the CG (Cohen's d = 0.95).⁸

Although there were slight increases in general cognition and the Letter Number Sequencing test in one study, no significant effect was observed for these parameters after EAT (Cohen's d = 0.30 and 0.17, respectively).⁸

There was a positive effect on QoL after EAT, in particular for the domains of functional
 capacity, physical aspects and mental health.¹⁸

Prior to EAT, the external oblique muscle on the affected side was significantly less thick than on the non-affected side, as measured by ultrasonic imaging. Following EAT, the thickness increased significantly (Cohen's d = 0.33), and was therefore more similar to the non-affected side. By contrast, muscle thickness of the internal oblique and transversus abdominis was comparable between affected and non-affected side and did not change after the intervention.¹⁴

In addition, by using EMG recordings, the trunk muscle activity during sit-to-stand was measured after EAT. Paretic erector spinae activation was significantly higher for the EG after the intervention (Cohen's d = 0.91) which, moreover, differed significantly from the CG (Cohen's d = 1.20). By contrast, the rectus abdominis remained unchanged.⁴³

379

380 Difference in physical outcome when applying EAT with horses or riding simulators

In general, we could only identify five studies applying EAT after stroke with horses. It
was only possible to compare the differences for balance and gait.

For within-effects on balance, four studies applied EAT with horses and seven studies 383 in simulators (see Fig. 2). Positive within-effects were found for most studies/ 384 outcomes, independent of EAT with horses or simulators, study quality or design. 385 Three vs. six studies investigated between-effects on balance with horses and 386 simulators, respectively. Significant between-effects on balance were found for one 387 388 RCT with high methodological quality and a large sample size applying EAT with horses but not in two other studies (one RCT and one NRT) with lower methodological 389 quality and small sample sizes. For studies applying EAT with riding simulators, results 390 varied. However, in addition to the unequal number of reports to compare, studies were 391 highly heterogeneous in terms of study design, quality, and sample size. 392

Effects of EAT on gait were evaluated in five reports with horses and in five reports with riding simulators (see Fig. 4). Four studies each investigated also between-effects. Independent of the study design, for both horses and simulators, significant and nonsignificant effects on gait were detected. However, studies were highly heterogeneous similarly to the studies on balance. Furthermore, outcome measures were inconsistent between studies.

399 Discussion

400 Summary of results

401 Taken together, this systematic literature review revealed 14 studies that evaluated the effect of EAT on health-related outcomes. While thirteen studies reported physical 402 outcomes, seven studies reported further health-related outcomes. In general, the 403 positive effects of EAT on stroke recovery could be identified in all the domains 404 investigated, i.e., physical (balance, gait, postural control, lower extremity motor 405 impairment, motor function, and ADL) and further outcomes (perceived recovery from 406 stroke, and QoL, abdominal muscle thickness, trunk muscle activation). The most 407 consistent and robust beneficial effects were identified on balance and gait. 408

409 Physical effects of EAT

Although different aspects of physical effects of EAT were studied, most of the studies
focused on investigating the effects of EAT on balance and/or gait.

Independent of the exact intervention, dose and study design, all eight studies 412 investigating within-effects of EAT on balance, as measured by BBS, reported positive 413 effects of EAT. Furthermore, in four out of seven studies assessing between-effects 414 of EAT on balance (measured by BBS), significant improvements were reported.^{8,50-} 415 ⁵² BBS is a valid tool for assessing balance during stroke recovery with an excellent 416 reliability.⁵⁶ It measures both the static and dynamic aspects of balance, i.e., to 417 maintain balance either statically or during functional tasks.⁵⁶ The 14 items include 418 419 tasks such as standing on one or two legs with eyes open and closed, sitting or standing up or sitting down.⁵⁷ This suggests a robust effect of EAT on general balance 420 which has previously also been supported by a meta-analysis (albeit only including 421 two studies).⁵⁸ In addition, positive findings were described for individual aspects of 422

balance, which were assessed by balance systems. However, these studies
investigated different aspects of balance and were in general of low methodological
quality. To conclude, EAT appears to have a positive effect on general balance,
whereas the exact details require further consideration.

