

1 **Genetic Polymorphisms and Post-Stroke Upper Limb Motor Improvement – A Systematic**
2 **Review and Meta-Analysis**

3
4 *Sandeep K. Subramanian,^{1,2,3,4*} Riley T. Morgan,¹ Carl Rasmusson,¹ Kayla M. Shepherd,¹ Carol*
5 *L Li^{3,5}*

6
7 ¹Department of Physical Therapy, School of Health Professions, University of Texas Health
8 Science Center at San Antonio, San Antonio, TX, USA.

9 ²Department of Physician Assistant Studies, School of Health Professions, University of Texas
10 Health Science Center at San Antonio, San Antonio, TX, USA.

11 ³Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, Long School of Medicine, University of Texas Health
12 Science Center at San Antonio, San Antonio, TX, USA.

13 ⁴Center for Biomedical Neurosciences, University of Texas Health Science Center at San
14 Antonio, San Antonio, TX, USA.

15 ⁵Audie L. Murphy VA Hospital, South Texas Veterans Health Administration, Polytrauma
16 Rehabilitation Center, San Antonio, TX, USA.

17
18 *Corresponding Author:
19 Sandeep K Subramanian, PT, Ph.D

20 Assistant Professor,
21 Department of Physical Therapy,
22 School of Health Professions,
23 UT Health San Antonio,
24 San Antonio, Texas,

25 USA 78229

26 Phone: 1-210-567-8762

27 Fax: 1-210-567-8774

28 Email: subramanias3@uthscsa.edu

29

30 Keywords: arm, cerebrovascular accident, BDNF, CoMT, APOE, outcome, rehabilitation, genes

31

32 Word Count: 3662 words

33

34 ORCID: Sandeep K Subramanian: 0000-0002-5972-1588

35 **Abstract:**

36

37 **Background:** Post-stroke upper limb (UL) motor improvement is associated with adaptive
38 neuroplasticity and motor learning. Both intervention-related (including provision of intensive,
39 variable, and task-specific practice) and individual-specific factors (including the presence of
40 genetic polymorphisms) influence improvement. In individuals with stroke, most commonly,
41 polymorphisms are found in Brain Derived Neurotrophic Factor (BDNF), Apolipoprotein
42 (APOE) and catechol-O-methyltransferase (COMT). These involve a replacement of cystine by
43 arginine (APOE ϵ 4) or one or two valines by methionine (BDNF: val⁶⁶met, COMT: val¹⁵⁸met).
44 However, the implications of these polymorphisms on post-stroke UL motor improvement
45 specifically have not yet been elucidated.

46

47 **Objective:** Examine the influence of genetic polymorphism on post-stroke UL motor
48 improvement.

49

50 **Design:** Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

51

52 **Methods:** We conducted a systematic search of the published literature in English language of
53 using standard methodology. The modified Downs and Black checklist helped assess study
54 quality. We compared change in UL motor impairment and activity scores between individuals
55 with and without the polymorphisms. Meta-analyses helped assess change in motor impairment
56 scores based upon a minimum of two studies per time point. Effect sizes (ES) were quantified

57 based upon the Rehabilitation Treatment Specification System as follows: small (0.08–0.18),
58 medium (0.19–0.40) and large (≥ 0.41).

59

60 **Results:** We retrieved 10 (four good and six fair quality) studies. Compared to those with BDNF
61 val⁶⁶met polymorphism, meta-analyses revealed lower motor impairment scores (large ES) in
62 those without the polymorphism at intervention completion (0.5, 95% CI: 0.11-0.88) and at
63 retention (0.58, 95% CI: 0.06-1.11). Presence of CoMT val¹⁵⁸met polymorphism had similar
64 results, with higher levels of improvement in impairment (large ES ≥ 1.5) and activity scores
65 (large ES ranging from 0.5-0.76) in those without the polymorphism. Presence of APOE ϵ 4 form
66 did not influence UL motor improvement.

67

68 **Conclusion:** BDNF val⁶⁶met and COMT val¹⁵⁸met polymorphisms negatively influence UL
69 motor improvement in impairment and activity scores.

70

71 **Registration:** <https://osf.io/wk9cf/>

72 **Introduction**

73

74 Stroke continues to be a leading cause of adult morbidity in the United States.¹ One of the
75 most disabling aftereffects of a stroke is the presence of upper limb (UL) hemiparesis. A large
76 proportion of stroke survivors present with UL sensorimotor impairments on the paretic side,
77 reduced independence in performance of daily life activities (ADL) and restricted participation.²
78 Along with spontaneous recovery mechanisms,³ motor improvement of the paretic side enabling
79 successful task-performance is attributable to adaptive neuroplasticity and motor learning.⁴

80

81 Successful task-performance entails an interaction of the individual, environment, and the
82 task to be performed.⁵ The role of the environment^{6,7} and factors influencing task-practice⁸ have
83 been extensively studied. Recently, there is a renewed focus on the role of individual-specific
84 characteristics such as levels of motivation,^{9,10} mood¹⁰ and the role of biomarkers.¹¹ Bernhardt et
85 al¹² defined biomarkers as “*indicators of disease state that can be used clinically as a measure*
86 *reflecting underlying molecular and cellular processes that may be difficult to measure directly*
87 *in humans and could be used to predict recovery or treatment response.*” Biomarker studies
88 within the realm of neurorehabilitation include those based on biology (e.g., genetics), structural
89 and/or imaging¹³ and neurophysiological markers¹⁴ of central nervous system excitability and
90 electrical activity.

91

92 The role of imaging-based biomarkers of structural and functional corticospinal tract
93 connectivity alone¹³ or in combination with neurophysiological markers (e.g. motor evoked
94 potential amplitude)¹⁴ has been extensively studied. The role of genetics-based biomarkers is

95 slowly gaining prominence,¹⁵ with studies focusing on single nucleotide polymorphisms
96 (SNPs).¹¹ These SNPs can alter the basic functioning in cellular and molecular processes¹⁶ and
97 tend to influence functional improvement produced by environmental interaction and in response
98 to rehabilitation interventions.¹⁷ Genetics-based biomarkers identified as pertinent to stroke
99 recovery include SNPs in brain-derived neurotrophic factor (BDNF), Catechol-o-
100 methyltransferase (COMT) and Apolipoprotein (APOE).¹¹

101
102 An activity dependant¹⁸ neurotrophin important for neuroplasticity and protection after
103 injury, BDNF facilitates synaptic transmission and long-term potentiation important for motor
104 learning.¹⁹ A common SNP that occurs in BDNF is substitution of one or two valines at codon 66
105 with methionine due to substitution of adenine in place of guanine at nucleotide 196.²⁰ The
106 polymorphism reduces activity-dependent BDNF release,²¹ and results in altered neuroplasticity
107 and learning in healthy controls²² and after a stroke.^{23,24}

108
109 The COMT enzyme helps degrade and thus influences the availability of Dopamine in
110 the central nervous system.²⁵ Dopamine can influence post-stroke motor learning and
111 improvement.^{26,27} A commonly observed SNP results in a change from valine or methionine at
112 codon 158 (in the membrane form) and codon 108 in the soluble form, which results in a 3-4 fold
113 decrease in COMT activity.^{28,29} The role of COMT polymorphism has primarily been assessed
114 on motor learning in Parkinson's disease^{30,31} and severe Schizophrenia.³² Given that COMT is
115 found in areas essential for motor learning,³³ such as striatum and motor cortex,³⁴ the effects of
116 COMT polymorphism on post-stroke motor improvement need to be addressed.

