

Impact of Trunk Function and Lower Limb Paralysis on Independence in Activities of Daily Living in Patients with Stroke

1 Takato Nishida¹, Shun Sawai^{2,3}, Shoya Fujikawa^{2,3}, Ryosuke Yamamoto^{2,4}, Yusuke Shizuka^{2,3},
2 Takayuki Maru^{5,6}, Kotaro Nakagawa^{5,7}, Hideki Nakano^{2,5*}

3 ¹Department of Physical Therapy, Faculty of Rehabilitation and Care, Seijoh University, Tokai,
4 Japan

5 ²Graduate School of Health Sciences, Kyoto Tachibana University, Kyoto, Japan

6 ³Department of Rehabilitation, Kyoto Kuno Hospital, Kyoto, Japan

7 ⁴Department of Rehabilitation, Tesseikai Neurosurgical Hospital, Shijonawate, Japan

8 ⁵Department of Physical Therapy, Faculty of Health Sciences, Kyoto Tachibana University, Kyoto,
9 Japan

10 ⁶Department of Rehabilitation, Junshinkai Kobe Hospital, Kobe, Japan

11 ⁷Nagashima Neurosurgery Rehabilitation Clinic, Osaka, Japan

12 * Correspondence:

13 Hideki Nakano

14 nakano-h@tachibana-u.ac.jp

15 **Keywords: trunk function, lower limb paralysis, ADL, stroke, hierarchical regression analysis**

16 Abstract

17 Stroke is a major global health issue, and many patients experience motor paralysis and sensory
18 impairments that affect their independence in activities of daily living (ADL). Trunk and lower limb
19 functions are crucial in post-stroke ADL independence. Although these two functions are closely
20 related, few studies have evaluated them in combination, and the importance of assessment methods
21 that consider their mutual relationship has not been thoroughly examined. In this study, we aimed to
22 clarify the degree to which trunk function and lower limb paralysis impact ADL independence when
23 evaluated individually versus in combination, through a hierarchical regression analysis, and to verify
24 the significance of the combined assessment of both functions. This cross-sectional study included 51
25 patients with first-ever stroke and hemiplegia. Trunk function was assessed using the Trunk
26 Impairment Scale, lower limb paralysis was evaluated using the Brunnstrom Recovery Stage for the
27 lower extremities, and ADL independence was measured using the Functional Independence
28 Measure. Hierarchical regression analysis was conducted to examine the impact of trunk and lower
29 limb functions on ADL independence. Across two regression models, the assessment of trunk and
30 lower limb function in combination significantly improved the accuracy in reflecting ADL
31 independence compared with the assessment of each function individually. The findings suggest that
32 a combined assessment of both trunk and lower limb functions is a valuable evaluation method in the
33 rehabilitation of patients with stroke.

34

35 1 Introduction

36 Stroke, the second most common cause of death and third most common cause of disability, is a
37 leading global health issue (Du et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2024). Between 1990 and 2019, the
38 incidence and prevalence of stroke increased by 18.5% and 32%, respectively. In 2019 alone,
39 approximately 6.1 million people died from stroke worldwide, highlighting its significant health
40 burden (Zhang et al., 2024). The particularly high incidence and mortality rates of stroke in low-
41 income regions contribute to health disparities, emphasizing the need for global initiatives in stroke
42 prevention and treatment (Feigin et al., 2022).

43 Stroke causes a variety of functional impairments, such as motor paralysis, sensory deficits, and
44 speech disorders, which hinder the recovery of independence in activities of daily living (ADL) and
45 walking ability (Patel et al., 2000). Improving ADL independence is a primary goal in post-stroke
46 rehabilitation, and it requires the multidimensional assessment of functions. In particular, accurate
47 evaluation of trunk function and lower limb paralysis is crucial for developing effective treatment
48 programs (van der Putten et al., 1999; Hsieh et al., 2002; Meijer et al., 2003; Van Criel et al.,
49 2017).