After stroke, gait issues are very common. Specifically, reduced walking speed and 427 longer stance phase have been reported after stroke.^{59,60} After EAT, walking speed 428 different 429 (measured by assessment tools) was consistently found to increase.^{8,40,42,45,49–51} Moreover, these improvements were higher in the EG than in 430 the CG in some studies.^{8,40,42,50,51} This indicates a robust finding across different 431 studies, independent of study design and guality. However, for other gait parameters, 432 especially those investigated by Gait Analyzer, evidence is sparse, and conclusions 433 are restricted due to limitations in study quality. 434

Taken together, there is considerable evidence for a positive effect of EAT on balance 435 436 and gait. Recovery of gait parameters was reported as a major goal of stroke patients and is associated with guality of life.⁶¹ In addition, recovery of gait and balance may 437 decrease the risk of falling in stroke patients.^{60,62} These findings support the promising 438 potential of EAT as a multimodal intervention for recovery after stroke. In addition, 439 preliminary evidence was provided for improved lower extremity motor impairment⁴⁶ 440 and overall motor function after EAT⁴⁰. However, to our knowledge, the effects of EAT 441 on fine motor control or spasticity in stroke patients have yet to be evaluated. While 442 fine motor control was not formally assessed, stroke patients reported subjectively 443 improved fine motor skills during a semi-structured interview.⁵³ Moreover, temporary 444 (lower extremity) spasticity was shown to decrease for patients with cerebral palsy^{10,63} 445 or spinal cord injury^{13,25}. Even though the effects on upper extremity spasticity remain 446 unclear, EAT may hold a promising potential for decreasing spasticity after stroke. 447

Future research should investigate both short- and long-term changes of upper and
lower extremity spasticity, as well as changes in fine motor control.^{21,30}

450 *Effects of EAT on further health-related outcomes*

Different further effects after EAT were investigated in stroke patients. However, 451 evidence was sparse, and findings varied between studies. For example, EAT was 452 found to have positive effects on perceived recovery from stroke and QoL.^{8,18} 453 Furthermore, the intervention (applied in horses) had a large emotional impact on the 454 participants. For example, they reported higher self-esteem and increased self-455 efficacy.⁵³ Moreover, perceived recovery from stroke was associated with improved 456 gait parameters, emphasizing the high subjective importance of gait recovery for 457 stroke patients.41 458

The evidence for effects of EAT on depression was, however, inconclusive^{45,51} While 459 depression was shown to improve in one study⁶⁴, it did not change on the other 460 study⁴⁵. In this pilot study, however, the dose of EAT was much lower than in the other 461 studies (i.e., 8h of EAT⁴⁵ vs. 15h EAT⁶⁴) Additionally, only eight patients were enrolled 462 in this study. Moreover, the study that showed significant improvements of depression 463 was of low methodological quality. The results might therefore be compromised by 464 these constraints and require further consideration. In addition, no significant effects 465 of EAT on cognitive aspects were observed. However, cognitive outcome was 466 assessed in only one study.⁸ 467

Moreover, it is important to understand the underlying physiological mechanisms of EAT to explain the findings and to predict and optimize EAT protocols. In this context, our systematic literature search revealed only two studies for stroke patients; these studies investigate muscle thickness and activity.^{14,43} It was found that muscle activity

and thickness of the paretic side change after EAT which supports theories that EAT
is training respective muscles.^{17,18} However, it should be noted that study quality was
low in both studies.