117

118 Although involved in lipid transport between cells, APOE helps modulate neuronal repair
119 and regeneration of nervous tissue. One of the alleles of APOE is the Epsilon-4 form (ϵ 4) with
120 arginine at positions 112 and 158 in place of cystine. Presence of APOE- ϵ 4 can cause reduced
121 hippocampal volume and cortical thickness, cognitive impairments³⁵ and lower recovery levels
122 after traumatic brain³⁶ and spinal cord³⁷ injuries. After a stroke, previous meta-analyses^{38,39}
123 revealed lower improvement after sub-arachnoid hemorrhage in those with the ϵ 4 form, but no
124 association with improvements after ischemic strokes. In both studies,^{38,39} motor improvements
125 were assessed using generic scales such as the modified Rankin Scale (mRS). Improved scores in
126 assessments such as the mRS does not specifically represent UL motor improvement.⁴⁰ As
127 presence of cognitive impairments influence UL motor improvement,⁴¹ the effects of the APOE-
128 ϵ 4 form on post-stroke UL motor improvements needs to be systematically evaluated.

129
130 The role of genetic polymorphisms has previously been reviewed.^{11,16,24,39,42,43} These
131 studies were either narrative reviews^{11,16,24,43} or meta-analyses including global stroke outcomes
132 like National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale and/or mRS.^{39,42} Post-stroke UL motor
133 improvement continues to remain variable and less than optimal in many cases.⁴⁴ Evaluation of
134 whether and to what extent genetic polymorphisms influence the extent of improvement may
135 help explain some of the observed variability. Using a systematic review and meta-analysis, we
136 examined the influence of genetic polymorphisms on UL motor improvement. The question
137 guiding our review was “*In individuals with post-stroke UL hemiparesis, does the presence,*
138 *compared to the absence of genetic polymorphisms, influence motor improvement?*” Preliminary
139 results have previously appeared as an abstract.⁴⁵

140

141 **Methods**

142

143 This systematic review followed the PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic
144 Reviews and Meta-Analyses) guidelines. The protocol was registered on the Open Science
145 Framework (<https://osf.io/wk9cf/>).

146

147 We searched the literature for studies involving human subjects published in English
148 between the years 2000 and 2023. The last search was conducted in September 2023. Key search
149 terms used included: stroke, cerebrovascular accident, upper limb, arm, rehabilitation,
150 impairment, activities of daily living, recovery, polymorphisms, gene*, neuroplasticity, and
151 motor learning. Databases searched included: PubMed and ISI Web of Science and the Google
152 Scholar repository. We included studies that used clinical assessments of UL motor impairment
153 and/or ADL and provided data for individuals with and without polymorphisms. We excluded
154 studies focusing exclusively on lower limb or on only cognitive outcomes. We also excluded
155 other reviews, although we searched the reference lists of these excluded reviews for pertinent
156 citations. To identify additional relevant articles, we also searched reference lists of each
157 retrieved study.

158

159 *Data Abstraction*

160 We grouped the retrieved articles according to the polymorphism examined. We
161 developed and used a data abstraction form to extract data from the selected articles. Data were
162 initially extracted by RTM, CR and KMS. The first author (SKS) then verified that all relevant
163 data were obtained from the selected articles. The extracted data included details about

164 chronicity, distribution of sample based upon those with and without polymorphism, details
165 about the intervention, outcomes used to assess change and the study results.

166

167 *Study quality assessment*

168 We assessed the quality of the selected articles using the modified version⁴⁶ of the
169 reliable and valid Downs and Black (D&B) checklist.⁴⁷ The D&B checklist can be used to assess
170 the quality of both randomized and non-randomized study designs. The total scores of this
171 assessment and PEDro scale are highly correlated in studies involving post-stroke participants.⁴⁸
172 According to available guidelines,⁴⁹ we classified the scores as “excellent” (score 24-28), “good”
173 (score 19-23), “fair” (score 14-18), or “poor” (score \leq 13). The quality of each study was
174 independently evaluated by RTM, CR and KMS, with discrepancies, if any, resolved by SKS and
175 CLL.

176

177 *Risk of Bias*

178 The risk of bias (ROB) was estimated using the Cochrane ROB tool⁵⁰ and ACROBAT-
179 NRSI (A Cochrane Risk Of Bias Assessment Tool: for Non-Randomized Studies of
180 Interventions)⁵¹ for randomized and non-randomized studies respectively. The Cochrane ROB
181 tools assesses the following domains: sequence generation, allocation, concealment, blinding of
182 participants, personnel and outcome assessors, incomplete outcome data, selective outcome
183 reporting, and other sources of bias. For each domain, we assigned a judgment: Yes - indicating
184 low ROB, No - indicating a high ROB, and Unclear - indicating unclear or unknown ROB where
185 reported details were insufficient to reach a conclusion. The ACROBAT-NRSI tool assesses bias
186 that can arise because of confounding, study participant selection, intervention measurement,

187 departures from intended interventions, missing data, outcome measurement and reported result
188 selection.

189

190 *Statistical analyses*

191 Descriptive statistics of the study populations were calculated as percentages of the total
192 sample. When an article reported the effect of a particular polymorphism at both the motor
193 impairment and activity limitation levels, they were considered separately. Meta-analyses
194 (RevMan 5) examined differences in Fugl-Meyer (FM) scores in groups with and without
195 polymorphism. Pooled effects of the polymorphisms were quantified with standardized mean
196 differences.⁵² If at least two studies reported the effects of the polymorphism on change in FM
197 scores, we included them in the meta-analysis.^{53,54} I^2 scores helped assess heterogeneity.⁵⁵

198

199 Given that a variety of interventions were employed in the different studies, we used the
200 random effects models (irrespective of I^2 values). Effect sizes were categorized as small (0.08 -
201 0.18), medium (0.19 - 0.40) and large (≥ 0.41), in accordance with the Rehabilitation Treatment
202 Specification System recommendations.⁵⁶ Sensitivity analysis was carried out to assess the effect
203 of provision of rehabilitation interventions. We conducted an additional analysis excluding any
204 study that did not report details of rehabilitation interventions provided.

205

206 **Results**

207 The search and selection results are shown in the Preferred Reporting Items for
208 Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) flow diagram. In total, 319 citations were
209 identified through database and registry searches (Figure 1). After removing duplicates, 187

210 citations were screened, of which 16 were excluded. We sought 116 reports for retrieval and
211 assessed 31 for full text eligibility, which were experimental studies including outcomes related
212 to rehabilitation. We further excluded 21 studies, as they included lower limb and/or gait
213 outcomes or used generic measures such as the mRS, NIHSS and Barthel Index. Ten articles
214 assessing the effects of genetic polymorphisms on UL motor impairment and ADL performance
215 were included in the qualitative synthesis (Figure 1). The reference lists of these ten articles did
216 not yield any additional citations.

217
218 Out of the 10 studies, eight examined the influence of BDNF val⁶⁶met and two addressed
219 the effects of COMT val¹⁵⁸met polymorphisms. Two of the eight studies assessing the effects of
220 BDNF val⁶⁶met polymorphism additionally examined effects of APOE ε4 polymorphism. Six^{23,}
221 ⁵⁷⁻⁶¹ of the eight articles addressing effects of BDNF polymorphism had available FM scores
222 assessed at the end of the intervention to be used for a meta-analysis. Two studies^{59,60} also
223 included a retention assessment, with that data being included for a second meta-analysis.

224 *Insert_Figure_1_here*

225
226 *BDNF val⁶⁶met polymorphism*

227 In total, 598 individuals (59.2% men, 40.8% women) sustaining a stroke participated in
228 the eight studies included in the qualitative analysis. The average age of the participants (mean ±
229 SD) was 58.4 ± 3.2 years. A greater proportion of participants had sustained ischemic strokes
230 (79.7%) compared to hemorrhagic strokes (20.3%). The distribution of the more-affected side
231 was almost equal (50.7% right, 49.3% left). Four^{57,61-63} of the included studies were ranked as
232 'good' and the remaining six^{23,58-60,64,65} 'fair' (Supplementary Table 1). Participants were either in

233 the acute^{57-60,64} or chronic^{23,61} stage post-stroke. All participants had moderate-to-severe⁶⁶ UL
234 motor impairment (FM score $\leq 49/66$).