50 Trunk function plays multiple roles, including assisting with support against gravity, respiratory
51 function, and postural control in response to both internal and external disturbances (Thijs et al.,
52 2023). Impairments in trunk support and postural control significantly affect the recovery of ADL
53 and walking ability in patients with stroke (Karatas et al., 2004; Van Criel et al., 2019).
54 Furthermore, acute-phase trunk function is strongly associated with independence in ADL 6 months
55 after stroke onset, and the evaluation of trunk function can predict post-discharge balance and
56 mobility abilities (Wang et al., 2005; Verheyden et al., 2006).

57 Similarly, lower limb function plays a critical role in ADL independence. Lower limb paralysis,
58 weight-bearing on the non-paralyzed side, and lower limb muscle strength have been associated with
59 walking ability and ADL independence in patients with stroke (Pradon et al., 2013; Matsuyama,
60 2018). This is particularly evident in ADL tasks that require anti-gravity activities, such as walking
61 and maintaining a standing posture. Additionally, improvements in upper and lower limb paralysis
62 have been linked to enhanced ADL independence (Kwakkel et al., 2002; Liu and Liu, 2022). A
63 decline in lower limb function, including motor paralysis, poses a serious challenge to walking and
64 ADL independence in patients with stroke. As such, the evaluation of lower limb function to
65 facilitate ADL recovery is warranted. Both trunk and lower limb functions have been individually
66 associated with ADL independence, and in ADL tasks that require significant standing activity,
67 coordinated movements between the trunk and lower limbs are crucial (Sullivan et al., 2002).
68 Patients with stroke, who often experience motor impairments on one side of the body, may rely
69 more heavily on the interrelationship between trunk and lower limb functions than do healthy
70 individuals.

71 However, most previous studies have evaluated trunk and lower limb functions separately, and
72 comprehensive assessment methods that consider their interrelationship have been insufficiently
73 investigated (Sullivan et al., 2002). Additionally, some studies focusing on the impact of trunk
74 function on ADL independence did not include ADL tasks involving mobility, thereby limiting the
75 practicality of the evaluations (Hsieh et al., 2002). To verify the importance of comprehensive
76 assessment methods that account for the interaction between trunk and lower limb functions in stroke
77 rehabilitation, the incremental addition of functional evaluation items is necessary, as well as the use
78 of practical ADL measures to assess the impact on ADL independence.

79 Therefore, in this study, we aimed to clarify the extent to which trunk function and lower limb
80 paralysis affect ADL independence, both when evaluated individually and in combination, through
81 stepwise analysis. We also sought to verify the importance of a combined assessment method that
82 integrates both functions.

83 **2 Methods**

84 **2.1 Participants**

85 This cross-sectional study included patients with first-time stroke and hemiplegia who were admitted
86 to Aichi-Pref Saiseikai Rehabilitation Hospital between July 2017 and October 2018.

87 The exclusion criteria were subarachnoid hemorrhage, infratentorial lesions, the inability to
88 comprehend verbal instructions, and lack of consent to participate in the study.

89 **2.2 Ethics Declarations**

90 This study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and informed consent was
91 obtained from all participants. This study was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of Seijoh
92 University (Approval number: 2016C0035; Approval date: July 12, 2017) and the Aichi-Pref
93 Saiseikai Rehabilitation Hospital (Approval number: 201705; Approval date: March 24, 2017). This
94 study was registered in the UMIN Clinical Trials Registry (UMIN000056341).

95 **2.3 Measures**

96 We collected data on age, sex, stroke type, paralyzed side, and days since stroke onset from medical
97 records as basic information, and administered the Brunnstrom Recovery Stage for the lower
98 extremities (BRS-LE) to assess motor paralysis, Trunk Impairment Scale (TIS) to assess trunk
99 function, and Functional Independence Measure (FIM) to assess ADL independence. The BRS-LE
100 and TIS were administered on the same day by the principal investigator. FIM scores were collected
101 from assessments conducted by the responsible physical therapists, occupational therapists, and
102 nurses during the same period.