While these studies may help to explain physical changes, e.g., in gait or balance, 475 other factors may shape our understanding of the mechanisms of action and should 476 477 be investigated in future studies. In healthy, elderly people, for example, EAT led to hormonal changes, i.e., to a significant increase in serotonin and a decrease in cortisol 478 levels.⁶⁵ In an autistic population, a decrease in the level of cortisol was detected in 479 the course of EAT training.⁶⁶ In addition, an increase of progesterone levels over time 480 was found.⁶⁶ Cortisol is a classical biomarker of stress and may thus reflect a lower 481 level of stress after EAT.67 482

483 Moreover, preliminary investigations of brain physiology in this context have been made using EEG, fMRI, and NIRS.^{27,68–71} In healthy elderly people, alpha power in the 484 EEG increased during both riding a horse⁶⁹, and a riding simulator.^{69,70} Furthermore, 485 one study used fMRI to assess changes in brain connectivity in children with ADHD.²⁷ 486 Increased connectivity was detected both within the cerebellum (albeit not statistically 487 higher than in the CG)⁷² and from the cerebellum to other regions, i.e., to the right 488 insular cortex, right middle temporal gyrus, left superior temporal gyrus, and right 489 precentral gyrus²⁷. 490

In addition, heart rate variability (HRV) in older adults increased after EAT when
interacting with horses.⁷³ Interestingly, the subjects' HRV often synchronized with the
horses' HRV, suggesting social bonding.^{73,74}

Taken together, these findings suggest a positive effect of EAT on relaxation and increased concentration.^{67,69,73,74} However, it remains unclear as to which specific

brain areas and networks are active and affected by EAT in stroke patients.
Understanding the physiological mechanisms and clinical correlates of EAT may help
to further optimize the therapy as well as to stratify patients who may benefit from it.⁷⁵

499 **EAT applied with horses vs. riding simulator**

500 To assess the whole field, we included studies that applied EAT in both riding 501 simulators and horses. These approaches have different advantages and 502 disadvantages:

Although similar, riding simulators may not reflect movements comparable to those of 503 a horse.⁷⁶ For example, some simulators apply only two-dimensional movements.^{44,76} 504 On the other hand, simulators offer the advantage of rhythmic movements without any 505 deviation from the protocol compared to training with a real animal.⁴⁴ Riding simulators 506 may also be more easily accessible and more affordable.⁷⁶ However, the emotional 507 and psychological effects of the interaction with a horse should not be underestimated. 508 Meaningful and positively stimulating training may increase the likelihood of 509 improvement.^{53,77,78} For example, stroke patients who underwent EAT for several 510 weeks stressed the importance and strong effect of bonding with the horse during 511 therapy.⁵³ This was also confirmed by HRV studies which found a favorable effect of 512 EAT on HRV.67,73,74 513

Both horses and riding simulators seem to yield positive effects on balance and gait without favoring one over the other. Consequently, based on previous literature on equine-assisted therapy (EAT) after stroke, it is challenging to determine the superiority of one approach over the other. Additionally, investigating their impact on other factors would be of significant interest and should be explored in future studies.

519 Prior research suggests that the benefits of applying EAT in horses may outweigh 520 those of riding simulators.^{44,76,79} However, for introducing patients to the movements 521 and training, using riding simulators could prove beneficial.

522 Study Quality

The study quality assessment suggests low methodological quality for most studies. Risk of bias include inappropriate randomization in RCT, missing data, blinding and incomplete information about adherence to assigned intervention. Therefore, findings from previous research as well as the presented synthesis of the results cannot be generalized to all stroke patients and require further investigation.

However, although most current evidence is limited by methodological constraints, 528 seven reports (based on five studies) were of considerable methodological quality. 529 Four of them reported improved gait^{8,40,45,49} and three of them improved balance^{8,45,49} 530 after EAT. Similar effects have been identified for EAT in children with cerebral 531 palsy^{22,80} which may have similarities to stroke patients. Therefore, synthesized results 532 of this review, especially the effectiveness of EAT in boosting gait and balance after 533 stroke, should not be disregarded but rather taken as a starting point for further 534 investigation. 535

536 *Limitations*

537 We are aware of multiple limitations regarding this systematic review. In general, 538 previous evidence for the effects of EAT in stroke patients is sparse.

To comprehensively assess the entire field, our goal was to incorporate all studies related to Equine-Assisted Therapy (EAT) during stroke recovery. The term EAT encompasses various specific therapies involving horses, ^{13,17} such as those focusing on teaching riding skills, improving motor function, or providing psychotherapy. ¹³

Importantly, inconsistent use of terms and often insufficiently detailed descriptions of
interventions make it challenging to distinguish between their respective effects.
Additionally, different interventions may exhibit variations in their effects. ^{13,17} We also
included studies with diverse study designs.

