

Title Page

Title

The Effect of Sensory Therapy on Upper Extremity Functions and Activities of Daily Living in Patients with Chronic Stroke: A Randomized Controlled Trial

Author information

Author 1: Muhammed Rohat Yazıcı, MsC. OT, is Researcher Assistant, Department of Occupational Therapy, Uskudar University, Istanbul, Turkey (Corresponding author)
Email: muhammedrohat.yazici@uskudar.edu.tr
Orcid: 0000-0002-3150-0433

Author 2: Cigdem Cekmece, PhD., Asst. Prof., is Section of Occupational Therapy, Department of Therapy and Rehabilitation, Vocational School of Kocaeli Health Service Kocaeli, Turkey.
Email: cigdemcekmece@yahoo.com
Orcid: 0000-0003-2865-480X

Key Words: Stroke, sensory therapy, post-stroke rehabilitation, occupational therapy

Word Count: 3470

Itemized list of tables and figures:

1. Table 1. Characteristic and sensory functions of study participants (mean, SD, range, and number)
2. Table 2. Clinical outcome measures at before treatment (BT), and after treatment (AT) in participants
3. Table 3. Activities in which participants have problems according to COPM
4. Figure 1. Consort flow diagram of the study
5. Figure 2. Analysis graph of pre/post treatment differences of JTHFT parameters

Declarations

The authors confirm that there is no conflict of interest.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

~~Conflicts of interest/Competing interests~~ This preprint is not certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

The authors do not have any conflict of interest.

Availability of data and material

The datasets created and/or analyzed during the current study are not publicly available due to [participants' deprivation of personal information] but are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Ethics approval

The study was approved by the local institutional ethical board (Ethics Committee at Kocaeli University) and it was examined by the ministry of health and was found in accordance with the regulation (Number: (KAEEK 2021/04.39)).

All the procedures performed were in accordance with the ethical standards of the national research standards and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments. Informed consent was obtained from all the individual participants included in the study.

Statement of contributorship

All authors contributed to the development of the study methodology, data collection, and analysis. All authors participated in writing, reviewing, and editing the manuscript, and approved the final version.

Data availability statement

Data are available upon reasonable request from the corresponding author and are otherwise restricted for ethical considerations, as it was instructed by the ethical committee.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank all the individuals who participated in this study.

Consent to participate

All respondents signed online informed consent forms for participation.

Funding statement

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Contributorship

Conceptualization, Ç.Ç. and M.R.Y.; methodology, Ç.Ç.; software, Ç.Ç. and M.R.Y.; formal analysis, Ç.Ç. and M.R.Y.; investigation, M.R.Y.; resources, M.R.Y.; data curation, Ç.Ç. and M.R.Y.; writing—original draft preparation, Ç.Ç.; writing—review and editing, Ç.Ç.; visualization, Ç.Ç. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Guarantor statement: Muhammed Rohat Yazıcı

The Effect of Sensory Therapy on Upper Extremity Functions and Activities of Daily Living in Patients with Chronic Stroke: A Randomized Controlled Trial

Abstract

Introduction: The aim of this study was to investigate the effects of intensive sensory therapy on upper extremity functions, daily activity and life quality of stroke survivors.

Methods: This randomized controlled trial included 30 participants aged between 18 and 80 years, who were divided into a sensory-training group (n = 15) and a control group (n = 15). Both groups received 15 sessions of 30 minutes of physical therapy, occupational therapy, and 20 minutes of activity daily living training for three weeks. The ST group also received intensified sensory therapy during each session. Thumb localization, finger shift, and stereognosis tests were performed in both groups only before the start of intervention. The Jebsen Taylor Hand Function Test, Canadian Occupational Performance Measure, Modified Frenchay Scale, and Stroke Specific Quality of Life Scale (SS-QOL) were administered before and after intervention.

Results: Statistically significant differences were observed between the ST group and the control group across all tests, except for the Language, Thinking, and Vision parameters of the SS-QOL.

Conclusion: These results suggest that sensory therapies applied with conventional interventions increased upper extremity functions, activity daily living performance, participation and quality of life of the stroke survivors.

Registration: URL: <https://clinicaltrials.gov/study/NCTxxxxxx> Unique identifier: NCTxxxxxx.

Key Words: Stroke, sensory therapy, post-stroke rehabilitation, occupational therapy

1 **Introduction**

2 Internationally, stroke remains a leading cause of disability, imposing significant economic
3 burdens on post-stroke care worldwide (Rajsic et al., 2019). A significant portion of stroke
4 survivors, approximately 35%, experience complete or partial dependence in activities of
5 daily living (ADL) (Carey et al., 2016). Stroke survivors commonly face motor, sensory, and
6 cognitive challenges (Hoffmann et al., 2010). These dysfunctions, occurring in chronic
7 stroke, affect both upper and lower extremities, leading to dependence in personal care, work
8 productivity, leisure activities, and social participation, while also impacting personal, family,
9 and work roles (Gillen, 2015). Otherwise the high prevalence and significance of
10 somatosensory function in daily activities, there is limited empirical evidence linking
11 impaired somatosensory with participation in these activities (Carey et al., 2016).

12 Post-stroke sensory rehabilitation generally follows two key approaches: explicit sensory-
13 focused training, where patients actively engage in detecting and recognizing sensory stimuli,
14 and implicit sensory-focused training, which involves repeated exposure to sensory stimuli
15 without direct attention or verbal interaction (Doyle et al., 2010; Serrada et al., 2019).