235 *Insert_Table_1_and_figure_2_near_here*

236
237 Table 1 presents a summary of studies evaluating the effects of BDNF polymorphism
238 with a focus on sample size, type and dose of rehabilitation provided (if any), main outcomes and
239 results. The sample size used for the Meta-analysis was 295 (no polymorphism: 101,
240 polymorphism: 194). Analysis revealed a *large* (0.50, 95% CI: 0.11 - 0.88, $p = 0.01$, $I^2 = 54\%$,
241 random effects model; Figure 2) effect size at the end of the intervention period for improvement
242 in UL FM scores in those without compared to those with the polymorphism. At retention
243 testing, the sample size used was 79 (no polymorphism: 19, polymorphism: 60,). We found a
244 similar large effect size (0.58, 95% CI: 0.06 - 1.11, $p = 0.03$, $I^2 = 0\%$, random effects model;
245 Figure 3).

246 *Insert_Figure_3_near_here*

247
248 In addition to UL FM scores, other assessments at the body structure and function level
249 included use of functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI), diffusion tensor imaging (DTI)
250 and MRI. In terms of fMRI outcomes, lower ipsilesional activation volume and percentage signal
251 change were noted in individuals with the Met alleles as compared to the Val homozygous
252 individuals.²³ Use of DTI revealed differences in radial and axial diffusion⁵⁹ and fractional
253 anisotropy⁶⁰ between individuals with and without met alleles. Individuals with met alleles also
254 had greater cerebral atrophy on MRI.⁶²

255 Sensitivity analysis included an additional meta-analysis being conducted with data from
256 five studies included in this analysis. The only study excluded⁵⁹ provided no details on whether
257 and if so, how many sessions of any form of rehabilitation were provided to the participants.
258 The sample size used for this Meta-analysis was 260 (no polymorphism: 91, polymorphism:169).
259 Analysis revealed a large (0.43, 95% CI: 0.01 - 0.86, $p = 0.046$, $I^2 = 57%$, random effects model;
260 Figure 4) effect size at the end of the intervention period for improvement in UL FM scores in
261 those without compared to those with the polymorphism.

262 *Insert_Figure_4_near_here*

263

264 *APOEε4 Polymorphism*

265 Table 2 presents a summary of studies evaluating the effects of APOEε4 and COMT
266 val¹⁵⁸met polymorphism. Two (good quality^{61,62}) of the eight studies examining the effects of
267 BDNF val66met polymorphism also assessed the effects of APO ε4 polymorphism. These two
268 studies included a total of 260 participants (61.5% men, 38.5% women). A greater proportion of
269 participants had sustained ischemic strokes (83.4%) compared to hemorrhagic strokes (16.7%).
270 The distribution of the more-affected side was equal (50 % right, 50% left).

271

272 Both studies used the Wolf Motor Function Test - timed test (WMFT-tt) as the primary
273 outcome. No differences were noted between individuals with and without the polymorphism on
274 WMFT-tt scores (Table 2A). In addition, groups did not differ on the amount of change seen in
275 UL FM scores and self-reported levels of UL quality (assessed using the Motor Activity Log)⁶¹
276 or in the amount of cerebral atrophy noted between groups.⁶²

277

Insert_Table_2_near_here

278 COMT val¹⁵⁸met Polymorphism

279 Two fair^{63,65} quality studies including 157 participants (59.7% men, 40.3% women)
280 examined the influence of COMT val¹⁵⁸met polymorphism (53: no polymorphism, 104:
281 polymorphism). A greater proportion of participants had sustained ischemic strokes (83.8%)
282 compared to hemorrhagic strokes (16.2%). The distribution of the more-affected side was 46.8%
283 right side, 51.9 %, left side and 1.3% of the participants had bilateral strokes. The studies used
284 either the UL section of the Rivermead Motor Assessment (RMA)⁶³ or the FMA.⁶⁵

285
286 Compared to those with met¹⁵⁸met, participants with val¹⁵⁸met allele (ES = 0.51) or
287 val¹⁵⁸val (ES = 0.76) distribution had greater recovery with large effect sizes on the UL section
288 of the RMA, at the end of the intervention period. Similar results were obtained for the FMA.
289 Individuals with val¹⁵⁸val distribution had greater recovery on the FMA at the end of the
290 intervention period (ES = 2.69), and at 3 (ES = 1.51) and 6 months (ES = 1.98) retention testing.
291 In addition, participants without the polymorphism improved more on other components of the
292 RMA scores⁶³ including gross function, leg, and trunk function and higher FIM scores.⁶⁵

293
294 *Risk of Bias:*

295 Overall, the risk of bias was low for all studies (*Supplementary Figure 1, Supplementary*
296 *Table 2*), except one.⁵⁹ The ROB for this one study could not be ascertained for the domains of
297 measurement of interventions and departures from intended interventions, as information on
298 whether the participants received any intervention or not was missing.

299

300

301 **Discussion**

302

303 Results from this systematic review and meta-analysis showed that the presence of some
304 genetic polymorphisms negatively influence post-stroke UL motor improvement. The meta-
305 analyses revealed that BDNF polymorphism negatively impacted UL motor improvement,
306 immediately after the end of the intervention period as well as at retention testing. Overall,
307 majority of the studies had low risk of bias, which lends further credence to these results.

308 Sensitivity analyses revealed that results continued to remain significant even with the exclusion
309 of the study where information on some domains of bias was not available.

310

311 These results are in agreement to those found previously,⁴² and extend those findings
312 more specifically to UL motor improvement and not just general recovery from a stroke. We also
313 found that while APO ε4 polymorphism does not influence UL motor improvement, presence of
314 COMT val¹⁵⁸met polymorphism has a negative impact. Our results for APO ε4 agree partially
315 with those found previously,³⁹ and go beyond those results by focusing on UL motor
316 improvement. To our knowledge, this is the first review which has systematically investigated
317 the effects of COMT polymorphism on post-stroke UL motor improvement.

318

319 *Study Quality Assessment*

320 Of the ten articles included in the review, four^{57, 61-63} were ranked as 'good' and the
321 remaining six^{23, 58-60,64,65} 'fair'. We did not find any articles that could be categorized as being of
322 'poor' quality. However, we also did not have any articles that were 'excellent' in quality. We
323 used the modified D&B checklist in this review, as both randomized and non-randomized study

324 designs were included. The modified D&B checklist score includes an assessment of internal and
325 external validity, reporting standards and sample size. Commonly non-reported details across
326 studies in this review include information on external validity (three questions) and on
327 power/sample size analysis. Inherent word limitations in manuscript length may often preclude
328 exclusion of such information in the main text. It is suggested that such information may be
329 reported at least as supplementary material to provide a better overview of the rationale behind
330 participant selection in the studies.

331

332 *Interventions used and number of sessions*

333 A variety of interventions were used amongst the various studies included in the review.
334 The interventions used included the use of rTMS along with traditional physical (PT) and
335 occupational therapy (OT) sessions,^{57,58} provision of traditional PT and OT sessions alone^{60,63, 64}
336 virtual reality platform along with robotic assistive devices,²³ commercial gaming solution (i.e.,
337 Nintendo Wii),⁶¹ modified constraint induced movement therapy,⁶¹ and task-oriented UL
338 training.⁶² No details were provided for two studies.^{59,65} The above-mentioned interventions were
339 delivered at different intensities. Time spent in therapy was the most common metric used to
340 denote intensity in the included studies. Time spent in therapy was either 60 minutes/day,^{61,62} 90
341 minutes/day (outpatient rehabilitation phase)⁶⁴ or three hours/day.^{57,58,64} Therapy was provided
342 for 10 sessions over 2 weeks,^{57,58, 61} 2-3 weeks^{23,60} or 30 sessions.⁶² Information on exact number
343 of sessions was not provided for the other studies.

