medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Effects of Equine-Assisted Therapy on Recovery after Stroke – A Systematic Review

Bettina Hanna Trunk*, Alireza Gharabaghi*

Institute for Neuromodulation and Neurotechnology, University Hospital and University of Tübingen, Tuebingen, Germany

*Correspondence

Institute for Neuromodulation and Neurotechnology, University Hospital and University of Tuebingen, Otfried-Mueller-Str.45, 72076 Tuebingen, Germany.
Telephone: +49 7071 29-85197. Email addresses: bettina.trunk@uni-tuebingen.de, 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NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Abstract

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

Objective The goal of this systematic review is to gain a better understanding of the 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 studies were included in this systematic review (437 patients, mean age range: 40 – 70 years). Since several of these studies lacked important methodological information, the overall methodological quality varied. Thirteen studies reported physical findings (balance, gait, postural coordination, activities of daily living, lower extremity motor impairment, motor function and hand strength), and seven studies reported further health-related outcomes (cognition, quality of life, depression and perception of the intervention, muscle thickness and trunk muscle activity). The findings suggest positive effects of EAT on stroke recovery in different health-related outcomes, whereas the most consistent beneficial effects were reported for balance and gait.

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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

Key words (max. 6)

Equine-Assisted Therapy, Hippotherapy, Therapeutic Horse Riding, Stroke, Recovery, Multimodal Intervention

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Introduction

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

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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

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

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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).

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

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 cross-checked 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.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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. Full-text copies of the relevant studies were then downloaded and screened for eligibility.

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.

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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).

Quality assessment

The quality of the included studies was assessed using the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) version 2018. (Hong *et al.*, 2018) This tool was designed for evaluating the quality of studies that used mixed methods (randomized controlled trials, non-randomized trials, quantitative descriptive studies, and mixed methods studies) to be 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 a “N” or a “U” in the event of missing information. No studies were excluded based on their methodological quality.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Results

Study selection

Our systematic literature yielded 3107 articles. Then, 1077 duplicates were removed. After screening, 1996 articles were excluded, and 33 articles were retrieved and checked for eligibility. 17 articles met the inclusion criteria. As four reports reported outcomes from the same study (Bunketorp-Käll *et al.*, 2017*b*, 2019, 2020), we included 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.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
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.*

*[1]Findings from data of one study. [2]Study 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 Liljenäs 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-Meyer 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 = Non-randomized 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 10-meter walk test, 6 MWT = The six-minute walk test*