16 Sensory inputs are fundamental to motor recovery after stroke, as motor movements require
17 the integration of sensory information (Chen et al., 2018). Thus, motor rehabilitation should
18 include sensory training (Doyle et al., 2014a; Doyle et al., 2014b). However, therapies often
19 prioritize motor functions, overlooking the auxiliary role of sensory inputs (Zandvliet et al.,
20 2020). A promising approach is a rehabilitation process that integrates sensory therapy,
21 involving somatosensory, visual, auditory, tactile, vestibular, or multisensory stimulation,
22 alongside targeted movements (Hildebrand et al., 2023). Researchers suggest that sensory
23 therapy, such as peripheral nerve stimulation and muscle tendon vibration, may improve
24 motor performance by increasing corticospinal excitability and expanding the representation
25 of the excited body part (Edwards et al., 2014). Furthermore, restoring sensorimotor

26 interactions in the damaged motor system is beneficial for motor recovery (Laible et al.,
27 2012).

28 Sensory disruptions in the upper extremity after stroke often lead to persistent challenges in
29 everyday tasks like self-care, household chores, and recreational activities. However, sensory
30 disorders are often overlooked in stroke rehabilitation, with more focus placed on motor
31 function and exercises for the upper and lower extremities (Byrne et al., 2023). Since re-
32 establishing sensory processing and sensorimotor interactions is crucial for motor recovery,
33 sensory-based therapies should be integrated with conventional intervention methods (Aguia-
34 Rojas et al., 2023).

35 Research on sensory rehabilitation has often focused on either active sensory exercise, such
36 as identifying different tactile stimuli or passive methods like electrical stimulation, hot or
37 cold applications, and pneumatic compression (Walker et al., 2022). Conversely increasing
38 evidence supporting the benefits of specific sensory training, its application in clinical
39 practice remains limited (Doyle et al., 2013a; Doyle et al., 2014b). Therefore, there is a need
40 for more robust evidence supporting the use of sensory therapies in stroke intervention. A
41 deeper understanding of how sensory impairments affect daily life will enable clinicians to
42 design better, individualized rehabilitation interventions. A recent systematic review
43 identified a significant need for standardized sensory retraining protocols tested through
44 rigorous methodologies to ensure their effectiveness in clinical settings (Gavin et al., 2022).

45 Future studies should focus on sensory-based occupational therapy interventions for stroke
46 survivors (Carey et al., 2018; Doyle et al., 2013b). There are theoretical, clinical, and
47 academic gaps in sensory assessment and interventions for individuals with chronic stroke.
48 Accordingly, this study was planned. This randomized controlled study aimed to investigate
49 the effects of sensory-based occupational therapy on upper extremity sensory functions,

50 ADL, and quality of life in chronic stroke patients. Our hypothesis was that sensory therapy
51 would improve upper extremity functions and ADL in stroke survivors.

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75 **Methods**

76 **Study design**

77 This clinical trial followed Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials (CONSORT)
78 guidelines. It was randomized, single-blind, and conducted in parallel design. This study has
79 been registered with the Clinical Trials Registry (NCTxxxxxxx). This study conducted at
80 the Kocaeli University Hospital Department of Physical and Rehabilitation Medicine in in
81 Kocaeli, Turkey. The study utilized standardized clinical outcome measures for upper
82 extremity sensory functions, quality of life, and ADL functions in chronic stroke patients.
83 This study was approved by the University Ethical Committee (K.....). The study
84 CONSORT flow chart is shown in Figure 1.

85 **Participants**

86 The inclusion criteria were aged between 18 and 80 years, medically stable, a post-stroke
87 interval of at least six months, and a score of more than 24 on the Mini-Mental State Exam.
88 Stroke survivors were not considered for inclusion in the study if they exhibited severe
89 spasticity, indicated by a Modified Ashworth Scale (MAS) score of 3 or higher in upper
90 extremity muscles, had joint limitations (contractures), congestive heart failure, peripheral
91 arterial disease, severe dementia, language impairments, or experienced highly painful
92 conditions like reflex sympathetic dystrophy.

93 **Allocation**

94 This study was conducted with stroke survivors who were hospitalized at the Physical and
95 Rehabilitation Department of Kocaeli University Hospital between May and September 2022.
96 Participants who completed the assessment were then randomly assigned to intervention
97 groups. Assessments and interventions were conducted in the occupational therapy
98 department of this hospital. Informed written consent was obtained from all participants
99 before participating in the study.

100 **Randomization and blinding**

101 Simple randomization method was used for the study. The participants were randomly
102 assigned in a 1:1 ratio to the ST group or the control group by a researcher who did not
103 participate in the intervention or the evaluation process. To ensure standardization, all
104 evaluations were made by the same researcher who was blind to the intervention group. Since
105 this researcher is not part of the standard intervention team, she is not aware of this specific
106 intervention modality the patient received, which ensures blinding. Physiotherapists who
107 applied conventional intervention, and occupational therapists who applied occupational
108 therapy, ADL training, and sensory interventions were not blinded to the study.
109 For randomization, A person who was not part of the study made the allocation. To ensure
110 allocation concealment, our study used an independent, centralized allocation protocol that
111 did not involve any individuals associated with the study. With this method, randomization
112 lists were created and maintained securely in remote locations (in the hospital's main
113 building), thus reducing the chance of monitoring intervention assignments and the process.
114 With a centralized intervention assignment, a participant who was eligible and consented to
115 the study was assigned to the intervention group (sensory group or control group) by calling
116 the randomization centre to receive the intervention assignment, after recording demographic
117 information and initial assessments. It is clear from this example that neither patients nor
118 researchers can predict the next allocation; This is designed to hide the allocation.