344

345 Although time spent in therapy is one metric of intensity,⁶⁷ other metrics include numbers
346 of repetitions⁶⁸ as well as “*amount of physical and/or mental work put forth by the client*”.⁶⁹

347 Previous work involving healthy controls with BDNF polymorphism has shown that employing a
348 high number of repetitions (about 800 repetitions/session) for about five days can cause
349 significant changes in short-term plasticity even in those with the polymorphism.⁷⁰ The minimal
350 number of repetitions/ session in individuals with BDNF and other polymorphisms that have also
351 sustained a stroke are currently unknown. Approaches similar to those used previously could be
352 employed to estimate the minimal number of repetitions to achieve a plateau in motor
353 performance in a single session.^{71,72} Whether using a fixed number of repetitions results in better
354 UL motor improvement in post-stroke individuals with polymorphisms remains to be estimated.

355

356 *Outcomes used to assess improvement*

357 A variety of outcomes were used to assess the effects of the different polymorphisms. At
358 the body structure and function level, in addition to the FMA, the Rivermead Motor Assessment,
359 MRI, fMRI and diffusion tensor imaging (DTI) were used. At the activity level, Box and Blocks
360 Test, Wolf Motor Function Test and Motor Activity Log helped specifically assess UL activity
361 performance, while outcomes including Barthel Index and Functional Independence measure
362 helped assess general activity performance. All the selected outcomes have well established
363 psychometric properties^{73,74} and measures including the FMA, Functional Independence
364 Measure, Motor Activity Log, Rivermead Motor Assessment, and Wolf Motor Function Test are
365 amongst recommended measures.⁷³ However, no study used any assessment at the participation
366 level. Hence the effects of the polymorphism at the participation level have not yet been
367 assessed. If select core measures such as those recommended by previous publications^{75,76} are
368 used, the effects across the different levels of the ICF could be better understood. In addition, the
369 UL part of the FM does not account for the use of altered movement patterns.⁶⁶ It is currently

370 unknown whether individuals with genetic polymorphisms use compensatory movement patterns
371 for task completion.

372

373 *Influence of ethnicity*

374 Majority of the studies in this review emerged from Asia, particularly from South East
375 Asia, with only four studies^{23,61-63} being conducted outside Asia. Amongst these four studies,
376 three^{23,61, 62} had detailed demographics available on ethnicity of the participants. Individuals
377 belonging to Asian Ethnicity already have poor outcomes after a stroke.⁷⁷ There are some reports
378 that individuals of Asian Ethnicity tend to receive less rehabilitation services compared to
379 individuals from a Caucasian ethnicity and have higher rates of hospital readmission.⁷⁸⁻⁸⁰ In
380 addition, in all the three biomarkers examined in this meta-analysis, individuals with Asian
381 ethnicity have higher rates of polymorphism.⁸¹⁻⁸³ The presence of high rates of the polymorphism
382 can be an additional factor explaining the lower rates of post-stroke motor improvement seen in
383 this population. This information can likely play an important role in prediction of prognosis
384 after a stroke. Furthermore, it can also help make decisions as to whether and if so, the extent to
385 which provision of rehabilitation interventions need to differ for this population.

386

387 **Limitations**

388

389 We only included studies involving adult participants published in English (since no one
390 in the team was proficient in other languages). It might be possible that we missed studies
391 published in other languages. None of the studies had an explicit sample size calculation.
392 Information on baseline levels of depression and/or intake of anti-depression medication was

393 available in only two studies.^{23, 63} Information on the presence of depression is essential, as the
394 presence of genetic polymorphisms is an additional risk factor⁸⁴ for post-stroke depression and
395 can influence the extent of UL motor improvement.¹⁰

396

397 **Conclusion**

398

399 Our review and meta-analyses results indicate that presence of genetic polymorphisms in
400 BDNF and COMT negatively impact post-stroke motor improvement. This is especially true at
401 the body-structure and function domain of the ICF. Our findings may contribute to the
402 understanding of one of the underlying mechanisms to help explain some variability in post-
403 stroke UL motor improvement. This is valuable information for the means of tailoring a plan of
404 care, creating realistic goals, and providing relevant, individualized care to every patient. In
405 addition, new questions have been identified including does the i) use of a fixed number of
406 repetitions result in similar or better levels of UL motor improvement in individuals with genetic
407 polymorphisms; ii) presence of COMT val¹⁵⁸met continue to influence motor improvement at
408 retention testing; iii) presence of genetic polymorphisms influence participation levels and iv) do
409 individuals with genetic polymorphisms use altered movement patterns and if so, to what extent.
410 Answers to these emergent questions can help better understand the influence of genetic
411 polymorphisms on post-stroke upper limb motor improvement.

412 **Declarations**

- 413 • *Ethics approval and consent to participate:* Not applicable, as this manuscript is a
414 systematic review. However, ethics approval was obtained for all the studies included.

- 437 3. Cassidy JM, Cramer SC. Spontaneous and therapeutic-induced mechanisms of functional
438 recovery after stroke. *Transl Stroke Res* 2017; 8: 33-46.
- 439 4. Buma F, Kwakkel G, Ramsey N. Understanding upper limb recovery after stroke. *Restor*
440 *Neurol Neurosci* 2013; 31: 707-722
- 441 5. Newell KM. Motor skill acquisition. *Annu Rev Psychol* 1991; 42: 213-237.
- 442 6. Subramanian SK, Lourenco CB, Chilingaryan G, et al. Arm motor recovery using a virtual
443 reality intervention in chronic stroke: randomized control trial. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*
444 2013; 27: 13-23.
- 445 7. White JH, Bartley E, Janssen H, et al. Exploring stroke survivor experience of participation
446 in an enriched environment: a qualitative study. *Disabil Rehabil* 2015; 37: 593-600.
- 447 8. Kleim JA. Neural plasticity and neurorehabilitation: teaching the new brain old tricks. *J*
448 *Commun Disord* 2011; 44: 521-528.
- 449 9. Levy T, Christie LJ, Killington M, et al. "Just that four letter word, hope": stroke survivors'
450 perspectives of participation in an intensive upper limb exercise program; a qualitative
451 exploration. *Physiother Theory Pract* 2021: 1-15.
- 452 10. Subramanian SK, Chilingaryan G, Sveistrup H, et al. Depressive symptoms influence use
453 of feedback for motor learning and recovery in chronic stroke. *Restor Neurol Neurosci*
454 2015; 33: 727-740.
- 455 11. Stewart JC, Cramer SC. Genetic variation and neuroplasticity: Role in rehabilitation after
456 stroke. *J Neurol Phys Ther* 2017; 41 Suppl 3: S17-S23.
- 457 12. Bernhardt J, Borschmann K, Boyd L, et al. Moving rehabilitation research forward:
458 Developing consensus statements for rehabilitation and recovery research. *Int J Stroke*
459 2016; 11: 454-458.

- 460 13. Feng W, Wang J, Chhatbar PY, et al. Corticospinal tract lesion load: an imaging biomarker
461 for stroke motor outcomes. *Ann Neurol*. 2015; 78: 860-870.
- 462 14. Connell LA, Smith MC, Byblow WD, et al. Implementing biomarkers to predict motor
463 recovery after stroke. *NeuroRehabilitation* 2018; 43: 41-50.
- 464 15. Musunuru K, Hickey KT, Al-Khatib SM, et al. Basic concepts and potential applications of
465 genetics and genomics for cardiovascular and stroke clinicians: a scientific statement from
466 the American Heart Association. *Circ. Cardiovasc. Genet* 2015; 8: 216-242.
- 467 16. Pearson-Fuhrhop KM, Kleim JA, Cramer SC. Brain plasticity and genetic factors. *Top*
468 *Stroke Rehabil* 2009; 16: 282-299.
- 469 17. Uhm KE, Kim YH, Yoon KJ, et al. BDNF genotype influence the efficacy of rTMS in
470 stroke patients. *Neurosci Lett* 2015; 594: 117-121
- 471 18. Langdon KD, Corbett D. Improved working memory following novel combinations of
472 physical and cognitive activity. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair* 2012; 26: 523-532.
- 473 19. Mang CS, Campbell KL, Ross CJ, et al. Promoting neuroplasticity for motor rehabilitation
474 after stroke: considering the effects of aerobic exercise and genetic variation on brain-
475 derived neurotrophic factor. *Phys Ther* 2013; 93: 1707-1716.
- 476 20. Casey BJ, Glatt CE, Tottenham N, et al. Brain-derived neurotrophic factor as a model
477 system for examining gene by environment interactions across development. *Neuroscience*
478 2009; 164: 108-120.
- 479 21. Egan MF, Kojima M, Callicott JH, et al. The BDNF val66met polymorphism affects
480 activity-dependent secretion of BDNF and human memory and hippocampal function. *Cell*
481 2003; 112: 257-269.