Study, Location and Study Design	Patient population	Intervention		Outcome domain	Assessed Function	Outcome Measure	ES (95% CI) - within	ES (95% CI) - between
	Age *Time since stroke*	*N* *Experimental Dose*	*N* *Control Dose*					
RCT, Horse								
Beinotti *et al.*, 2013 Brazil	59 years (EG) and 52 years (CG) >1 year post 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 *et al.*, 2017 [1] Sweden	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 Physical Physical Other Other Other	Balance Balance Gait Hand Strength RH Hand Strength RH Hand Strength RH Hand Strength LH Hand Strength LH Hand Strength LH Perception of Recovery Cognitive Level Working Memory	BBS BDL-BS TUGT Grippit max Grippit mean Grippit final Grippit max 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) 0.17 (-0.26 – 0.61)	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 (-0.30 – 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) 0.11 (-0.32 – 0.54)
Bunketorp-Kall *et al.*, 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 Study Design	Patient population	Intervention		Outcome domain	Assessed Function	Outcome Measure	ES (95% CI) - within	ES (95% CI) - between
Bunketorp-Käll *et al.*, 2020 [1]				Other	Association perceived recovery and actual recovery (Correlation: changes of clinical scales and SIS-9)	M-MAS UAS BBS TUGT 10 mWT (self-selected) 10 mWT (fast)	*Spearman-correlation* r = 0.13, p = .40 r = 0.25, p = .12 r = -0.04, p = .81 r = -0.41, p = .001 r = -0.38, p = .02	N/A
Lee *et al.*, 2014 Korea	63.8±6.2 (EG) and 64.3±4.8 (CG) Not specified	N=15 Horse riding training 3 days/week, 8 weeks, 30min/session	N=15 Treadmill Training 3 days/week, 8 weeks, 30min/session	Physical Physical Physical	Balance Gait (Gait Analyzer) Gait (Gait Analyzer)	BBS Gait velocity Step length asymmetry	0.92 (0.17 - 1.67)* 2.06 (1.17 - 2.94)* 2.60 (1.63 - 3.57)*	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 (CG) Not specified	N=15 CNDS + horse riding training 3 times/week, 8 weeks, 30min CNSD therapy + 30min horse riding training	N=15 CNDS + trunk exercises with Swiss balls 3 times/week, 8 weeks, 30min CNSD therapy + 30min trunk exercises	Physical Physical Other Other Other Other Other	Balance (BioRescue System) Balance (BioRescue System) Muscle Thickness Muscle Thickness Muscle Thickness Muscle Thickness Muscle Thickness Muscle Thickness	CoP - Path Length [cm] CoP - Travel Speed [mm/sec] TrA - A TrA - NA IO - A IO - NA EO muscle - A EO muscle - NA	0.78 (0.04 - 1.53)* 0.39 (-0.33 - 1.11)* 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)* 0.00 (-0.72 - 0.72)	0.68 (-0.06 - 1.41)* 0.39 (-0.33 - 1.11)* N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A
Baillet *et al.*, 2019 France	51.1±13.0 years (EG) 39.9±18.6 years (CG)	N=10 Horse riding therapy 2 times/week for 12 weeks, 30min/session	N=8 Conventional therapy 2 times/week for 12 weeks, 30min/session	Physical Physical Physical Physical	Trunk/horse coordination - 30% Trunk/horse coordination - 40% Trunk/horse coordination - 50%	Relative Phase Relative Phase Relative Phase Relative Phase	3.74 (2.29 - 5.20)* 1.52 (0.52 - 2.51)* 1.04 (0.10 - 1.97) 1.53 (0.53 - 2.52)	2.31 (1.11 - 3.51)* 0.80 (-0.16 - 1.77)* 0.14 (-0.79 - 1.07) 1.67 (0.59 - 2.75)

Study, Location and Study Design	Patient population	Intervention		Outcome domain	Assessed Function	Outcome Measure	ES (95% CI) - within	ES (95% CI) - between
	>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 *et al.*, 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) 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 Study Design	Patient population	Intervention		Outcome domain	Assessed Function	Outcome Measure	ES (95% CI) - within	ES (95% CI) - between
				Physical Other Other	Gait (OptoGait System) Gait (OptoGait System) Trunk Muscle Activity Trunk Muscle Activity	Cadence [step/sec] EMG - Erector Spinae [µV] EMG - Rectus Abdominis [µV]	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)*
NRT, Horse								
Beinotti *et al.*, 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 *et al.*, 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 N/A
NRT, Simulator								
Han *et al.*, 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 Study Design	Patient population	Intervention		Outcome domain	Assessed Function	Outcome Measure	ES (95% CI) - within	ES (95% CI) - between
		2 times/week, 12 weeks, 20min/session horse-riding						
Kim *et al.*, 2014 Korea	63.9 ± 8.7 years ≥6 months post stroke	N=20 Horse riding training 5 times/week, 6 weeks, 30min/session	No CG	Physical Physical Physical Physical Physical Physical Physical Physical Physical Physical Physical Physical Physical Physical Physical	Trunk Impairment Balance (BioRescue System) Balance (BioRescue System) Balance (BioRescue System) Balance (BioRescue System) Balance (BioRescue System) Balance (BioRescue System) Gait Gait (Gaitrite) Gait (Gaitrite) Gait (Gaitrite) Gait (Gaitrite) Gait (Gaitrite) Gait (Gaitrite) Gait (Gaitrite)	TIS EO - Sway area [cm] EO - Sway length [mm2] EO - Sway speed [cm/s] EC - Sway area [cm] EC - Sway length [mm2] EC - Sway speed [cm/s] FGA Velocity [cm/s] Cadence [steps/min] Stride – A [cm] Stride – NA [cm] Double Support – A [%] Double Support – NA [%]	1.43 (0.73 - 2.12)* 0.35 (-0.27 - 0.98)* 0.67 (0.04 - 1.31)* 0.46 (-0.16 - 1.09)* 0.50 (-0.13 - 1.12)* 1.13 (0.46 - 1.79)* 1.13 (0.46 - 1.79)* 1.62 (0.90 – 2.33)* 0.59 (-0.04 – 1.22)* 0.33 (-0.30 – 0.95)* 0.35 (-0.28 – 0.97)* 0.29 (-0.34 – 0.91)* 0.59 (-0.05 – 1.22)* 0.31 (-0.32 – 0.93)*	N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A
Lee and Kim, 2015 Korea	68.4±2.1 (EG) and 67.0±3.2 (CG)	N=15 Conventional therapy + horse-riding	N=15 Conventional therapy	Physical Physical Other	Balance Gait Depression	BBS TUGT BDI	2.23 (1.32 - 3.14)* 1.84 (0.98 - 2.69)* 1.58 (0.76 - 2.40)*	1.66 (0.83 - 2.49)* 1.85 (1.00 - 2.71)* 1.25 (0.47 - 2.04)*