119 **Intervention**

120 All participants in the study received a 3-week intervention consisting of a total of 15
121 sessions. While one session of participants in the control group lasted approximately 1 hour,
122 one session of participants in the sensory training group was approximately one and a half
123 hours. The interventions were conducted in person and on an individual basis. The specific
124 content of the interventions in the two groups is outlined below:

125 All participants received physical therapy, which included hot-pack application, stretching
126 exercises, strengthening exercises, balance, and ambulation training as appropriate. In the
127 occupational therapy program, which was applied to both groups for 30 minutes a day, fine
128 grasping exercises (screwing objects together, removing nails, and placing round rings),
129 rough grip exercises (throwing balls, cup activity, placing big box blocks, and gripping
130 cylinders), bilateral training and teaching activities (hand cycling, climbing ladders, hitting
131 two objects together, reaching for a large ball with both hands) were applied. Following a 5-
132 minute rest period, participants undertook 20 minutes of training in ADL.

133 The ADL training focused on working on activities identified by participants using the
134 COPM and scales and included activities such as cooking, shaving, taking a shower, walking,
135 and visiting relatives. The aim was that participants would be able to perform their identified
136 activities independently. In addition, ADL training aimed to increase the stroke survivors'
137 functional independence by making activity modifications and environmental arrangements,
138 such as thickening the fork handle, adding a cup holder, teaching techniques for wearing
139 cardigans, t-shirts, and trousers, and one-handed lacing methods.

140 In the sensory-training group, the ADL training was followed by a 5-minute rest period, after
141 which participants received sensory therapy for 30 minutes. As sensory therapy, training on
142 recognizing different surfaces, weight transfer, vestibular sensory studies, approximations,
143 deep massage applications, and brushing were performed. In the training for recognizing
144 different surfaces, wooden blocks of surfaces of different textures and hardness were used.
145 Barbed balls and hard and soft sensory brushes were used for brushing. The stroke survivors'
146 affected hand and arm were brushed for a duration of 5 minutes. Touching activities, using
147 hot and cold tubes, were also included in the application to create thermal, tactile stimulation
148 in the stroke survivors. After brushing, weight-bearing was performed with the stroke
149 survivors' arm on the table (1 minute), extended in the sitting position (1 minute), and with

150 the arm leaning against the wall (1 minute) for a total of 3 minutes. Deep massage
151 applications to the affected hand and arm and therapist-assisted approximations were also
152 performed as part of the intervention. Intervention was completed with vestibular sensory
153 studies.

154 **Assessments and outcomes**

155 Demographic information of the stroke survivors, including age, gender, dominant hand,
156 plegic side, and time after stroke, was recorded. The stroke survivors' sensory evaluation
157 (Thumb Localization Test, Finger Shift Test, and Stereognosis Test) results were recorded
158 before the intervention. At the beginning and end of the intervention, the Jebsen Taylor Hand
159 Function Test (JTHFT) (Davis Sears & Chung, 2010), Canadian Occupational Performance
160 Measurement (COPM) (Carswell et al., 2004), Modified Frenchay Scale (MFS) (Laclergue et
161 al., 2023), and Stroke-Specific Quality of Life Scale (SS-QOL) (Hakverdioğlu Yönt &
162 Khorshid, 2012), were applied.

163 **Primary outcomes**

164 Primary outcomes are JTHFT and COPM. JTHFT consists of seven subsections (writing,
165 turning cards, moving small objects, simulated feeding, stacking checkers, moving empty
166 cans, and moving full cans). As some of the stroke survivors participating in the study were
167 illiterate, the first item of JTHFT, the act of "writing", was excluded from the evaluation.
168 COPM is a client-centered, and semi structured assessment tool used to identify and evaluate
169 the stroke survivors perceived performance and satisfaction in everyday activities. Patients
170 are asked about the activities in which they have problems in these areas, their performance
171 and satisfaction levels. Performance and importance levels are determined by the patient on a
172 1-10 scale as "Not at all important" (1) and "Very important" (10).

173 **Secondary outcomes**

174 Secondary outcomes are MFS and SS-QOL. MFS is a scale that evaluates stroke survivors'
175 upper extremity functions and instrumental ADL (drawing a straight line with a ruler,
176 opening a jar compartment, attaching a peg, combing hair, etc.). Scoring for each activity was
177 done as 0 (no movement), 5 (completed the task) and 10 (normal movement).
178 SS-QOL consists of 12 sub-sections including energy, family roles, language, mobility,
179 mood, personality, self-care, social roles, thinking, upper extremity function, vision and
180 work/productivity and a total of 49 questions; It is graded with Likert type scoring ranging
181 from 1 to 5.

182 **Sample size calculation**

183 The sample size for the trial was calculated based on the Jebsen Taylor Hand Function Test
184 (JTHFT) as the primary indicator, with an anticipated mean effect size of $d = 1.42$, as
185 observed in previous studies (Allgöwer & Hermsdörfer, 2017; Krumlinde-Sundholm et al.,
186 2019). A sample size of 15 patients in each group was determined using G*power Software
187 (version 3.1.9.6) with an alpha level (α) of 0.05 and power ($1-\beta$) of 0.950. Accordingly, a
188 total of 30 participants were included in the study and control groups.

189 **Statistical Analysis**

190 Statistical analysis was done with IBM SPSS, version 20.0 (IBM Corp, Armonk, NY, USA).
191 Normality of data set distribution was evaluated with the Shapiro-Wilk Test. Normally
192 distributed numerical variables are given as mean \pm standard deviation, non-normally
193 distributed numerical variables as median (25th-75th percentile), and categorical variables as
194 frequency (percentage). The difference between the groups was determined by independent
195 samples t-test and Mann-Whitney U test, as appropriate. Differences between dependent
196 samples were analysed by paired t-test and Wilcoxon signed-rank test. A $p < 0.05$ was
197 considered sufficient to indicate statistical significance when testing two-sided hypotheses.