- 482 22. McHughen SA, Rodriguez PF, Kleim JA, et al. BDNF val66met polymorphism influences
483 motor system function in the human brain. *Cereb Cortex* 2010; 20: 1254-1262.
- 484 23. Kim DY, Quinlan EB, Gramer R, et al. BDNF Val66Met Polymorphism is related to motor
485 system function after stroke. *Phys Ther* 2016; 96: 533-539.
- 486 24. Balkaya M, Cho S. Genetics of stroke recovery: BDNF val66met polymorphism in stroke
487 recovery and its interaction with aging. *Neurobiol Dis* 2019; 126: 36-46.
- 488 25. Meyer-Lindenberg A, Kohn PD, Kolachana B, et al. Midbrain dopamine and prefrontal
489 function in humans: interaction and modulation by COMT genotype. *Nat Neurosci* 2005; 8:
490 594-596.
- 491 26. Floel A, Hummel F, Breitenstein C, et al. Dopaminergic effects on encoding of a motor
492 memory in chronic stroke. *Neurology* 2005; 65: 472-474.
- 493 27. Cramer SC. Drugs to enhance motor recovery after stroke. *Stroke* 2015; 46: 2998-3005.
- 494 28. Lachman HM, Papolos DF, Saito T, et al. Human catechol-O-methyltransferase
495 pharmacogenetics: description of a functional polymorphism and its potential application to
496 neuropsychiatric disorders. *Pharmacogenetics* 1996; 6: 243-250.
- 497 29. Egan MF, Goldberg TE, Kolachana BS, et al. Effect of COMT Val108/158 Met genotype
498 on frontal lobe function and risk for schizophrenia. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2001; 98:
499 6917-6922.
- 500 30. Pearson-Fuhrhop KM, Minton B, Acevedo D, et al. Genetic variation in the human brain
501 dopamine system influences motor learning and its modulation by L-Dopa. *PLoS One*
502 2013; 8: e61197. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0061197.

- 503 31. Yin Y, Liu Y, Xu M, et al. Association of COMT rs4680 and MAO-B rs1799836
504 polymorphisms with levodopa-induced dyskinesia in Parkinson's disease-a meta-analysis.
505 *Neurol Sci* 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s10072-021-05509-3.
- 506 32. Galderisi S, Maj M, Kirkpatrick B, et al. Catechol-O-methyltransferase Val158Met
507 polymorphism in schizophrenia: associations with cognitive and motor impairment.
508 *Neuropsychobiology* 2005; 52: 83-89.
- 509 33. Doyon J, Bellec P, Amsel R, et al. Contributions of the basal ganglia and functionally
510 related brain structures to motor learning. *Behav Brain Res* 2009; 199: 61-75.
- 511 34. Huotari M, Gogos JA, Karayiorgou M, et al. Brain catecholamine metabolism in catechol-
512 O-methyltransferase (COMT)-deficient mice. *Eur J Neurosci* 2002; 15: 246-256.
- 513 35. Parasuraman R, Greenwood PM, Sunderland T. The apolipoprotein E gene, attention, and
514 brain function. *Neuropsychology* 2002; 16: 254-274.
- 515 36. McFadyen CA, Zeiler FA, Newcombe V, et al. Apolipoprotein E4 polymorphism and
516 outcomes from traumatic brain injury: a living systematic review and meta-analysis. *J*
517 *Neurotrauma* 2021; 38: 1124-1136.
- 518 37. Strattan LE, Britsch DRS, Calulot CM, et al. Novel influences of sex and APOE genotype
519 on spinal plasticity and recovery of function after spinal cord injury. *eNeuro* 2021; 8. DOI:
520 10.1523/ENEURO.0464-20.2021.
- 521 38. Martinez-Gonzalez NA, Sudlow CL. Effects of apolipoprotein E genotype on outcome
522 after ischaemic stroke, intracerebral haemorrhage and subarachnoid haemorrhage. *J Neurol*
523 *Neurosurg Psychiatr* 2006; 77: 1329-1335.
- 524 39. Math N, Han TS, Lubomirova I, et al. Influences of genetic variants on stroke recovery: a
525 meta-analysis of the 31,895 cases. *Neurol Sci* 2019; 40: 2437-2445.

- 526 40. Levin MF, Kleim JA, Wolf SL. What do motor "recovery" and "compensation" mean in
527 patients following stroke? *Neurorehabil Neural Repair* 2009; 23: 313-319.
- 528 41. Subramanian SK, Chilingaryan G, Sveistrup H, et al. Influence of training environment and
529 cognitive deficits on use of feedback for motor learning in chronic stroke. In: Deutsch J,
530 Wright WG, Weiss PT, eds. *Proceedings of the 2015 International Conference on Virtual
531 Rehabilitation (ICVR)*; June 9–12, 2015; Valencia, Spain. IEEE Publications. doi: 10.1109/
532 ICVR.2015.7358582
- 533 42. Liu X, Fang JC, Zhi XY, et al. The influence of val66met polymorphism in brain-derived
534 neurotrophic factor on stroke recovery outcome: A systematic review and meta-analysis.
535 *Neurorehabil Neural Repair* 2021; 35: 550-560.
- 536 43. Kotlega D, Peda B, Zembron-Lacny A, et al. The role of brain-derived neurotrophic factor
537 and its single nucleotide polymorphisms in stroke patients. *Neurol Neurochir Pol* 2017; 51:
538 240-246.
- 539 44. Veerbeek JM, van Wegen E, van Peppen R, et al. What is the evidence for physical therapy
540 poststroke? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PloS one* 2014; 9: e87987.
- 541 45. Subramanian SK, Birnbaum LA. Genetic polymorphisms negatively impact upper limb
542 motor recovery after stroke-A meta-analysis [abstract]. *Stroke* 2019; 50(Suppl_1):
543 AWP193.
- 544 46. Morton S, Barton CJ, Rice S, et al. Risk factors and successful interventions for cricket-
545 related low back pain: a systematic review. *Br J Sports Med* 2014; 48: 685-691.
- 546 47. Downs SH, Black N. The feasibility of creating a checklist for the assessment of the
547 methodological quality both of randomised and non-randomised studies of health care
548 interventions. *J Epidemiol Comm Health* 1998; 52: 377-384.

- 549 48. Subramanian SK, Caramba SM, Hernandez OL, et al. Is the Downs and Black scale a
550 better tool to appraise the quality of the studies using virtual rehabilitation for post-stroke
551 upper limb rehabilitation? In: Wright WG, Fluet GG, Subramanian SK, Agmon M, eds.
552 *Proceedings of the 2019 International Conference on Virtual Rehabilitation (ICVR)*; July
553 22–24, 2019; Tel Aviv, Israel. IEEE Publications. doi: 10.1109/ICVR46560.2019.8994724
- 554 49. O'Connor SR, Tully MA, Ryan B, et al. Failure of a numerical quality assessment scale to
555 identify potential risk of bias in a systematic review: a comparison study. *BMC Res Notes*
556 2015; 8: 224.
- 557 50. Higgins JP, Altman DG, Gotzsche PC, et al. The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for
558 assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ* 2011; 343: d5928.
- 559 51. Sterne JAC HJ, Reeves BC on behalf of the development group for ACROBAT-NRSI. A
560 Cochrane Risk Of Bias Assessment Tool: for Non-Randomized Studies of Interventions
561 (ACROBAT-NRSI), , [http://www.bristol.ac.uk/population-health-sciences/centres/cresyda/
562 barr/riskofbias/robins-i/acrobat-nrsi/](http://www.bristol.ac.uk/population-health-sciences/centres/cresyda/barr/riskofbias/robins-i/acrobat-nrsi/) (2014, accessed October 01, 2023).
- 563 52. Hedges LV, Olkin I. Combining estimates of correlation co-efficients. *Statistical methods
564 for meta-analysis*. Academic Press, Montreal, QC, 2014, pp.224-244.
- 565 53. Valentine JC, Pigott TD, Rothstein HR. How many studies do you need? A primer on
566 statistical power for meta-analysis. *J Educ Behav Stat* 2010; 35: 215-247.
- 567 54. Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, et al. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of
568 Interventions*. 2nd ed. Chichester, UK: John Wiley and Sons, 2019.
- 569 55. DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. *Control Clin Trials* 1986; 7: 177-
570 188.