547 Consequently, the included studies exhibited high heterogeneity in terms of study 548 design, study quality, applied intervention (horses or simulators), intervention dosage, 549 and control groups (see Table 1, Fig. 3 and 4). Due to this substantial heterogeneity, 550 we were unable to draw overarching conclusions. To address this diversity, our 551 approach was to synthesize the literature based on study design and whether the 552 studies employed EAT with horses or riding simulators.

553 **Conclusion and future directions**

To conclude, EAT combines several important factors that may boost stroke rehabilitation of different symptoms. Specifically, this multimodal intervention consists of sensory, motor and cognitive components, offers high intensity training, and incorporates emotional and motivational aspects.^{8,12}

558 While the benefits of EAT on recovery after stroke were identified in different domains, 559 previous research is sparse and methodologically limited. This highlights the need of 560 future research which should especially focus on systematically evaluating the effects 561 of EAT on physical function including upper extremity motor function and spasticity, as 562 well as on psychological factors. In addition, investigating physiological changes may 563 help us to gain a better understanding of the underlying mechanisms and to further 564 optimize future therapies.

565 Authorship contribution statement

- 566 BHT: Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Formal Analysis, Visualization,
- 567 Writing Original Draft, AG: Conceptualization, Project administration, Funding
- sea acquisition, Writing Review and Editing

569

570 Declaration of competing interest

571 The authors declare no conflict of interests.

572

573 Acknowledgments

574 This work was supported by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research

575 [BMBF 13GW0570, BEVARES]. We acknowledge support from the Open Access

576 Publishing Fund of the University of Tuebingen. We thank Karolina Talar for valuable

578

577

579 Data availability

methodological input.

- 580 The data that support the findings of this study are available for researchers from the
- 581 first author upon reasonable request.

582 **References**

- 583 Achten D, Visser-Meily JMA, Post MWM, Schepers VPM. Life satisfaction of couples
- 3 years after stroke. Disabil Rehabil 2012; 34: 1468–72.
- 585 Badin L, Alibran É, Pothier K, Bailly N. Effects of equine-assisted interventions on older
- adults' health: A systematic review. Int J Nurs Sci 2022; 9: 542–52.
- Baek IH, Kim BJ. The Effects of Horse Riding Simulation Training on Stroke Patients'
 Balance Ability and Abdominal Muscle Thickness Changes. J Phys Ther Sci 2014; 26:
 1293–6.
- Baillet H, Leroy D, Verin E, Delpouve C, Benguigui N, Komar J, et al. Effect of
 Mechanical Horse Practice as New Postural Training in Patients With Neurological
 Disorders: A Pilot Study. Front Psychol 2019; 10: 1035.
- 593 Baldwin AL, Rector BK, Alden AC. Effects of a Form of Equine-Facilitated Learning on
- Heart Rate Variability, Immune Function, and Self-Esteem in Older Adults. People
 Anim Int J Res Pract 2018; 1: 5.
- Baldwin AL, Rector BK, Alden AC. Physiological and Behavioral Benefits for People
 and Horses during Guided Interactions at an Assisted Living Residence. Behav Sci
 (Basel) 2021; 11
- 599 Beinotti F, Christofoletti G, Correia N, Borges G. Effects of horseback riding therapy 600 on quality of life in patients post stroke. Top Stroke Rehabil 2013; 20: 226–32.
- Beinotti F, Correia N, Christofoletti G, Borges G. Use of hippotherapy in gait training
 for hemiparetic post-stroke. Arg Neuropsiquiatr 2010; 68: 908–13.
- ⁶⁰³ Berg K, Wood-Dauphinee S, Williams JI, Gayton D. Measuring balance in the elderly:
- Preliminary development of an instrument. Physiother Canada 1989; 41: 304–11.