198

199 **Results**

200 **Enrollment flow**

201 Of the 45 stroke patients assessed, five were excluded due to not meeting the inclusion
202 criteria and three refused to participate. The remaining 37 were randomised to study (n = 19)
203 or control (n = 18) groups. Two participants moved away, one due to lack of motivation, two
204 due to personal reasons, and two due to unstable health were lost to follow-up. The final
205 analysis included 15 participants in the sensory training group and 15 in the control group, as
206 shown in Figure 1, which illustrates the flow of participants.

207 **Pre-intervention characteristics**

208 Baseline characteristics were comparable between the ST and control groups. ($p > 0.05$). The
209 demographic information of the stroke survivors regarding gender, dominant hand,
210 hemiplegic side, and time after stroke is given in Table 1. Sensory evaluations of the stroke
211 survivors were examined before the intervention, both groups were similar in terms of all
212 sensory functions (Table 1) ($p > 0.05$). The outcome of JTHFT, COPM, MFS, and SS-QOL of
213 stroke survivors before intervention are given in Table 2. No significant differences were
214 found between the two groups in the pre-intervention evaluations ($p > 0.05$).

215 **Changes from post-intervention**

216 The assessments of JTHFT, MFS, COPM and SS-QOL of stroke survivors after intervention
217 are given in Table 2. Scores in the post-intervention JTHFT categories were significantly
218 different between both groups: turning cards ($p = 0.026$), moving small objects ($p = 0.017$),
219 simulated feeding ($p = 0.017$), stacking checkers ($p = 0.044$), moving empty cans ($p = 0.003$) and
220 moving full cans ($p = 0.007$) (Table 2). Moreover, the differences of all JTHFT parameters
221 before and after intervention were taken (intervention response), statistical analysis was made
222 and added graphically (Figure 2). Significant differences in improvement were also found in
223 the ST group for COPM performance ($p = 0.001$) and satisfaction ($p = 0.006$) values when

224 compared to the control group (Table 2). Furthermore, according to the COPM assessment,
225 the activities that participants in both the ST group and the control group had problems with
226 are given in Table 3.

227 All the MFS scores of the ST group and control groups were compared after the intervention,
228 there was a significant difference in the activities of all parameters after the intervention
229 ($p < 0.05$) (Table 2). When the SS-QOL results of the ST group and the control group were
230 compared after intervention, a statistically significant difference was found in favour of the
231 ST group ($p < 0.05$), except for language, thinking and visual domains ($p > 0.05$) (Table 2).

232

233 [INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

234

235 [INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE]

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

244

245

246

247

248

249 **Discussion**

250 This randomized controlled study explored the impact of sensory therapy on upper
251 extremity functions, ADL performance, and quality of life in stroke survivors. After a three-
252 week intervention, the sensory therapy group showed significant improvements in motor
253 function and quality of life compared to the control group, who received conventional
254 therapy without sensory training. Additionally, the sensory therapy group demonstrated
255 enhanced ADL performance and satisfaction. These findings highlight the potential of
256 sensory therapy as a complementary approach to traditional stroke rehabilitation.

257 JTHFT was utilized to assess motor function in the plegic upper extremity. This test
258 includes tasks involving common grips used in daily activities and evaluates the speed with
259 which individuals perform these tasks. Unlike self-reported scales, JTHFT provides
260 objective assessment results that are independent of a participant's perception of
261 performance. Good performance in this test requires the accurate integration of complex
262 sensorimotor information (Duff et al., 2006). In everyday activities, people frequently
263 encounter tasks requiring grip, reach, and shoulder stabilization. For stroke survivors,
264 proprioceptive sensory impairments often impede the coordinated execution of these tasks.

265 The greater improvements seen in these activities in the sensory therapy group strengthen
266 the argument that stroke survivors receiving this additional therapy may use their upper
267 extremity more functionally in ADL. This aligns with earlier studies that found positive
268 outcomes when sensory rehabilitation was added to conventional interventions for upper
269 extremity motor function (Allgöwer & Hermsdörfer, 2017; Blennerhassett et al., 2007). In
270 this study, a statistically significant improvement in motor function was found in the
271 sensory therapy group, particularly in tasks involving recognition of different textures.

272 Bernard-Espina et al. (Bernard-Espina et al., 2021) also demonstrated the importance of
273 multisensory integration, including hand motor control, vision, and proprioception, in

274 motor function recovery following stroke. They concluded that stroke affects both motor
275 and sensory functions. In a randomized controlled trial conducted by Allgöwer and
276 Hermsdörfer, JTHFT was used similarly to our study, and the researchers found that fine
277 motor skills for grasping, holding, and manipulating objects require interaction among
278 multiple sensorimotor systems (Allgöwer & Hermsdörfer, 2017).

279 A semi-structured interview using the COPM was conducted to assess stroke survivors'
280 activity performance, satisfaction, and participation. Both groups showed significant
281 improvement in all COPM subfields, but post-intervention comparisons revealed a
282 significant advantage for the sensory therapy group. Hejazi-Shirmard et al., in their
283 comparison of top-down and bottom-up rehabilitation, found COPM scores like those in our
284 study (Hejazi-Shirmard et al., 2024). According to COPM results, an improvement of 2
285 points or more is considered moderate to high clinical improvement, which correlates with
286 significant performance changes in stroke survivors (Law et al., 1994). In our study, the
287 sensory therapy group showed increases of 2.34 points in performance and 2.45 points in
288 satisfaction after intervention, while the control group showed increases of only 0.7 and 1.2
289 points, respectively. This level of improvement (>2.0) suggests that combining sensory
290 therapy with patient-centred ADL education effectively enhances ADL performance in
291 stroke survivors. Common areas of limitation identified in stroke survivors included self-care
292 (e.g., brushing teeth, showering), productivity-work (e.g., cooking, cleaning), and leisure
293 (e.g., walking). COPM is notable for its ability to assess participation levels, and in our
294 study, stroke survivors expressed a desire to spend more time with family and engage in
295 these activities as part of their intervention.