- 571 56. Kinney AR, Eakman AM, Graham JE. Novel effect size interpretation guidelines and an
572 evaluation of statistical power in rehabilitation research. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2020;
573 101: 2219-2226. DOI: 10.1016/j.apmr.2020.02.017.
- 574 57. Chang WH, Bang OY, Shin Y-I, et al. BDNF polymorphism and differential rTMS effects
575 on motor recovery of stroke patients. *Brain Stimul* 2014; 7: 553-558.
- 576 58. Chang WH, Uhm KE, Shin Y-I, et al. Factors influencing the response to high-frequency
577 repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation in patients with subacute stroke. *Restor Neurol*
578 *Neurosci* 2016; 34: 747-755.
- 579 59. Kim EJ, Park CH, Chang W, et al. The brain-derived neurotrophic factor Val66Met
580 polymorphism and degeneration of the corticospinal tract after stroke: a diffusion tensor
581 imaging study. *Eur J Neurol* 2016; 23: 76-84.
- 582 60. Park E, Lee J, Chang WH, et al. Differential relationship between microstructural integrity
583 in white matter tracts and motor recovery following stroke based on brain-derived
584 neurotrophic factor genotype. *Neural Plast* 2020; 2020: 5742421. doi: 10.1155/2020/
585 5742421.
- 586 61. Shiner CT, Pierce KD, Thompson-Butel AG, et al. BDNF genotype interacts with motor
587 function to influence rehabilitation responsiveness poststroke. *Front Neurol* 2016; 7: 69.
588 doi: 10.3389/fneur.2016.00069.
- 589 62. Cramer SC, See J, Liu B, et al. Genetic Factors, Brain Atrophy, and Response to
590 Rehabilitation Therapy After Stroke. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair* 2022; 36: 131-139.
- 591 63. Liepert J, Heller A, Behnisch G, et al. Catechol-O-methyltransferase polymorphism
592 influences outcome after ischemic stroke: a prospective double-blind study. *Neurorehabil*
593 *Neural Repair* 2013; 27: 491-496.

- 594 64. Chang WH, Park E, Lee J, et al. Association between brain-derived neurotrophic factor
595 genotype and upper extremity motor outcome after stroke. *Stroke* 2017; 48: 1457-1462.
- 596 65. Kim BR, Kim HY, Chun YI, et al. Association between genetic variation in the dopamine
597 system and motor recovery after stroke. *Restor Neurol Neurosci* 2016; 34: 925-934.
- 598 66. Subramanian SK, Yamanaka J, Chilingaryan G, et al. Validity of movement pattern
599 kinematics as measures of arm motor impairment poststroke. *Stroke* 2010; 41: 2303-2308.
- 600 67. Kwakkel G, Wagenaar RC, Koelman TW, et al. Effects of intensity of rehabilitation after
601 stroke. A research synthesis. *Stroke* 1997; 28: 1550-1556.
- 602 68. Lang CE, Lohse KR, Birkenmeier RL. Dose and timing in neurorehabilitation: prescribing
603 motor therapy after stroke. *Curr Opin Neurol* 2015; 28: 549-555.
- 604 69. Page SJ, Schmid A, Harris JE. Optimizing terminology for stroke motor rehabilitation:
605 recommendations from the American Congress of Rehabilitation Medicine Stroke
606 Movement Interventions Subcommittee. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2012; 93: 1395-1399.
- 607 70. McHughen SA, Pearson-Fuhrhop K, Ngo VK, et al. Intense training overcomes effects of
608 the Val66Met BDNF polymorphism on short-term plasticity. *Exp Brain Res* 2011; 213:
609 415-422.
- 610 71. Subramanian S, Chavez M, Gonzalez EA, et al. Estimation of Task Practice Intensity in
611 Individuals with Mild Traumatic Brain Injury [abstract]. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2021;
612 102: e52-e53.
- 613 72. Cirstea MC, Ptito A, Levin MF. Arm reaching improvements with short-term practice
614 depend on the severity of the motor deficit in stroke. *Exp Brain Res* 2003; 152: 476-488.

- 615 73. Sullivan JE, Crowner BE, Kluding PM, et al. Outcome measures for individuals with
616 stroke: process and recommendations from the American Physical Therapy Association
617 neurology section task force. *Phys Ther* 2013; 93: 1383-1396. DOI: 10.2522/ptj.20120492.
- 618 74. *Rehabilitation Measures Database* [Internet]. www.sralab.org/, (2023, accessed September
619 25 2023).
- 620 75. Subramanian SK, Cross MK, Hirschhauser CS. Virtual reality interventions to enhance
621 upper limb motor improvement after a stroke: commonly used types of platform and
622 outcomes. *Disabil Rehabil Assist Technol* 2022;17:107-115.
- 623 76. Kwakkel G, Lannin NA, Borschmann K, et al. Standardized measurement of sensorimotor
624 recovery in stroke trials: Consensus-based core recommendations from the Stroke
625 Recovery and Rehabilitation Roundtable. *Int J Stroke* 2017; 12: 451-461.
- 626 77. Weech-Maldonado R. Racial-ethnic differences in nursing home rehabilitation care. In: *6th*
627 *Annual Medicaid Policy and Research Conference* 2007, pp.11-12.
- 628 78. Tay MRJ. Hospital readmission in stroke survivors one year versus three years after
629 discharge from inpatient rehabilitation: prevalence and associations in an asian cohort. *J*
630 *Rehabil Med* 2021; 53:jrm00208. doi: 10.2340/16501977-2849.
- 631 79. Song S, Liang L, Fonarow GC, et al. Comparison of clinical care and in-hospital outcomes
632 of Asian American and white patients with acute ischemic stroke. *JAMA Neurol* 2019; 76:
633 430-439.
- 634 80. Bhandari VK, Kushel M, Price L, et al. Racial disparities in outcomes of inpatient stroke
635 rehabilitation. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2005; 86: 2081-2086.

- 636 81. Shimizu E, Hashimoto K and Iyo M. Ethnic difference of the BDNF 196G/A (val66met)
637 polymorphism frequencies: the possibility to explain ethnic mental traits. *Am J Med Genet*
638 *B Neuropsychiatr Genet* 2004; 126B: 122-123.
- 639 82. Domschke K, Deckert J, O'donovan MC, et al. Meta-analysis of COMT val158met in panic
640 disorder: Ethnic heterogeneity and gender specificity. *Am J Med Genet B Neuropsychiatr*
641 *Genet* 2007; 144: 667-673.
- 642 83. Kumar A, Kumar P, Prasad M, et al. Association between apolipoprotein ε4 gene
643 polymorphism and risk of ischemic stroke: a meta-analysis. *Ann Neurosci* 2016; 23: 113-
644 121.
- 645 84. Zhao F, Yue Y, Jiang H, et al. Shared genetic risk factors for depression and stroke. *Prog*
646 *Neuropsychopharmacol Biol Psychiatry* 2019; 93: 55-70.
- 647

648 Figure legends

649

650 Figure 1. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) flow
651 diagram.

652

653 Figure 2. Results of meta-analyses examining influence of genetic polymorphisms on upper limb
654 motor impairment quantified using the Fugl-Meyer Assessment, at the end of the intervention
655 period. Larger squares indicate bigger study effect sizes. The diamonds represent pooled effects
656 of results of individual studies. The location of the diamond indicates the estimated effect size
657 and precision of the estimate is indicated by the width of the diamond

658

659 Figure 3. Results of meta-analyses examining influence of genetic polymorphisms on upper limb
660 motor impairment quantified using the Fugl-Meyer Assessment, at retention testing. Larger
661 squares indicate bigger study effect sizes. The diamonds represent pooled effects of results of
662 individual studies. The location of the diamond indicates the estimated effect size and precision
663 of the estimate is indicated by the width of the diamond.