103 **2.3.1 Brunnstrom Recover Stage for the lower extremities**

104 The BRS-LE, proposed by Brunnstrom, evaluates motor paralysis as a qualitative phenomenon based
105 on changes in movement patterns (Brunnstrom, 1966). It comprises assessments of the upper limbs,
106 fingers, and lower limbs, with the degree of separation of associated and synergistic movements rated
107 from Stage I to VI, where VI indicates the mildest form of motor paralysis. This tool was selected
108 owing to its frequent use in Japan as well as its utility as a common language in research, as it serves
109 as the basis for developing scales such as the Fugl–Meyer Assessment and Chedoke–McMaster
110 Stroke Assessment (Fugl-Meyer et al., 1975; Gowland et al., 1993).

111 **2.3.2 Trunk Impairment Scale**

112 The TIS, developed by Verheyden et al., is a clinical assessment tool designed to evaluate motor
113 dysfunction in the trunk (Verheyden et al., 2004). It comprises 17 items (scored out of 23 points)
114 covering static sitting balance, dynamic sitting balance, and coordination. Higher scores indicate
115 better trunk motor function. We adopted the TIS as the trunk function evaluation in this study owing
116 to its reported reliability and validity (Verheyden et al., 2004).

117 **2.3.3 Functional Independence Measure**

118 The FIM measures practical ADL independence (Granger et al., 1993). It comprises 13 motor items
119 and 5 cognitive items, with each item rated on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (total assistance) to 7
120 (independence). The FIM is widely used in Japan's recovery rehabilitation wards, where it is also
121 employed in calculating medical fees. Herein, we used the total score for the motor items in the
122 analysis.

123 **2.4 Statistical Analysis**

124 The Shapiro–Wilk test was used to confirm the normality of the data. We used hierarchical
125 regression analysis to analyze the impact of motor paralysis and trunk function on ADL
126 independence and the forced-entry method to examine variables that explained ADL independence.
127 The dependent variable was the FIM score, and the independent variables were age, days since stroke
128 onset, BRS-LE stage, and TIS score. In Step 1, age, days since stroke onset, and TIS score were
129 entered, followed by BRS-LE stage in Step 2. To consider the possible influence of variable order, an
130 alternate analysis was performed by entering age, days since stroke onset, and BRS-LE stage in Step
131 1, followed by TIS score in Step 2. All statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS Statistics,
132 Version 29 (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY, United States), with the significance level set at 5%.

133 **3 Results**

134 **3.1 Participant Characteristics**

135 The analysis included the data of 51 participants. Table 1 shows the characteristics of the
136 participants.

137 **3.2 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis using the TIS score**

138 Table 2 shows the results of the hierarchical regression analysis using the TIS score as an
139 independent variable and the total motor score of the FIM as the dependent variable. The variance
140 inflation factor for all the variables was < 10.0 , indicating no multicollinearity. In Step 1, age, days
141 since stroke onset, and TIS score were entered into the model. The adjusted R^2 of this model was
142 0.71, indicating that these variables had a certain explanatory power for the total motor score of the
143 FIM. The unstandardized regression coefficient for each variable was as follows: age, $\beta = -0.45$ ($p <$
144 0.01); days since stroke onset, $\beta = -0.05$ ($p = 0.51$); and TIS score, $\beta = 2.80$ ($p < 0.01$). Age and the
145 TIS score were the variables that significantly influenced the regression model. Subsequently, in Step
146 2, the model was tested by adding BRS-LE stage. The adjusted R^2 of the Step 2 model was 0.75,
147 similar to that of the Step 1 model, indicating a certain explanatory power for the total motor score of
148 the FIM. Moreover, adding the BRS-LE stage significantly increased the change in F-value from the
149 Step 1 model, indicating that the BRS-LE stage contributed to improving the model ($\Delta F = 8.81$, $p <$
150 0.01).