Study, Location and Study Design	Patient population	Intervention		Outcome domain	Assessed Function	Outcome Measure	ES (95% CI) - within	ES (95% CI) - between
	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 *et al.*, 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, Horse								
Pohl *et al.*, 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 *et al.*, 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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Subject characteristics

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 two studies (Baek and Kim, 2014, Lee *et al.*, 2014*a*), the stroke stage was specified. In one study, the minimum time since stroke was not reported, but the patients had suffered a stroke on average about one year earlier. (Sung *et al.*, 2013) All other studies included patients at the chronic stage of stroke (i.e., > 6 months post stroke). In two studies (Sunwoo *et al.*, 2012; Baillet *et al.*, 2019), the majority of patients were stroke patients, although, a small number of traumatic brain injury and cerebral palsy patients were also included. All other studies involved stroke patients only.

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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

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

**Findings from data of same study.*

Study	**MMAT assessment**																
	Screening		*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
(Baek and Kim, 2014)	Y	Y						U	Y	Y	N	U					
(Baillet *et al.*, 2019)	Y	Y						Y	Y	Y	N	U					
(Beinotti *et al.*, 2010)	Y	Y											Y	Y	U	Y	U
(Beinotti *et al.*, 2013)	Y	Y						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y					

Study	**MMAT assessment**																
	Screening		*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.*, 2017*b*)*	Y	Y															
(Bunketorp-Käll *et al.*, 2019)*	Y	Y						Y	Y	Y	Y	U					
(Bunketorp-Käll *et al.*, 2020)*	Y	Y															
(Cho and Cho, 2015)	Y	Y						U	Y	Y	U	U					
(Han *et al.*, 2012)	Y	Y											Y	Y	U	N	U
(Kim *et al.*, 2014*b*)	Y	Y											Y	Y	Y	Y	U
(Kim and Lee, 2015)	Y	Y						U	Y	U	U	U					
(Lee *et al.*, 2014*a*)	Y	Y						U	Y	U	U	U					
(Lee and Kim, 2015)	Y	Y											Y	N	U	N	U
(Park *et al.*, 2013)	Y	Y											Y	Y	U	Y	U
(Pohl *et al.*, 2018)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y										
(Sung *et al.*, 2013)	Y	Y						U	Y	U	U	U					
(Sunwoo *et al.*, 2012)	Y	Y											Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Intervention

Different forms of intervention and terminology were used. Four studies referred to their intervention as *hippotherapy* (Beinotti *et al.*, 2010; Sunwoo *et al.*, 2012, Lee *et al.*, 2014*b*) or *hippotherapy simulator* (Sung *et al.*, 2013); four studies used *horse-riding therapy* (Bunketorp-Käll *et al.*, 2017*b*, 2019, 2020) or *horse-riding exercise* (Kim and Lee, 2015); two studies used *horseback riding* (Pohl *et al.*, 2018) or *horseback riding therapy* (Beinotti *et al.*, 2013); two studies used *horse riding simulation training* (Baek and Kim, 2014, Kim *et al.*, 2014*a*); one study used *horseback riding simulator exercise* (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 al.*, 2012; Cho and Cho, 2015; Lee and Kim, 2015). The exact protocol was not, or only briefly described in most studies. In general, some studies included exercises during riding while other studies did not.