296 While changes in various domains impact survivors' performance in daily life, there are
297 limited studies on the effectiveness of sensory-based rehabilitation practices for ADL
298 improvement (Alwawi et al., 2024). We utilized the MFS to evaluate instrumental ADLs.

299 MFS showed significant improvements in the sensory therapy group. However, 8 of 15
300 stroke survivors in the sensory therapy group and 4 of 15 in the control group achieved the
301 expected level of performance, while 2 in the sensory therapy group and 1 in the control
302 group exceeded their goals. Studies by Eghlidi et al. and Derakhshanfar et al. have similarly
303 demonstrated significant improvements in ADL performance through sensory-based
304 rehabilitation added to conventional interventions (Derakhshanfar et al., 2021; Eghlidi et al.,
305 2015).

306 Following a stroke, many survivors experience functional loss, including balance and
307 walking difficulties, upper extremity dysfunction, speech disorders, swallowing problems,
308 and sensory loss, which negatively affect daily activities and quality of life (Ghrouz et al.,
309 2024). Quality of life in stroke survivors is influenced by physical, functional, cognitive, and
310 social factors (Rocha et al., 2021). In this study, we used the SS-QOL scale to assess the
311 impact of sensory therapy. Post-intervention comparisons showed significant improvements
312 in the sensory therapy group across all domains except "Language," "Thinking," and "Sight."
313 Although there are studies examining the effectiveness of sensory therapy in stroke
314 survivors, there is no study evaluating the effect of sensory therapy on the quality of life of
315 stroke survivors. The results of the present study showed that sensory training has positive
316 effects on upper extremity functionality and independence, participation in ADL, and thus
317 improved quality of life in stroke survivors.

318 Our findings suggest that sensory training positively influences upper extremity function,
319 ADL participation, and quality of life. Despite the common emphasis on motor function
320 recovery in early stroke rehabilitation, sensory function interventions are often neglected.
321 Our study, along with others, suggests that sensory training should be incorporated into early
322 rehabilitation protocols.

323

324 **Limitation**

325 One limitation of our study is the short follow-up period of three weeks, which leaves the
326 long-term effectiveness of the intervention unexamined. Another limitation is the relatively
327 small sample size, which could be addressed in future research with larger, prospective
328 studies that include long-term follow-up. Additionally, while both groups showed
329 improvement, the greater effect observed in the sensory therapy group complicates the
330 identification of which specific sensory stimuli contributed to the outcomes. Future studies
331 should consider isolating individual sensory stimuli to better understand their distinct
332 contributions.

333 **Conclusions**

334 This randomized controlled study suggests that thorough assessment of sensory functions
335 and the integration of sensory therapy into routine interventions are crucial for enhancing
336 functionality in stroke survivors. Moreover, participants who received sensory therapy
337 reported significant improvements in quality of life. We believe that the variety of
338 materials, devices, and environments used in sensory therapy plays a key role in promoting
339 recovery in stroke survivors.

340 **Key findings**

- 341 ▪ This study will provide a resource and encourage occupational therapists working in
342 stroke rehabilitation to include sensory processes in their therapies.
- 343 ▪ This study may create awareness among occupational therapy practitioners about the
344 importance of sensory therapy in stroke rehabilitation.
- 345 ▪ This study may encourage occupational therapists to work with stroke survivors for
346 sensory therapy and allow planning interventions and comparing results.

REFERENCES

- Aguiá-Rojas, K., Bracewell, R. M., Castillo, J. A., & O'Brien, J. (2023). 'It is never-ending work': Colombian occupational therapists' experiences of working in stroke rehabilitation. *British Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 86(10), 705-713. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03080226231178396>
- Allgöwer, K., & Hermsdörfer, J. (2017). Fine motor skills predict performance in the Jebsen Taylor Hand Function Test after stroke. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, 128(10), 1858-1871. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2017.07.408>
- Alwawi, D. a. A., Heldstab, A., Dean, E., & Dunn, W. (2024). Coping with sensory changes after stroke: a qualitative study. *Topics in stroke rehabilitation*, 31(3), 272-280. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10749357.2023.2240581>
- Bernard-Espina, J., Beraneck, M., Maier, M. A., & Tagliabue, M. (2021). Multisensory integration in stroke patients: A theoretical approach to reinterpret upper-limb proprioceptive deficits and visual compensation. *Frontiers in neuroscience*, 15, 646698. <https://doi.org/doi:10.3389/fnins.2021.646698>
- Blennerhassett, J. M., Matyas, T. A., & Carey, L. M. (2007). Impaired discrimination of surface friction contributes to pinch grip deficit after stroke. *Neurorehabilitation and neural repair*, 21(3), 263-272. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/1545968306295560>
- Byrne, D., Cahill, L. S., Barr, C., & George, S. (2023). Assessment of sensory impairment of the upper limb post-stroke by occupational therapists within the acute setting: A mixed methods study exploring current clinical practice. *British Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 86(12), 830-838. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03080226231184994>
- Carey, L. M., Lamp, G., & Turville, M. (2016). The state-of-the-science on somatosensory function and its impact on daily life in adults and older adults, and following stroke: a scoping review. *OTJR: occupation, participation and health*, 36(2_suppl), 27S-41S. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/1539449216643941>
- Carey, L. M., Matyas, T. A., & Baum, C. (2018). Effects of Somatosensory Impairment on Participation After Stroke. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 72(3), 7203205100p7203205101-7203205100p7203205110. <https://doi.org/10.5014/ajot.2018.025114>
- Carswell, A., McColl, M. A., Baptiste, S., Law, M., Polatajko, H., & Pollock, N. (2004). The Canadian Occupational Performance Measure: a research and clinical literature review. *Can J Occup Ther*, 71(4), 210-222. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000841740407100406>
- Chen, X., Liu, F., Yan, Z., Cheng, S., Liu, X., Li, H., & Li, Z. (2018). Therapeutic effects of sensory input training on motor function rehabilitation after stroke. *Medicine*, 97(48), e13387. <https://doi.org/10.1097/md.00000000000013387>
- Davis Sears, E., & Chung, K. C. (2010). Validity and Responsiveness of the Jebsen–Taylor Hand Function Test. *The Journal of hand surgery*, 35(1), 30-37. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhsa.2009.09.008>
- Derakhshanfar, M., Raji, P., Bagheri, H., Jalili, M., & Tarhsaz, H. (2021). Sensory interventions on motor function, activities of daily living, and spasticity of the upper limb in people with stroke: A randomized clinical trial. *J Hand Ther*, 34(4), 515-520. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jht.2020.03.028>
- Doyle, S., Bennett, S., Fasoli, S. E., & McKenna, K. T. (2010). Interventions for sensory impairment in the upper limb after stroke. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*, 2010(6), Cd006331. <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD006331.pub2>