151 **3.3 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis using the BRS-LE stage**

152 Table 3 shows the results of the hierarchical regression analysis using the BRS-LE stage as an
153 independent variable and the total motor score of the FIM as the dependent variable. The variance
154 inflation factor for all the variables was < 10.0 , indicating no multicollinearity. In Step 1, age, days
155 since stroke onset, and BRS-LE stage were entered into the model. The adjusted R^2 of this model was
156 0.74, indicating that these variables had a certain explanatory power for the total motor score of the
157 FIM. The unstandardized regression coefficient for each variable was as follows: age, $\beta = -0.36$ ($p =$

158 0.03); days since stroke onset, $\beta = -0.02$ ($p = 0.77$); and BRS-LE stage, $\beta = 13.37$ ($p < 0.01$). Age and
159 the BRS-LE stage were the variables that significantly influenced the regression model.
160 Subsequently, in Step 2, the model was tested by adding the TIS score. The adjusted R^2 of the Step 2
161 model was 0.75, similar to that of the Step 1 model, indicating a certain explanatory power for the
162 total motor score of the FIM. Furthermore, adding the TIS score significantly increased the change in
163 F-value from the Step 1 model, indicating that the TIS score contributed to improving the model (ΔF
164 = 4.55, $p = 0.04$). The results of both hierarchical multiple regression analyses revealed that the
165 combined evaluation of trunk and lower limb functions better reflected ADL independence than did
166 individual evaluations.

167 4 Discussion

168 In this study, we analyzed the effects of trunk function and lower limb motor paralysis on ADL
169 independence in a stepwise manner, clarifying the extent of their impact on ADL when assessed
170 individually and in combination. The importance of evaluating both functions in combination was
171 also verified. We found that the accuracy in reflecting ADL independence was improved when trunk
172 function and lower limb motor paralysis were evaluated together rather than individually. This result
173 suggests that it is important to evaluate trunk and lower limb functions in combination for
174 rehabilitation of patients with stroke.

175 The study revealed an increase in the change in F-value when both functions were added to the
176 regression model versus when either trunk function or lower limb motor paralysis was used
177 individually; thus, the combination of functions improved the explanatory power of the model. This
178 may be because the ADL of patients with stroke involve a variety of movements performed in sitting
179 and standing positions. The FIM includes items such as toileting, transfers, mobility, and stair
180 climbing, all of which require balance and mobility in a standing position (Granger et al., 1993).
181 While trunk function is crucial for sitting balance, lower limb function—particularly the strength of
182 the muscles around the hip joint—is important for standing balance and walking (Kirker et al., 2000;
183 Cabanas-Valdés et al., 2013). Therefore, practical ADL requires both trunk and lower limb functions.
184 This suggests that combining the evaluation of trunk function and lower limb motor paralysis better
185 explains ADL independence than do individual evaluations.

186 Furthermore, both the lateral and medial motor systems play essential roles in the acquisition of ADL
187 movements after stroke (Ishiwatari et al., 2021). The lateral motor system mainly controls the distal
188 muscles of the limbs via the corticospinal tract, while the medial motor system controls the trunk and
189 proximal muscles of the limbs via the corticoreticulospinal and corticorubral tracts. These neural
190 pathways are closely situated, rendering them highly susceptible to simultaneous damage during
191 stroke (Jang and Lee, 2019). From the perspective of the neural fibers involved, this suggests the
192 need to comprehensively evaluate both trunk and lower limb functions.

193 The relationship between trunk and lower limb functions has been reported in previous studies.
194 Verheyden et al. have shown that trunk stability is a prerequisite for the movement of the head and
195 limbs and that these functions are related to ADL (Verheyden et al., 2007). Hsieh et al. have also
196 investigated the impact of walking ability after stroke on ADL, reporting that the recovery of lower
197 limb function is directly linked to improvements in ADL independence (Hsieh et al., 2002). Based on
198 the results of the present study, it was found that in post-stroke rehabilitation, a combined evaluation
199 of both trunk and lower limb function better reflected ADL independence than did evaluating these
200 functions individually. Therefore, to assess the effectiveness of rehabilitation and understand the

201 physical condition, it may be useful to comprehensively evaluate the relationship between trunk
202 function and lower limb motor paralysis.

203 The novelty of this study lies in the fact that it addresses the insufficient consideration of the
204 interaction between trunk and lower limb functions in previous research. It also complements
205 previous studies that have focused solely on trunk function by means of a detailed analysis with
206 practical ADL evaluations (Hsieh et al., 2002; Sullivan et al., 2002). Herein, hierarchical multiple
207 regression analysis was performed using the FIM—which measures practical ADL independence—as
208 the dependent variable, with trunk function and lower limb motor paralysis as independent variables,
209 providing new insights into the influence of these functions on ADL independence.