A short summary of the parameters of EG and CG applied in each study can be found in Tab. 1. While eight studies applied EAT in addition to conventional therapy (Beinotti *et al.*, 2010; Han *et al.*, 2012; Beinotti *et al.*, 2013; Park *et al.*, 2013; Sung *et al.*, 2013; Baek and Kim, 2014; Cho and Cho, 2015; Lee and Kim, 2015), the others applied EAT only. (Sunwoo *et al.*, 2012, Kim *et al.*, 2014*a*, Lee *et al.*, 2014*a*; Kim and Lee, 2015, Bunketorp-Käll *et al.*, 2017*b*; 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, Mean ± SD). EAT was applied within four to 16 weeks, in 16 to 30 total sessions.

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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

Outcome measures

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 (BDL-BS) 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).

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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]

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.

Depression was assessed in two studies by Becks Depression Inventory (BDI) and/or Hamilton Depression Rating Scale (HAM).[45,51] Another study assessed different domains of the patients' perception of EAT. Specifically, a qualitative assessment using semi-structured interviews was performed in one report[53], and the correlation between changes in different outcomes and the change in perceived recovery from stroke was estimated in another report.[41,53] Furthermore, the change in perceived 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 examined using the Barrow Neurological Institute screen for higher cerebral functions and the Letter-number sequencing test, respectively.[8] QoL was investigated in one study by the Medical Outcomes Study 36-item Short-Form health survey (SF-16).[18]

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Effects of intervention on outcome measures

Effects of EAT on physical outcome

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.


A
Balance within
Negative effect
No effect
Positive effect
Horse
Simulator
Study Quality
B
Balance between
NRT
RCT

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


A
Gait within
Negative effect
No effect
Positive effect
Horse
Simulator
Study Quality
B
Gait between
NRT
RCT

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*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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

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 (Cohen's d between 0.57 and 1.66) investigating between-effects on BBS. (Park *et al.*, 2013; Kim and Lee, 2015; Lee and Kim, 2015, Bunketorp-Käll *et al.*, 2017*b*) In addition, significant between-effects on balance were found for COP Path Length and Travel 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 *et al.*, 2013). However, no significant between-effects were found for FMLE-balance

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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

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.*, 2017*b*) and the 10 mWT (Cohen's d between 0.26 and 1.55) (Sunwoo *et al.*, 2012; Kim and Lee, 2015; Bunketorp-Käll *et al.*, 2019). Moreover, with gait analyzer, positive effects were found on velocity (Cohen's d = 0.59 – 2.06) (Kim *et al.*, 2014*a*, Lee *et al.*, 2014*a*), stride of the affected and unaffected sides (Cohen's d = 0.35 and 0.29, respectively), Double Support of the affected and unaffected sides (Cohen's d = 0.59 and 0.31, respectively) (Kim *et al.*, 2014*a*), Step Length Asymmetry (Cohen's d = 2.60) (Lee *et al.*, 2014*a*), single support (Cohen's d = 2.34), load response (Cohen's d = 1.61), total double support (Cohen's d = 1.07), and pre-swing (Cohen's d = 1.76) (Sung *et al.*, 2013). However, no effects of EAT on gait were detected in the 6 MWT (Cohen's d = 0.68) (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) (Han *et al.*, 2012). In addition, with gait analyzer, no effects of EAT were found on step length (Cohen's d = -0.01), stance phase (Cohen's d = 0.13), or swing phase (Cohen's d = 0.49) (Sung *et al.*, 2013). For cadence, one study found a positive effect (Kim *et al.*, 2014*a*) (Cohen's d = 0.33; assessed by gait analyzer), while others reported a negative effect (Beinotti *et al.*, 2010; Sung *et al.*, 2013) (Cohen's d = -0.16, assessed by FGA; and Cohen's d = 0.00, gait analyzer).