Beyaert C, Vasa R, Frykberg GE. Gait post-stroke: Pathophysiology and rehabilitation

- strategies. Neurophysiol Clin 2015; 45: 335–55.
- 607 Blum L, Korner-Bitensky N. Usefulness of the Berg Balance Scale in stroke 608 rehabilitation: A systematic review. Phys Ther 2008; 88: 559–66.
- ⁶⁰⁹ Brewer L, Horgan F, Hickey A, Williams D. Stroke rehabilitation: Recent advances and
- 610 future therapies. Qjm 2013; 106: 11–25.
- Bunketorp-Käll L, Lundgren-Nilsson Å, Nilsson M, Blomstrand C. Multimodal
 rehabilitation in the late phase after stroke enhances the life situation of informal
 caregivers. Top Stroke Rehabil 2017
- Bunketorp-Käll L, Lundgren-Nilsson Å, Samuelsson H, Pekny T, Blomvé K, Pekna M,
- et al. Long-Term Improvements after Multimodal Rehabilitation in Late Phase after
 Stroke. Stroke 2017; 48: 1916–24.
- Bunketorp-Käll L, Pekna M, Pekny M, Blomstrand C, Nilsson M, Bunketorp-Kall L, et
 al. Effects of horse-riding therapy and rhythm and music-based therapy on functional
 mobility in late phase after stroke. NeuroRehabilitation 2019; 45: 483–92.
- Bunketorp-Käll L, Pekna M, Pekny M, Samuelsson H, Blomstrand C, Nilsson M. Motor
 Function in the Late Phase After Stroke: Stroke Survivors' Perspective. Ann Rehabil
 Med 2020; 44: 362–9.
- Byzova A, Roozbahani H, Handroos H, Hakansson N, Lankarani HM. Monitoring of the
 human body and brain behavior using optical motion capture system and EEG utilizing
 horseback riding simulator: an extended case study. J Phys Ther Sci 2020; 32: 85–91.
- Campbell M, McKenzie JE, Sowden A, Katikireddi SV, Brennan SE, Ellis S, et al.
 Synthesis without meta-analysis (SWiM) in systematic reviews: Reporting guideline.

628 BMJ 2020; 368: 1–6.

- Cassidy JM, Cramer SC. Spontaneous and Therapeutic-Induced Mechanisms of
 Functional Recovery After Stroke. Transl Stroke Res 2017; 8: 33–46.
- 631 Cho SH. Effects of horseback riding exercise on the relative alpha power spectrum in
- the elderly. Arch Gerontol Geriatr 2017; 70: 141–7.
- Cho SH, Kim JW, Kim SR, Cho BJ. Effects of horseback riding exercise therapy on
 hormone levels in elderly persons. J Phys Ther Sci 2015; 27: 2271–3.
- Cho W-S, Cho S-H. Effects of Mechanical Horseback Riding Exercise on Static
 Balance of Patient with Chronic Stroke. J Korea Acad Coop Soc 2015; 16: 1981–8.
- 637 Collado-Mateo D, Lavín-Pérez AM, García JPF, García-Gordillo MÁ, Villafaina S.
- 638 Effects of Equine-Assisted Therapies or Horse-Riding Simulators on Chronic Pain: A
- 639 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Medicina (B Aires) 2020; 56: 444.
- Deutz U, Heussen N, Weigt-Usinger K, Leiz S, Raabe C, Polster T, et al. Impact of
 Hippotherapy on Gross Motor Function and Quality of Life in Children with Bilateral
 Cerebral Palsy: A Randomized Open-Label Crossover Study. Neuropediatrics 2018;
 49: 185–92.
- Dobkin BH. Rehabilitation after stroke. N Engl J Med 2005 2005; 352: 1677–1684.
- Dominguez-Romero JG, Molina-Aroca A, Moral-Munoz JA, Luque-Moreno C, LucenaAnton D. Effectiveness of mechanical horse-riding simulators on postural balance in
 neurological rehabilitation: Systematic review and meta-analysis. Int J Environ Res
 Public Health 2020; 17
- Feigin V, Krishnamurthi R, Parmar P, Norrving B, Mensah G, Bennett D, et al. Update
 on the Global Burden of Ischaemic and Haemorrhagic Stroke in 1990–2013: The GBD

651 2013 Study. Neuroepidemiology 2015; 45: 161–76.