210 The limitations of this study include its relatively small sample size; hence, caution should be
211 exercised when generalizing the results. A larger sample size would enable the construction of more
212 accurate models and improve the reproducibility of the results. Additionally, the cross-sectional
213 design precluded the evaluation of long-term rehabilitation outcomes. Longitudinal follow-up is
214 required to clarify how the effects of rehabilitation change over time. Moreover, the selection of
215 clinical assessment tools used in this study was limited—to more comprehensively evaluate ADL
216 independence, it may be necessary to assess not only motor paralysis but also strength, sensory
217 function, and coordination.

218 In conclusion, we investigated the impact of evaluating trunk function and lower limb motor
219 paralysis individually and in combination on explaining ADL independence in patients with stroke.
220 The combined evaluation method, which assesses both trunk function and lower limb motor
221 paralysis, more accurately reflected ADL independence, suggesting its usefulness as an assessment
222 method. Future studies should include larger sample sizes, incorporate a longitudinal design, and
223 adopt more multifaceted evaluation methods to examine the effects of trunk and lower limb functions
224 on ADL from multiple perspectives and address the limitations of our study.

225 **5 Conflict of Interest**

226 The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial
227 relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

228 **6 Author Contributions**

229 Conceptualization, T.N., and H.N.; Methodology, T.N., and H.N.; Formal Analysis, T.N., and S.S.;
230 Investigation, T.N.; Resources, T.N., and H.N.; Data Curation, T.N.; Writing—Original Draft
231 Preparation, T.N.; Writing—Review and Editing, T.N., S.S., S.F., R.Y., Y.S., T.M., K.N., and H.N.;
232 Visualization, T.N.; Supervision, H.N.; Project Administration, T.N., and H.N.; Funding Acquisition,
233 T.M., K.N., and H.N. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

234 **7 Funding**

235 This research was funded by JSPS KAKENHI grant number JP23K10417 for H.N., JSPS KAKENHI
236 grant number JP23K19907 for K.N., and JSPS KAKENHI grant number JP24K23764 for T.M.

237 **8 Acknowledgments**

238 We would like to thank the patients who participated in this study.

239 9 Data Availability Statement

240 The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding
241 author, HN, upon reasonable request. The data are not publicly available due to their containing
242 information that could compromise the privacy of research participants.

243 10 Reference

- 244 Brunnstrom, S. (1966). Motor testing procedures in hemiplegia: based on sequential recovery stages.
245 *Phys. Ther.* 46, 357–375.
- 246 Cabanas-Valdés, R., Cuchi, G. U., and Bagur-Calafat, C. (2013). Trunk training exercises approaches
247 for improving trunk performance and functional sitting balance in patients with stroke: a
248 systematic review. *NeuroRehabilitation* 33, 575–592.
- 249 Du, M., Mi, D., Liu, M., and Liu, J. (2023). Global trends and regional differences in disease burden
250 of stroke among children: a trend analysis based on the global burden of disease study 2019.
251 *BMC Public Health* 23, 2120.
- 252 Feigin, V. L., Brainin, M., Norrving, B., Martins, S., Sacco, R. L., Hacke, W., et al. (2022). World
253 stroke organization (WSO): Global Stroke Fact Sheet 2022. *Int. J. Stroke* 17, 18–29.
- 254 Fugl-Meyer, A. R., Jääskö, L., Leyman, I., Olsson, S., and Steglind, S. (1975). The post-stroke
255 hemiplegic patient. 1. a method for evaluation of physical performance. *Scand. J. Rehabil.*
256 *Med.* 7, 13–31.
- 257 Gowland, C., Stratford, P., Ward, M., Moreland, J., Torresin, W., Van Hullenaar, S., et al. (1993).
258 Measuring physical impairment and disability with the Chedoke-McMaster Stroke
259 Assessment. *Stroke* 24, 58–63.
- 260 Granger, C. V., Hamilton, B. B., Linacre, J. M., Heinemann, A. W., and Wright, B. D. (1993).
261 Performance profiles of the functional independence measure. *Am. J. Phys. Med. Rehabil.* 72,
262 84–89.
- 263 Hsieh, C.-L., Sheu, C.-F., Hsueh, I.-P., and Wang, C.-H. (2002). Trunk control as an early predictor
264 of comprehensive activities of daily living function in stroke patients. *Stroke* 33, 2626–2630.
- 265 Ishiwatari, M., Honaga, K., Tanuma, A., Takakura, T., Hatori, K., Kurosu, A., et al. (2021). Trunk
266 impairment as a predictor of activities of daily living in acute stroke. *Front. Neurol.* 12,
267 665592.
- 268 Jang, S. H., and Lee, S. J. (2019). Corticoreticular tract in the human brain: A mini review. *Front.*
269 *Neurol.* 10, 1188.
- 270 Karatas, M., Cetin, N., Bayramoglu, M., and Dilek, A. (2004). Trunk muscle strength in relation to
271 balance and functional disability in inihemispheric stroke patients. *Am. J. Phys. Med.*
272 *Rehabil.* 83, 81–87.
- 273 Kirker, S. G., Jenner, J. R., Simpson, D. S., and Wing, A. M. (2000). Changing patterns of postural
274 hip muscle activity during recovery from stroke. *Clin. Rehabil.* 14, 618–626.