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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*)

Effects of EAT on further health-related outcome

Findings for depression varied between studies. One study reported significant improvements in the BDI after EAT[51], 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]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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 in simulators (see Fig. 2). Positive within-effects were found for most studies/ outcomes, independent of EAT with horses or simulators, study quality or design. Three vs. six studies investigated between-effects on balance with horses and simulators, respectively. Significant between-effects on balance were found for one 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 quality and small sample sizes. For studies applying EAT with riding simulators, results varied. However, in addition to the unequal number of reports to compare, studies were highly heterogeneous in terms of study design, quality, and sample size.

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 non-significant effects on gait were detected. However, studies were highly heterogeneous similarly to the studies on balance. Furthermore, outcome measures were inconsistent between studies.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Discussion

Summary of results

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

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 investigating within-effects of EAT on balance, as measured by BBS, reported positive effects of EAT. Furthermore, in four out of seven studies assessing between-effects of EAT on balance (measured by BBS), significant improvements were reported.[8,50–52] BBS is a valid tool for assessing balance during stroke recovery with an excellent reliability.[56] It measures both the static and dynamic aspects of balance, i.e., to maintain balance either statically or during functional tasks.[56] The 14 items include 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 which has previously also been supported by a meta-analysis (albeit only including two studies).[58] In addition, positive findings were described for individual aspects of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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

Taken together, there is considerable evidence for a positive effect of EAT on balance and gait. Recovery of gait parameters was reported as a major goal of stroke patients and is associated with quality of life.[61] In addition, recovery of gait and balance may decrease the risk of falling in stroke patients.[60,62] These findings support the promising potential of EAT as a multimodal intervention for recovery after stroke. In addition, preliminary evidence was provided for improved lower extremity motor impairment[46] and overall motor function after EAT[40]. However, to our knowledge, the effects of EAT on fine motor control or spasticity in stroke patients have yet to be evaluated. While fine motor control was not formally assessed, stroke patients reported subjectively improved fine motor skills during a semi-structured interview.[53] Moreover, temporary (lower extremity) spasticity was shown to decrease for patients with cerebral palsy[10,63] or spinal cord injury[13,25]. Even though the effects on upper extremity spasticity remain unclear, EAT may hold a promising potential for decreasing spasticity after stroke.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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]

Effects of EAT on further health-related outcomes

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

The evidence for effects of EAT on depression was, however, inconclusive[45,51] While depression was shown to improve in one study[64], it did not change on the other study[45]. In this pilot study, however, the dose of EAT was much lower than in the other studies (i.e., 8h of EAT[45] vs. 15h EAT[64]) Additionally, only eight patients were enrolled in this study. Moreover, the study that showed significant improvements of depression was of low methodological quality. The results might therefore be compromised by these constraints and require further consideration. In addition, no significant effects of EAT on cognitive aspects were observed. However, cognitive outcome was assessed in only one study.[8]

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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, other factors may shape our understanding of the mechanisms of action and should 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 levels.[65] In an autistic population, a decrease in the level of cortisol was detected in the course of EAT training.[66] In addition, an increase of progesterone levels over time was found.[66] Cortisol is a classical biomarker of stress and may thus reflect a lower level of stress after EAT.[67]

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 EEG increased during both riding a horse[69], and a riding simulator.[69,70] Furthermore, one study used fMRI to assess changes in brain connectivity in children with ADHD.[27] Increased connectivity was detected both within the cerebellum (albeit not statistically higher than in the CG)[72] and from the cerebellum to other regions, i.e., to the right insular cortex, right middle temporal gyrus, left superior temporal gyrus, and right precentral gyrus[27].