- Feigin VL, Brainin M, Norrving B, Martins S, Sacco RL, Hacke W, et al. World Stroke
- Organization (WSO): Global Stroke Fact Sheet 2022. Int J Stroke 2022; 17: 18–29.
- ⁶⁵⁴ Funakoshi R, Masuda K, Uchiyama H, Ohta M. A possible mechanism of horseback
- riding on dynamic trunk alignment. Heliyon 2018; 4: e00777.
- 656 García-Gómez A, Guerrero-Barona E, García-Peña I, Rodríguez-Jiménez M, Moreno-
- 657 Manso JM. Equine-assisted therapeutic activities and their influence on the heart rate
- variability: A systematic review. Complement Ther Clin Pract 2020; 39: 101167.
- 659 Garner BA, Rigby BR. Human pelvis motions when walking and when riding a 660 therapeutic horse. Hum Mov Sci 2015; 39: 121–37.
- 661 Goulet-Pelletier J-C, Cousineau D. A review of effect sizes and their confidence 662 intervals, Part I: The Cohen's d family. Quant Methods Psychol 2020; 16: 422–3.
- 663 Grefkes C, Ward NS. Cortical reorganization after stroke: How much and how 664 functional? Neuroscientist 2014; 20: 56–70.
- Guindos-Sanchez L De, Lucena-Anton D, Moral-Munoz JA, Salazar A, CarmonaBarrientos I. The effectiveness of hippotherapy to recover gross motor function in
 children with cerebral palsy: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Children 2020; 7:
 106.
- Han JY, Kim JM, Kim SK, Chung JS, Lee H-CC, Lim JK, et al. Therapeutic effects of
 mechanical horseback riding on gait and balance ability in stroke patients. Ann Rehabil
 Med 2012; 36: 762–9.
- Heussen N, Häusler M. Equine-Assisted Therapies for Children With Cerebral Palsy:
 A Meta-analysis. Pediatrics 2022; 150: e2021055229.

Hong QN, Fàbregues S, Bartlett G, Boardman F, Cargo M, Dagenais P, et al. The
Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) version 2018 for information professionals and
researchers. Educ Inf 2018; 34: 285–91.

Hyun C, Kim K, Lee S, Ko N, Lee IS, Koh SE. The Short-term Effects of Hippotherapy

and Therapeutic Horseback Riding on Spasticity in Children with Cerebral Palsy: A

679 Meta-analysis. Pediatr Phys Ther 2022; 34: 172–8.

Hyun GJ, Jung TW, Park JH, Kang KD, Kim SM, Son YD, et al. Changes in Gait
Balance and Brain Connectivity in Response to Equine-Assisted Activity and Training
in Children with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder. J Altern Complement Med
2016; 22: 286–93.

Kim H, Her JG, Ko J. Effect of horseback riding simulation machine training on trunk
balance and gait of chronic stroke patients. J Phys Ther Sci 2014; 26: 29–32.

Kim HS, Lee CW, Lee IS. Comparison between the Effects of Horseback Riding
Exercise and Trunk Stability Exercise on the Balance of Normal Adults. J Phys Ther
Sci 2014; 26: 1325–7.

Kim P, Warren S, Madill H, Hadley M. Quality of life of stroke survivors. Int J TherRehabil 1999; 12: 43.

Kim SR, Cho SH, Kim JW, Lee H-C, Brienen M, Cho BJ. Effects of horseback riding
exercise therapy on background electroencephalograms of elderly people. J Phys Ther
Sci 2015; 27: 2373–2376.

Kim YN, Lee DK. Effects of horse-riding exercise on balance, gait, and activities of
daily living in stroke patients. J Phys Ther Sci 2015; 27: 607–9.