- 275 Kwakkel, G., Kollen, B. J., and Wagenaar, R. C. (2002). Long term effects of intensity of upper and
276 lower limb training after stroke: a randomised trial. *J. Neurol. Neurosurg. Psychiatry* 72,
277 473–479.
- 278 Liu, R., and Liu, J. (2022). Prognostic factors of functional outcome in post-acute stroke in the
279 rehabilitation unit. *J. Formos. Med. Assoc.* 121, 568–569.
- 280 Matsuyama, A. (2018). Factors associated with the walking ability of hemiplegic stroke patients.
281 *Open J. Nurs.* 08, 14–25.
- 282 Meijer, R., Ihnenfeldt, D. S., de Groot, I. J. M., van Limbeek, J., Vermeulen, M., and de Haan, R. J.
283 (2003). Prognostic factors for ambulation and activities of daily living in the subacute phase
284 after stroke. A systematic review of the literature. *Clin. Rehabil.* 17, 119–129.
- 285 Patel, A. T., Duncan, P. W., Lai, S. M., and Studenski, S. (2000). The relation between impairments
286 and functional outcomes poststroke. *Arch. Phys. Med. Rehabil.* 81, 1357–1363.
- 287 Pradon, D., Roche, N., Enette, L., and Zory, R. (2013). Relationship between lower limb muscle
288 strength and 6-minute walk test performance in stroke patients. *J. Rehabil. Med.* 45, 105–108.
- 289 Sullivan, K. J., Knowlton, B. J., and Dobkin, B. H. (2002). Step training with body weight support:
290 effect of treadmill speed and practice paradigms on poststroke locomotor recovery. *Arch.*
291 *Phys. Med. Rehabil.* 83, 683–691.
- 292 Thijs, L., Voets, E., Denissen, S., Mehrholz, J., Elsner, B., Lemmens, R., et al. (2023). Trunk training
293 following stroke. *Cochrane Database Syst. Rev.* 3, CD013712.
- 294 Van Criekinge, T., Saeys, W., Halleman, A., Vereeck, L., De Hertogh, W., Van de Walle, P., et al.
295 (2017). Effectiveness of additional trunk exercises on gait performance: study protocol for a
296 randomized controlled trial. *Trials* 18, 249.
- 297 Van Criekinge, T., Truijten, S., Schröder, J., Maebe, Z., Blanckaert, K., van der Waal, C., et al.
298 (2019). The effectiveness of trunk training on trunk control, sitting and standing balance and
299 mobility post-stroke: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin. Rehabil.* 33, 992–1002.
- 300 van der Putten, J. J., Hobart, J. C., Freeman, J. A., and Thompson, A. J. (1999). Measuring change in
301 disability after inpatient rehabilitation: comparison of the responsiveness of the Barthel index
302 and the Functional Independence Measure. *J. Neurol. Neurosurg. Psychiatry* 66, 480–484.
- 303 Verheyden, G., Nieuwboer, A., De Wit, L., Feys, H., Schuback, B., Baert, I., et al. (2007). Trunk
304 performance after stroke: an eye catching predictor of functional outcome. *J. Neurol.*
305 *Neurosurg. Psychiatry* 78, 694–698.
- 306 Verheyden, G., Nieuwboer, A., Mertin, J., Preger, R., Kiekens, C., and De Weerd, W. (2004). The
307 Trunk Impairment Scale: a new tool to measure motor impairment of the trunk after stroke.
308 *Clin. Rehabil.* 18, 326–334.
- 309 Verheyden, G., Vereeck, L., Truijten, S., Troch, M., Herregodts, I., Lafosse, C., et al. (2006). Trunk
310 performance after stroke and the relationship with balance, gait and functional ability. *Clin.*
311 *Rehabil.* 20, 451–458.