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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]

EAT applied with horses vs. riding simulator

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

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

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.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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

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, seven reports (based on five studies) were of considerable methodological quality. Four of them reported improved gait[8,40,45,49] and three of them improved balance[8,45,49] after EAT. Similar effects have been identified for EAT in children with cerebral palsy[22,80] which may have similarities to stroke patients. Therefore, synthesized results of this review, especially the effectiveness of EAT in boosting gait and balance after stroke, should not be disregarded but rather taken as a starting point for further investigation.

Limitations

We are aware of multiple limitations regarding this systematic review. In general, 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]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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.

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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]

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Authorship contribution statement

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

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare no conflict of interests.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research [BMBF 13GW0570, BEVARES]. We acknowledge support from the Open Access Publishing Fund of the University of Tuebingen. We thank Karolina Talar for valuable methodological input.

Data availability

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

References

Achten D, Visser-Meily JMA, Post MWM, Schepers VPM. Life satisfaction of couples 3 years after stroke. Disabil Rehabil 2012; 34: 1468–72.

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.

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

Beinotti F, Christofoletti G, Correia N, Borges G. Effects of horseback riding therapy 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. Arq Neuropsiquiatr 2010; 68: 908–13.

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.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Beyaert C, Vasa R, Frykberg GE. Gait post-stroke: Pathophysiology and rehabilitation strategies. Neurophysiol Clin 2015; 45: 335–55.

Blum L, Korner-Bitensky N. Usefulness of the Berg Balance Scale in stroke rehabilitation: A systematic review. Phys Ther 2008; 88: 559–66.

Brewer L, Horgan F, Hickey A, Williams D. Stroke rehabilitation: Recent advances and 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.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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.

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.

Collado-Mateo D, Lavín-Pérez AM, García JPF, García-Gordillo MÁ, Villafaina S. Effects of Equine-Assisted Therapies or Horse-Riding Simulators on Chronic Pain: A 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, Lucena-Anton 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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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.

Funakoshi R, Masuda K, Uchiyama H, Ohta M. A possible mechanism of horseback riding on dynamic trunk alignment. Heliyon 2018; 4: e00777.

García-Gómez A, Guerrero-Barona E, García-Peña I, Rodríguez-Jiménez M, Moreno-Manso JM. Equine-assisted therapeutic activities and their influence on the heart rate variability: A systematic review. Complement Ther Clin Pract 2020; 39: 101167.

Garner BA, Rigby BR. Human pelvis motions when walking and when riding a therapeutic horse. Hum Mov Sci 2015; 39: 121–37.

Goulet-Pelletier J-C, Cousineau D. A review of effect sizes and their confidence intervals, Part I: The Cohen's d family. Quant Methods Psychol 2020; 16: 422–3.

Grefkes C, Ward NS. Cortical reorganization after stroke: How much and how functional? Neuroscientist 2014; 20: 56–70.

Guindos-Sanchez L De, Lucena-Anton D, Moral-Munoz JA, Salazar A, Carmona-Barrientos 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.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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 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 Ther Rehabil 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.

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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

Krakauer JW, Carmichael ST, Corbett D, Wittenberg GF. Getting neurorehabilitation right: What can be learned from animal models? Neurorehabil Neural Repair 2012; 26: 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. Nurs Open 2020; 7: 58–67.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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.

McGibbon NH, Benda W, Duncan BR, Silkwood-Sherer D. Immediate and Long-Term Effects of Hippotherapy on Symmetry of Adductor Muscle Activity and Functional Ability in Children With Spastic Cerebral Palsy. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2009; 90: 966–74.

de Mello EC, Diniz LH, Lage JB, Ribeiro MF, Bevilacqua Junior DE, Rosa RC, et al. Analysis of Trunk Neuromuscular Activation During Equine-Assisted Therapy in Older Adults. Percept Mot Skills 2022; 129: 1458–76.

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.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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.

Portaro S, Cacciola A, Naro A, Cavallaro F, Gemelli G, Aliberti B, et al. Can Individuals with Down Syndrome Benefit from Hippotherapy? An Exploratory Study on Gait and 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 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;

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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 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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.09.23289710; this version posted December 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

disorder: A pilot study. Clin Psychopharmacol Neurosci 2016; 14: 357–64.

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 Child Neurol 2011; 53: 684–91.