664

665 Figure 4. Results of sensitivity analysis (meta-analyses) examining influence of genetic
666 polymorphisms on upper limb motor impairment quantified using the Fugl-Meyer Assessment, at
667 the end of the intervention. Larger squares indicate bigger study effect sizes. The diamonds
668 represent pooled effects of results of individual studies. The location of the diamond indicates
669 the estimated effect size and precision of the estimate is indicated by the width of the diamond.

Table 1 Effect of BDNF polymorphism

Study; Sample size (n); Val/Val and Met Allele distribution and Down's and Black score	Intervention	Rehabilitation provided/ Dose	Outcomes and timing of assessment	Results
<p>Chang et al. 2014; n = 44;</p> <p>Val/Val: n=9; Met allele: n = 35 DBS: 19 (Good)</p>	<p>10 sessions of rTMS over two weeks.</p> <p>Each session had 50 trains of 10 Hz frequency for 5 seconds at 90% RMT</p>	<p>Each train of rTMS was followed by 50 seconds of reaching and grasping exercises.</p> <p>Active and active assisted exercises consisting of range of motion exercises, moving, and grasping and releasing cups and cubes.</p> <p>All participants also received conventional physical (PT) and occupational therapy (OT) sessions, involving gait, fitness, and ADL training for 3 hours each day.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upper and lower limb Fugl-Meyer Assessment (FMA) scores • Box and Blocks test (BBT). <p>Assessments conducted at baseline, end of the intervention and 2-month retention.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>FMA</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UL: Greater change seen in Val/Val group at post (10 points) and retention (23 points) compared to Met alleles (4 and 11 points) respectively (p<0.05). • LL: Both groups improved at both assessments with no between group difference. <p style="text-align: center;"><u>BBT:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater change seen in Val/Val group (16 blocks) compared to Met alleles (6 blocks; p<0.05) at retention.
<p>Chang et al 2016; n = 62;</p> <p>Val/Val: n=12 Met allele; n= 50 DBS: 18 (fair)</p>	<p>10 sessions of rTMS over two weeks.</p> <p>Each session had 20 trains of 50 stimuli of 10 Hz frequency at 90% RMT</p>	<p>Each train of rTMS was followed by 50 seconds of reaching and grasping exercises.</p> <p>All participants also received conventional PT and OT sessions, involving gait, fitness, and ADL training for 3 hours each day.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upper and lower limb and total FMA scores • Degree of preserved Corticospinal tract (CST) integrity quantified by Diffusion tensor imaging and presence/absence of MEP in the FDI muscle. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20 participants were good responders and 42 were poor responders. • Greater proportion of good responders had Val/Val genotype (35%) compared to poor responders (11%). • Those with Val/Val genotype had significantly higher change in UL FMA scores (13.7 points) compared to Met alleles (1 point)

			<p>Assessments conducted at baseline and end of the intervention.</p> <p>Patients classified as good or poor responders depending upon the amount of change in UL FMA scores: good responders (≥ 5 points); poor responders (≤ 4 points)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individuals with Val/Val genotype almost twice more likely to have better improvement than those with Met alleles.
<p>Kim et al. 2016a n = 35;</p> <p>Val/Val: n=10 Met allele; n= 25 DBS: 17 (Fair)</p>	No details provided	No information provided	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UL FMA scores • Values of fractional anisotropy (FA), axial diffusivity (AD) and radial diffusivity (RD) for CST. <p>Assessments conducted at baseline, T1 (1 month after baseline) and T3 (3 months after baseline)</p>	<p><i>UL FMA scores</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater change in the <i>Val/Val</i> group at T2 (7 points) and T3 (17 points) compared to the <i>Met</i> group (4 and 12 points respectively). • Moderate positive correlation with FA Values at T1 ($r = 0.78$) and T2 ($r = 0.72$) for the <i>Val/Val</i> group and at T3 ($r = 0.59$) for the <i>Met</i> group • Moderate positive correlation with AD scores at T1 ($r = 0.78$) and T2 ($r = 0.72$) for the <i>Val/Val</i> group. • Moderate negative correlation with RD Values scores at T3 ($r = -0.59$) for the <i>Met</i> group.
<p>Kim et al. 2016b n = 42;</p> <p>Val/Val: n=26 Met allele; n= 16 DBS: 16 (Fair)</p>	Robotic therapy spread over 2-3 weeks.	<p>Therapy consisted of repeated grasp and release movements of the affected hand and wrist.</p> <p>Participants wore a Hand Wrist Assistive Rehabilitation Device and practiced tasks with real objects as well as virtual reality games (e.g.,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UL FMA scores • Values of percentage change on fMRI signals and activation volume obtained from the ipsi- and contralesional primary sensorimotor cortex 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No difference in change in UL FMA scores between the <i>Val/Val</i> group at T2 (2.1 points) and the <i>Met</i> group (3.2 points) at the end of therapy. • However, the <i>Val/Val</i> group had greater percentage signal change ($p = 0.037$) and activation volume ($p = 0.03$) in the ipsilesional primary

		<p>squeezing lemons, moving jewels into a safe, etc.)</p> <p>Tasks focusing on speed, reaction time, force, and range of motion were also practiced.</p>	<p>and dorsal premotor cortex using fMRI.</p> <p>Assessments conducted at baseline, T1 (end of therapy)</p>	<p>sensorimotor cortex compared to the those in the Met group.</p>
<p>Shiner et al. 2016 n = 54; Val/Val: n=27 Met allele: n=27 DBS: 19 (Fair)</p>	<p>Wii based movement therapy (n=40) or modified constraint induced movement therapy (mCIMT, n=14).</p>	<p>10 one-hour long sessions on consecutive weekdays.</p> <p>Sessions targeted movements of the more-affected hand and arm.</p> <p>The Wii group played golf, bowling, baseball, boxing, and tennis using the controller in the more-affected arm.</p> <p>mCIMT group received task-based training on object manipulation focusing on movement speed.</p> <p>Individuals classified into those with low (inability to move >1 block on BBT), moderate (inability to complete Perdue Pegboard Test) and high (ability to complete Perdue Pegboard Test) functional ability.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upper limb FMA • Wolf Motor Function Test - timed task (WMFT- tt) • Motor Activity Log Quality of Movement (MAL-QoM) scores. <p>Assessments conducted at baseline and at the end of the intervention.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All participants improved on FMA, WMFT -TT and MALQoM scores at the end of the interventions. • Overall, no difference in amount of change in FMA, WMFT-tt and MAL-QoM scores between those with Val/Val and Met alleles. • However, subgroup analysis revealed <i>less change</i> in those with Met alleles and moderate (8.9%) or high (13.8%) functional ability on WMFT-tt scores compared to those with Val/Val (25.2% and 37.3% respectively). • Similar results were seen on FMA Values <i>less change</i> in those with Met alleles and moderate (7%) or high (2%) functional ability compared to those with Val/Val (10% and 4% respectively).
<p>Chang et al. 2017; n = 97; Val/Val: n=21 Met allele: n=76</p>	<p>Traditional inpatient rehabilitation</p>	<p>Traditional inpatient (2 hrs PT, 1 hr OT) followed by outpatient rehab (1 hr PT, 30 mins OT) or home exs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upper limb FMA scores. <p>Assessments conducted at baseline and T1 (after 3 months).</p>	<p><i>Individuals with normal FMA scores or mild and moderate impairment</i></p>