- Doyle, S., Bennett, S., & Gustafsson, L. (2013a). Clinical decision making when addressing upper limb post-stroke sensory impairments. *British Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 76(6), 254-263. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4276/030802213X13706169932789>
- Doyle, S., Bennett, S., & Gustafsson, L. (2013b). Occupational Therapy for Upper Limb Post-Stroke Sensory Impairments: A Survey. *British Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 76(10), 434-442. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4276/030802213X13807217284143>
- Doyle, S. D., Bennett, S., & Dudgeon, B. (2014a). Upper limb post-stroke sensory impairments: the survivor's experience. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, 36(12), 993-1000. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3109/09638288.2013.825649>
- Doyle, S. D., Bennett, S., & Dudgeon, B. J. (2014b). Sensory impairment after stroke: exploring therapists' clinical decision making: examiner les prises de décisions cliniques des ergothérapeutes face aux déficits sensoriels à la suite d'un accident vasculaire cérébral. *Canadian Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 81(4), 215-225. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/0008417414540516>
- Duff, S. V., Shumway-Cook, A., & Woollacott, M. H. (2006). Clinical management of the patient with reach, grasp and manipulation disorders.
- Edwards, D. J., Dipietro, L., Demirtas-Tatlidede, A., Medeiros, A. H., Thickbroom, G. W., Mastaglia, F. L., Krebs, H. I., & Pascual-Leone, A. (2014). Movement-generated afference paired with transcranial magnetic stimulation: an associative stimulation paradigm. *Journal of neuroengineering and rehabilitation*, 11, 1-7. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1186/1743-0003-11-31>
- Eghlidi, J., Mirshoja, M.-S., Shafiei, Z., Jamebozorgi, A., & Taghizadeh, G. (2015). The Effect of Sensory-Motor Training On Recovery of Basic and Instrumental Activity of Daily Living in Chronic Stroke Patients. *The Scientific Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine*, 4(2), 79-85. <https://doi.org/10.22037/jrm.2015.1100029>
- Gavin, J. P., Kettlewell, J., Elliott, A. O., Ammour, S., & Wareham, P. (2022). Priorities for returning to work after traumatic injury: A public and professional involvement study. *British Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 85(12), 974-983, Article 03080226221107772. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03080226221107772>
- Ghrouz, A., Guillen-Sola, A., Morgado-Perez, A., Muñoz-Redondo, E., Ramírez-Fuentes, C., Curbelo Peña, Y., & Duarte, E. (2024). The effect of a motor relearning on balance and postural control in patients after stroke: An open-label randomized controlled trial. *European Stroke Journal*, 9(2), 303-311. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23969873231220218>
- Gillen, G. (2015). *Stroke rehabilitation: a function-based approach*. Elsevier Health Sciences.
- Hakverdioğlu Yönt, G., & Khorshid, L. (2012). Turkish version of the stroke-specific quality of life scale. *International nursing review*, 59(2), 274-280. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1466-7657.2011.00962.x>
- Hejazi-Shirmard, M., Taghizadeh, G., Rassafiani, M., Cheraghifard, M., Yousefi, M., Hosseini, S. H., Askary Kachosangy, R., & Lajevardi, L. (2024). Bottom-up versus Top-down designed rehabilitation sessions in chronic stroke survivors: a pilot randomized controlled trial. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09638288.2024.2384622>
- Hildebrand, M. W., Geller, D., & Proffitt, R. (2023). Occupational Therapy Practice Guidelines for Adults With Stroke. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 77(5). <https://doi.org/10.5014/ajot.2023.077501>