312 Wang, C.-H., Hsueh, I.-P., Sheu, C.-F., and Hsieh, C.-L. (2005). Discriminative, predictive, and
313 evaluative properties of a trunk control measure in patients with stroke. *Phys. Ther.* 85, 887–
314 894.

315 Zhang, X., Ye, W.-Q., Xin, X.-K., Gao, Y.-J., and Yang, F. (2024). Global, regional, and national
316 burden of stroke attributable to diet high in sodium from 1990 to 2019: a systematic analysis
317 from the global burden of disease study 2019. *Front. Neurol.* 15, 1437633.

318

319 **11 Tables**

320 Table 1. Participant characteristics

Characteristics	N = 51
Age (years)	71.5 ± 13.3
Sex (male/female)	29/22
Stroke type (ischemic/hemorrhagic)	29/22
Hemiplegic side (left/right)	27/24
Days since stroke onset (days)	40 (28–57)
BRS-LE stage (I/II/III/IV/V/VI)	4/8/2/9/6/22
TIS score	17 (7–20)
FIM motor score	54 (21–77)

321 Data are shown as mean ± standard deviation or median (interquartile range), as appropriate. BRS-
322 LE: Brunnstrom Recovery Stage for the lower extremities; TIS: Trunk Impairment Scale; FIM:
323 Functional Independence Measure

324

325 Table 2. Hierarchical multiple regression analysis using TIS score

Step and variables	β	SE	95% CI	p	Adjusted R ²	ΔF
Step 1	-	-	-	-	0.71	42.45
Age	-0.45	0.16	-0.77, -0.12	<0.01	-	-
Days since stroke onset	-0.05	0.07	-0.19, 0.10	0.51	-	-
TIS score	2.80	0.27	2.26, 3.34	<0.01	-	-
Step 2	-	-	-	-	0.75	8.81*
Age	-0.39	0.15	-0.69, -0.08	0.01	-	-
Days since stroke onset	-0.02	0.07	-0.16, 0.11	0.73	-	-
TIS score	1.24	0.58	0.07, 2.41	0.04	-	-
BRS-LE stage	8.11	2.73	2.61, 13.61	<0.01	-	-

326 *p < 0.01. β : unstandardized coefficient; SE: standard error; CI: confidence interval; Adjusted R²:
 327 adjusted coefficient of determination; ΔF : change in F-value from one model to another

328

329 Table 3. Hierarchical multiple regression analysis with inputs from BRS-LE

Step and variables	β	SE	95%CI	p	Adjusted R ²	ΔF
Step 1	-	-	-	-	0.74	47.36
Age	-0.36	0.16	-0.67, -0.04	0.03	-	-
Days since stroke onset	-0.02	0.07	-0.16, 0.12	0.77	-	-
BRS-LE stage	13.37	1.21	10.93, 15.81	<0.01	-	-
Step 2	-	-	-	-	0.75	4.55*
Age	-0.39	0.15	-0.69, -0.08	0.01	-	-
Days since stroke onset	-0.02	0.07	-0.16, 0.11	0.73	-	-
BRS-LE stage	8.11	0.50	2.61, 13.61	<0.01	-	-
TIS score	1.24	0.36	0.07, 2.41	0.04	-	-

330 *p < 0.01