<p>DBS: 14 (Fair)</p>			<p>Participants classified into 4 categories based upon FMA scores at T1: normal: 66, mild impairment (41–65), moderate impairment (25–40), and severe 0–24).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline FMA scores explained 47% of variance in FMA scores at T1 <p><i>Individuals with severe motor impairment</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A combination of presence of Met alleles, baseline FMA scores and age explained 59.5% of the variance in FMA scores at T1. Individuals with Met alleles were <i>1.48 times less likely</i> to have better scores on the UL FMA. • Smaller proportion of individuals with two (10%) or one Met allele (31%) recovered significantly at T1 compared to those with Val/Val genotype (42.9%). • Significant correlation between number of Met alleles and FMA score at T1 ($\rho = -0.248$, $p < 0.05$).
<p>Park et al. 2020; DBS: n = 58; Val/Val: n=17 Met allele: n=41 17 (Fair)</p>	<p>Traditional inpatient rehabilitation</p>	<p>All participants received the same dose of PT and OT (3-week intensive inpatient rehabilitation).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upper limb FMA scores. • FA Values for CST, intrahemispheric connection from M1 to the ventral premotor cortex and corpus callosum (CC). <p>Assessments conducted at baseline and T2 (after 3 months).</p>	<p><i>UL FMA scores</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similar mean change seen in UL FMA scores in those with Val/Val (12.6 points) and Met alleles (13.8 points) at T2. • <i>In the Val/Val group</i>, moderate negative correlation with FA in contralesional intrahemispheric connection from M1 to the ventral premotor cortex at T2 ($r = -0.60$; $p = 0.024$).

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>In those with Met alleles</i>, moderate positive correlation with FA in the in the ipsilesional CST ($r=0.47$; $p=0.003$) and FA in the CC ($r=0.41$, $p=0.011$).
<p>Cramer et al 2022; n = 206;</p> <p>Val/Val: n = 166; Met allele: n = 40</p> <p>DBS: 21 (Good)</p>	<p>Task Oriented upper extremity training or OT</p>	<p>Participants were randomized to 30 hrs each of task-oriented upper extremity training (Accelerated Skill Acquisition Program), dose-equivalent occupational therapy, or standard of care.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change in Log WMFT-tt. • Cerebral atrophy measured using ventricular brain ratio. <p>Assessments carried out at baseline and at end of 12 months</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall, no difference in amount of change in Log WMFT-tt scores between individuals with Met alleles compared to those with Val/Val genotype. • Greater cerebral atrophy ($p<0.01$) seen in individuals with Met alleles compared to those with Val/Val genotype. • This enlargement was caused primarily by an enlargement in ventricular volume ($p=0.0098$).

ADL: Activities of Daily Living ;DBS: Downs and Black Checklist Score; FDI: Flexor Digitorum Indicis; fMRI: Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging; MEP: Motor Evoked Potential; rTMS: Repetitive Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation; RMT: Resting Motor Threshold.

Table 2 Effect of APOE and COMT polymorphism

Study; Sample size (n); distribution and Down's and Black score	Intervention	Rehabilitation provided/ Dose	Outcomes and timing of assessment	Results
<i>A. Effects of APOE polymorphism</i>				
<p>Shiner et al. 2016; n = 54; $\epsilon 4$: n = 9; non $\epsilon 4$: n = 45 DBS: 19 (Good)</p>	<p>Wii based movement therapy (n=40) or modified constraint induced movement therapy (mCIMT, n=14).</p>	<p>10 one-hour long sessions on consecutive weekdays. Sessions targeted movements of the more-affected hand and arm. The Wii group played golf, bowling, baseball, boxing, and tennis using the controller in the more-affected arm. mCIMT group received task-based training on object manipulation focusing on movement speed. Individuals classified into those with low (inability to move >1 block on BBT), moderate (inability to complete Perdue Pegboard Test) and high (ability to complete Perdue Pegboard Test) functional ability.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upper limb FMA • Wolf Motor Function Test - timed task (WMFT- tt) • Motor Activity Log Quality of Movement (MAL-QoM) scores. <p>Assessments conducted at baseline and post-intervention.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All participants improved on FMA, WMFT-TT and MALQoM scores at the end of the interventions. • Overall, no difference in amount of change in FMA and MAL-QoM scores between $\epsilon 4$ carriers and those with non $\epsilon 4$ genotype. • $\epsilon 4$ carriers tended to take longer to complete ADL activities (WMFT-tt, p = 0.057) compared to those with non $\epsilon 4$ genotype.
<p>Cramer et al 2022; n = 206; $\epsilon 4$: n = 61; non $\epsilon 4$: n = 145 DBS: 21 (Good)</p>	<p>Task Oriented upper extremity training or Occupational therapy</p>	<p>Patients were randomized to 30 h each of task-oriented upper extremity training (Accelerated Skill Acquisition Program), dose-equivalent occupational therapy, or standard of care.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change in Log WMFT-tt. • Cerebral atrophy measured using ventricular brain ratio. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall, no difference in amount of change in Log WMFT-tt scores between $\epsilon 4$ carriers and those with non $\epsilon 4$ genotype. • No differences seen in cerebral atrophy between individuals with and without the polymorphism.

			Assessments carried out at baseline and at end of 12 months.	
<i>B. Effects of COMT polymorphism</i>				
Liepert et al. 2013; n = 83, val/val = 12, met allele: 71 DBS: 19 (Good)	Traditional Rehabilitation	Rehabilitation program included PT, OT, endurance, and strength training. Program was adapted to individual needs of the patient. Details unavailable on total duration of therapy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rivermead Motor Assessment (RMA) and Barthel Index (BI) scores. RMA scores divided into Gross Function, Leg and trunk and Upper limb function. <p>Assessments carried out at baseline, 4 weeks later and at the end of 6 months.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>RMA scores</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individuals with two met alleles showed less improvement in <i>gross function</i> ($p = 0.003$), <i>leg and trunk function</i> ($p = 0.022$) as well as <i>upper limb function</i> ($p = 0.047$). Significant correlation with BI scores at all time points ($p < 0.001$).
Kim et al. 2016 n = 74, val/val = 41, met allele = 33 DBS = 15 (fair)	No details provided	No details provided.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total Fugl-Meyer Assessment (FMA) and Functional Independence Measure (FIM) total scores. <p>Assessments carried out at hospital admission, discharge 3- and 6-mos. post- discharge.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>FMA scores</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower scores at discharge, 3-mos and 6 mos post discharge assessments in those with met alleles ($p < 0.01$) compared to the Val heterozygous group. <p style="text-align: center;"><i>FIM scores</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower scores at discharge ($p < 0.01$), 3-mos and 6 mos post discharge ($p < 0.05$) assessments in those with met alleles compared to the Val heterozygous group.

DBS: Downs and Black Checklist Score; OT: Occupational Therapy; PT: Physical Therapy;

Identification of studies via databases and registers

Identification

Records identified from PubMed (n = 119) and Google Scholar: (n = 200)

Records removed *before screening*:
Duplicate records removed (n = 192)

Screening

Records screened (n = 187)

Records excluded (n = 16)
*Reasons for exclusion:
Studies including healthy participants (n = 3), other conditions (including TBI, Myasthenia Gravis, CoViD, Cardiovascular diseases, Schizophrenia, Diabetes, Cerebral palsy, Neuro- developmental Disorders; n = 13)

Reports sought for retrieval (n = 116)

Reports not retrieved (n = 85)
(Reviews = 13,
No inclusion of rehabilitation/
clinical outcomes: 72)

Reports assessed for eligibility (n = 31)

Reports excluded: 21
• Global Rehabilitation outcomes such as BI, NIHSS and/or mRS: (n = 17)
• Gait outcomes: (n = 4)

Included

Studies included in the qualitative review (n = 10) and quantitative analyses (n = 6)