- Hoffmann, T., Bennett, S., Koh, C.-L., & McKenna, K. (2010). A systematic review of cognitive interventions to improve functional ability in people who have cognitive impairment following stroke. *Topics in stroke rehabilitation*, 17(2), 99-107. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1310/tsr1702-99>
- Krumlinde-Sundholm, L., Lindkvist, B., Plantin, J., & Hoare, B. (2019). Development of the assisting hand assessment for adults following stroke: a Rasch-built bimanual performance measure. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, 41(4), 472-480. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09638288.2017.1396365>
- Laclergue, Z., Ghédira, M., Gault-Colas, C., Billy, L., Gracies, J.-M., & Baude, M. (2023). Reliability of the Modified Frenchay Scale for the Assessment of Upper Limb Function in Adults with Hemiparesis. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 104(10), 1596-1605. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2023.04.003>
- Laible, M., Grieshammer, S., Seidel, G., Rijntjes, M., Weiller, C., & Hamzei, F. (2012). Association of activity changes in the primary sensory cortex with successful motor rehabilitation of the hand following stroke. *Neurorehabilitation and neural repair*, 26(7), 881-888. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/1545968312437939>
- Law, M., Polatajko, H., Pollock, N., Mccoll, M. A., Carswell, A., & Baptiste, S. (1994). Pilot testing of the Canadian Occupational Performance Measure: clinical and measurement issues. *Canadian Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 61(4), 191-197. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/000841749406100403>
- Rajsic, S., Gothe, H., Borba, H., Sroczynski, G., Vujicic, J., Toell, T., & Siebert, U. (2019). Economic burden of stroke: a systematic review on post-stroke care. *The European Journal of Health Economics*, 20, 107-134. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s10198-018-0984-0>
- Rocha, L. S. O., Gama, G. C. B., Rocha, R. S. B., de Barros Rocha, L., Dias, C. P., Santos, L. L. S., de Souza Santos, M. C., de Lima Montebelo, M. I., & Teodori, R. M. (2021). Constraint induced movement therapy increases functionality and quality of life after stroke. *Journal of Stroke and Cerebrovascular Diseases*, 30(6), 105774. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jstrokecerebrovasdis.2021.105774>
- Serrada, I., Hordacre, B., & Hillier, S. L. (2019). Does Sensory Retraining Improve Sensation and Sensorimotor Function Following Stroke: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Front Neurosci*, 13, 402. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2019.00402>
- Walker, D. M., Fletcher-Smith, J., Sprigg, N., & Pandyan, A. (2022). Designing a trial of early electrical stimulation to the stroke-affected arm: Qualitative findings on the barriers and facilitators. *British Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 85(3), 181-186, Article 03080226211008706. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03080226211008706>
- Zandvliet, S. B., Kwakkel, G., Nijland, R. H., van Wegen, E. E., & Meskers, C. G. (2020). Is recovery of somatosensory impairment conditional for upper-limb motor recovery early after stroke? *Neurorehabilitation and neural repair*, 34(5), 403-416. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/154596832090707>

Tables

Table 1. Characteristic and sensory functions of study participants (mean, SD, range, and number)

Characteristic	ST Group (n=15)	Control Group (n=15)	p-Value
Age (years) (mean±Standard deviation; range)	59.07±12.73; (29-78)	56.53±13.80; (25-75)	0.61
Gender (male/female)	8 / 7 (53.3%-46.7%)	9 / 6 (40%-60%)	0.76
Hemiplegic side (right/left)	11 / 4 (73.3%-26.7%)	8 / 7 (53.3%-46.7%)	0.65
Dominant hand (right/left)	13 / 2 (86.7%-13.3%)	13 / 2 (86.7%-13.3%)	0.59
Disease Duration (6-12 month)	3 (20%)	4 (26.6%)	0.62
Disease Duration (1-2 year)	6 (40%)	4 (26.6%)	
Disease Duration (2-6 year)	5 (33.2%)	6 (40%)	
Disease Duration (6-10 year)	1 (6.8%)	1 (6.8%)	
Disease Duration (10+ year)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	
Sensory Functions	ST Group - Before Treatment (n=15)	Control Group - Before Treatment (n=15)	
Decreased** Thumb Localization Test (n-%)	12 - 80%	12 - 80%	
Normal* Thumb Localization Test (n-%)	3 - 20.0%	3 - 20.0%	
Decreased** Finger Swipe Test (n-%)	12 - 80.0%	11 - 77.3%	
Normal* Finger Swipe Test (n-%)	3 - 20.0%	4 - 26.7%	
Decreased** Stereognosis (n-%)	9 - 60.0%	10 - 66.7%	
Normal* Stereognosis (n-%)	6 - 40.0%	5 - 33.3%	

ST: Sensory Training Group. p:Mann-Whitney U Test

*3 or 6 correct answers “reduced” in 6 repetitions: 4-6 correct answers are “normal”

**Recognizing 7-12 objects is “normal”: recognizing 7 or less objects are “decreased”

Table 2. Clinical outcome measures at before treatment (BT), and after treatment (AT) in participants