696 Kleim JA, Jones TA. Principles of experience-dependent neural plasticity: Implications

for rehabilitation after brain damage. J Speech, Lang Hear Res 2008; 51: 225–39.

698 Krakauer JW, Carmichael ST, Corbett D, Wittenberg GF. Getting neurorehabilitation

right: What can be learned from animal models? Neurorehabil Neural Repair 2012; 26:

700 923–31.

Lechner HE, Kakebeeke TH, Hegemann D, Baumberger M. The Effect of Hippotherapy

on Spasticity and on Mental Well-Being of Persons With Spinal Cord Injury. Arch Phys
Med Rehabil 2007; 88: 1241–8.

Lee C-W, Kim SG, Yong MS. Effects of Hippotherapy on Recovery of Gait and Balance
Ability in Patients with Stroke. J Phys Ther Sci 2014; 26: 309–311.

Lee D, Lee S, Park J. Effects of Indoor Horseback Riding and Virtual Reality Exercises
on the Dynamic Balance Ability of Normal Healthy Adults. J Phys Ther Sci 2014; 26:
1903–5.

Lee DK, Kim EK. The influence of horseback riding training on the physical function

and psychological problems of stroke patients. J Phys Ther Sci 2015; 27: 2739–41.

Lee JW, Han A, Kim K. Effects of rehabilitative horse riding on the Sit-to-Stand action
of the adolescent with brain lesions. J Exerc Rehabil 2014; 10: 31–4.

Lee N, Park S, Kim J. Effects of hippotherapy on brain function, BDNF level, and
physical fitness in children with ADHD. J Exerc Nutr Biochem 2015; 6: 115–21.

Lee N, Park S, Kim J. Hippotherapy and neurofeedback training effect on the brain function and serum brain-derived neurotrophic factor level changes in children with attention-deficit or/and hyperactivity disorder. J Exerc Nutr Biochem 2017; 21: 35–42.

Lewis SW. Equine-assisted therapies using horses as healers : A concept analysis.

719 Nurs Open 2020; 7: 58–67.

- Lohse KR, Lang CE, Boyd LA. Is more better? Using meta-data to explore dose response relationships in stroke rehabilitation. Stroke 2014; 45: 2053–8.
- 722 McGibbon NH, Benda W, Duncan BR, Silkwood-Sherer D. Immediate and Long-Term
- 723 Effects of Hippotherapy on Symmetry of Adductor Muscle Activity and Functional
- Ability in Children With Spastic Cerebral Palsy. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2009; 90: 966–
- 725 74.
- de Mello EC, Diniz LH, Lage JB, Ribeiro MF, Bevilacqua Junior DE, Rosa RC, et al.
- 727 Analysis of Trunk Neuromuscular Activation During Equine-Assisted Therapy in Older
- 728 Adults. Percept Mot Skills 2022; 129: 1458–76.
- 729 Minet LR, Peterson E, Von Koch L, Ytterberg C. Occurrence and Predictors of Falls in
- People with Stroke: Six-Year Prospective Study. Stroke 2015; 46: 2688–90.
- Murphy TH, Corbett D. Plasticity during stroke recovery: From synapse to behaviour.
 Nat Rev Neurosci 2009; 10: 861–72.
- Olney SJ, Richards CL. Hemiparetic gait following stroke . Part I : Characteristics. Gait
 Posture 1996; 4: 136–48.
- Ottiger B, Van Wegen E, Keller K, Nef T, Nyffeler T, Kwakkel G, et al. Getting into a
 "Flow" state: a systematic review of flow experience in neurological diseases. J
 Neuroeng Rehabil 2021; 18: 1–21.
- Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The
 PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. Int J
 Surg 2021; 88: 105906.
- Park J, Lee S, Lee J, Lee D. The effects of horseback riding simulator exercise on
 postural balance of chronic stroke patients. J Phys Ther Sci 2013; 25: 1169–72.