Outcome	Sensory training group		Control group		Intragroup comparison		Intergroup comparison	
	BT	AT	BT	AT	ST group (p ^a)	Control group (p ^b)	BT (p ^c)	AT (p ^d)
COPM Performance	3.2 (2.8-3.6)	5.6 (5 - 6.8)	3.8 (3.2-4)	4 (4 - 5)	<0.01	<0.01	0.18	<0.01
COPM Satisfaction	4 (3.2-4.6)	6.2 (5.6 - 7)	4 (3-5)	5 (4.2 - 6)	<0.01	<0.01	0.80	<0.01
COPM Total	7.2 (6.6 - 7.8)	12.2 (10.6 - 13)	7.6 (6.4 - 9)	9.8 (8.2 - 11)	<0.01	<0.01	0.57	<0.01
JTHFT/ Turning cards	40.14 (18.53-52.65)	28.01 (10.36-34.73)	38.87 (25.17-49.1)	37.43 (24.42-47.9)	<0.01	<0.01	0.87	0.02
JTHFT/ Moving small objects	47.5 (22.87-59.49)	34.24 (12.97-39.6)	49.53 (38.2-57.49)	48.7 (35.96-55.03)	<0.01	<0.01	0.71	<0.01
JTHFT/ Simulated feeding	40.65 (21.66-50.66)	30.12 (14.27-39.62)	40.55 (33.83-48)	38.67 (31.45-47.03)	<0.01	<0.01	0.90	0.01
JTHFT/ Stacking checkers	29.46 (20.09-48.49)	25.3 (16.56-33.46)	38.84 (25.88-53.99)	36.12 (23.56-49.8)	<0.01	<0.01	0.32	0.04
JTHFT/ Moving empty cans	29.56 (17.82-40.6)	23.18 (11.88-27.28)	36.22 (27.56-43.51)	35.74 (26.59-40.17)	<0.01	<0.01	0.25	<0.01
JTHFT/ Moving full cans	33.9 (20.07-39.72)	25.37 (12.72-32.03)	39.59 (31.9-54.12)	37.59 (28.3-50.54)	<0.01	<0.01	0.13	<0.01
MFS1/ Opening jar lid	3 (3-7)	9 (8-10)	7 (3-7)	6 (4-8)	<0.01	<0.01	0.10	<0.01
MFS2/ Drawing lines with a ruler	5 (4-6)	8 (5-9)	5 (4-6)	4 (3-7)	<0.01	0.65	0.35	<0.01
MFS3/ Big cup holding	6 (3-8)	8 (8-10)	6 (3-8)	5 (4-8)	<0.01	<0.01	0.16	0.02
MFS4/ Small cup holding	5 (2-7)	7 (6-9)	5 (2-7)	5 (3-7)	<0.01	<0.01	0.23	0.01
MFS5/ Drinking water	4 (3-5)	7 (5-9)	4 (3-5)	5 (2-7)	<0.01	0.24	0.79	0.01
MFS6/ 3 pegs install	4 (2-5)	6 (4-8)	4 (2-5)	2 (2-5)	<0.01	0.19	0.98	<0.01
MFS7/ Hair combing	4 (3-7)	5 (4-9)	3 (2-5)	4 (3-7)	<0.01	<0.01	0.08	0.02
MFS8/ Squeezing toothpaste	5 (4-7)	8 (5-9)	3 (3-5)	4 (4-6)	<0.01	<0.01	0.10	0.01
MFS9/ Using a fork and knife	4 (3-7)	7 (5-9)	3 (2-6)	5 (3-7)	<0.01	<0.01	0.51	0.02
MFS10/ Using a broom	5 (2-6)	8 (6-9)	4 (2-6)	5 (3-7)	<0.01	<0.01	0.96	0.03
SSQLS/ Energy	6 (4-7)	10 (8-14)	5 (3-8)	7 (5-10)	<0.01	0.01	0.51	0.02
SSQLS/ Family roles	5 (5-8)	8 (7-11)	5 (4-5)	7 (5-8)	<0.01	<0.01	0.14	0.02
SSQLS/ Language	15 (10-25)	20 (13-25)	15 (6-25)	19 (10-25)	<0.01	0.01	0.93	0.74
SSQLS/ Mobility	12 (9-16)	23 (19-26)	14 (9-23)	15 (11-23)	<0.01	0.08	0.22	0.02
SSQLS/ Mood	15 (10-19)	20 (18-24)	12 (10-18)	15 (13-20)	<0.01	<0.01	0.53	<0.01

SSQLS/ Personality	7 (4-12)	11 (8-15)	6 (3-12)	8 (6-13)	< 0.01	< 0.01	0.41	0.03
SSQLS/ Self-care	15 (11-17)	20 (18-24)	14 (11-17)	16 (13-17)	< 0.01	< 0.01	0.52	< 0.01
SSQLS/ Social roles	9 (7-9)	13 (12-15)	7 (5-9)	10 (8-13)	< 0.01	< 0.01	0.07	< 0.01
SSQLS/ Thinking	6 (4-9)	10 (8-15)	6 (3-13)	10 (5-14)	< 0.01	< 0.01	0.75	0.16
SSQLS/ Upper Extremity Function	12 (7-15)	19 (13-23)	11 (9-14)	14 (10-16)	< 0.01	< 0.01	0.96	0.01
SSQLS/ Seeing	11 (9-15)	13 (11-15)	15 (12-15)	15 (12-15)	0.08	0.06	0.28	0.19
SSQLS/ Work-productivity	5 (3-6)	8 (6-11)	5 (4-6)	6 (4-8)	< 0.01	0.03	0.93	0.03
SSQLS/ Total	115 (104-159)	174 (163-216)	118 (97-141)	148 (120-154)	< 0.01	< 0.01	0.77	< 0.01

Data were presented as median (p25,p75). Bold indicate values that are statistically significant. ST= Sensory Training BT= Before Treatment AT= After Treatment

COPM= Canadian Occupational Performance Measure JTHFT= The Jebsen Taylor Hand Function Test MFS= Modified Frenchay Scale SS-QOL= Stroke Specific Quality of Life Scale

p^a = value for between groups comparisons (Mann-Whitney U test)

p^b = value for between groups comparisons (Mann-Whitney U test)

p^c = value for within groups comparisons (Wilcoxon signed rank test)

p^d = value for within groups comparisons (Wilcoxon signed rank test)

Table 3. Activities in which participants have problems according to COPM

Activities		ST Group (n=15)		Control Group (n=15)	
		n	%	n	%
Self-Care Activities	Brushing teeth	3	20	4	26.6
	Shaving	4	26.6	1	6.6
	Take a shower	7	46.6	9	60
	Cut nail	4	26.6	2	13.3
	Dressing-Undressing	5	33.3	4	26.6
Productivity/ Work-Related Activities	Cooking	5	33.3	3	20
	Go to work	3	20	4	26.6
	Cleaning up	4	26.6	5	33.3
Leisure and Social Participation Activities	Take a walk	5	33.3	3	20
	Spending time with grandchildren	3	20	4	26.6
	Spending time with family	3	20	4	26.6
	Knit	2	13.3	1	6.6
	Visiting relatives/friends	3	20	4	26.6

Figure 1. Consort flow diagram of the study




Figure 2. Analysis graph of pre/post treatment differences of JTHFT parameters