- Park JH, Shurtleff T, Engsberg J, Rafferty S, You JY, You IY, et al. Comparison
 between the robo-horse and real horse movements for hippotherapy. Biomed Mater
 Eng 2014; 24: 2603–10.
- Pekna M, Pekny M, Nilsson M. Modulation of Neural Plasticity as a Basis for Stroke
 Rehabilitation. 2012: 2819–28.
- Pohl P, Carlsson G, Bunketorp Käll L, Nilsson M, Blomstrand C. A qualitative
 exploration of post-acute stroke participants' experiences of a multimodal intervention
 incorporating horseback riding. PLoS One 2018; 13: 1–18.
- 751 Portaro S, Cacciola A, Naro A, Cavallaro F, Gemelli G, Aliberti B, et al. Can Individuals

vith Down Syndrome Benefit from Hippotherapy? An Exploratory Study on Gait and

- 753 Balance. Dev Neurorehabil 2020; 23: 337–42.
- Rigby BR, Grandjean PW. The Efficacy of Equine-Assisted Activities and Therapies
 on Improving Physical Function. J Altern Complement Med 2016; 22: 9–24.
- Solomonow-Avnon D, Mawase F. The dose and intensity matter for chronic stroke. J
- 757 Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry 2019; 90: 1187–8.
- Stergiou A, Tzoufi M, Ntzani E, Varvarousis D, Beris A, Ploumis A. Therapeutic Effects
 of Horseback Riding Interventions: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. Am J
 Phys Med Rehabil 2017; 96: 717–25.
- Sung YH, Kim CJ, Yu BK, Kim KM. A hippotherapy simulator is effective to shift weight
 bearing toward the affected side during gait in patients with stroke. NeuroRehabilitation
 2013; 33: 407–12.
- Sunwoo H, Chang WH, Kwon J-Y, Kim T-W, Lee J-Y, Kim Y-H. Hippotherapy in Adult
 Patients with Chronic Brain Disorders : A Pilot Study. Ann Rehabil Med 2012; 2012;

766 36: 756–61.

Tabares C, Vicente F, Sánchez S, Aparicio A, Alejo S, Cubero J. Quantification of
hormonal changes by effects of hippotherapy in the autistic population. Neurochem J
2012; 6: 311–6.

- Uchiyama H, Ohtani N, Ohta M. Three-dimensional analysis of horse and human gaits
- in therapeutic riding. Appl Anim Behav Sci 2011; 135: 271–6.
- Viruega H, Galy C, Loriette C, Jacquot S, Houpeau JL, Gaviria M. Breast Cancer: How

773 Hippotherapy Bridges the Gap between Healing and Recovery—A Randomized

- Controlled Clinical Trial. Cancers (Basel) 2023; 15: 1317.
- Viruega H, Imbernon C, Chausson N, Altarcha T, Aghasaryan M, Soumah D, et al.

Neurorehabilitation through Hippotherapy on Neurofunctional Sequels of Stroke: Effect

on Patients' Functional Independence, Sensorimotor/Cognitive Capacities and Quality

- of Life, and the Quality of Life of Their Caregivers—A Study Protocol. Brain Sci 2022;
 12: 619.
- Vive S, Bunketorp-käll L, Carlsson G. Experience of enriched rehabilitation in the
 chronic phase of stroke. Disabil Rehabil 2022; 44: 412–9.
- Ward J, Hovey A, Brownlee K. Mental health benefits of mounted equine-assisted
 therapies: A scoping review. Heal Soc Care Community 2022: 1–16.
- Ward NS, Brander F, Kelly K. Intensive upper limb neurorehabilitation in chronic stroke:
 Outcomes from the Queen Square programme. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry 2019;
 90: 498–506.
- Yoo JH, Oh Y, Jang B, Song J, Kim J, Kim S, et al. The effects of equine-assisted
 activities and therapy on resting-state brain function in attention-deficit/hyperactivity

- disorder: A pilot study. Clin Psychopharmacol Neurosci 2016; 14: 357–64.
- 790 Zadnikar M, Kastrin A. Effects of hippotherapy and therapeutic horseback riding on
- postural control or balance in children with cerebral palsy: A meta-analysis. Dev Med
- 792 Child Neurol 2011; 53: 684–91.