

# The detrimental effect of stroke on motor adaptation

Sabrina J. Abram<sup>1,2,\*</sup>, Jonathan S. Tsay<sup>3,\*</sup>, Heran Yosef<sup>4</sup>,  
Darcy S. Reisman<sup>4</sup>, and Hyosub E. Kim<sup>4,5,6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Psychology, University of California, Berkeley

<sup>2</sup> Helen Wills Neuroscience Institute, University of California, Berkeley

<sup>3</sup> Department of Psychology, Carnegie Mellon University

<sup>4</sup> Department of Physical Therapy, University of Delaware

<sup>5</sup> School of Kinesiology, University of British Columbia

<sup>6</sup> Graduate Program in Neuroscience, University of British Columbia

\*These authors contributed equally to this work.

Correspondence: Sabrina Abram, Jonathan Tsay

Email: [abramsabrina@berkeley.edu](mailto:abramsabrina@berkeley.edu), [jtsay2@andrew.cmu.edu](mailto:jtsay2@andrew.cmu.edu)

## Abstract

*Background.* While it is evident that stroke impairs motor control, it remains unclear whether stroke impacts motor adaptation—the ability to flexibly modify movements in response to changes in the body and the environment. The mixed results in the literature may be due to differences in participants’ brain lesions, sensorimotor tasks, or a combination of both. *Objective.* We first sought to better understand the overall impact of stroke on motor adaptation and then delineated the impact of lesion hemisphere and sensorimotor task on adaptation poststroke. *Methods.* Following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines, we conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis of 17 studies comparing individuals poststroke to neurotypical controls, with each group consisting of over 200 participants. *Results.* We found that stroke impairs motor adaptation ( $d = -0.64$ ; 95% CI  $[-1.06, -0.22]$ ), and that the extent of this impairment did not differ across sensorimotor tasks but may vary with the lesioned hemisphere. Specifically, we observed greater evidence for impaired adaptation in individuals with left hemisphere lesions compared to those with right hemisphere lesions. *Conclusions.* This review not only clarifies the detrimental effect of stroke on motor adaptation but also underscores the need for finer-grained studies to determine precisely how various sensorimotor learning mechanisms are impacted. The current findings may guide future mechanistic and applied research at the intersection of motor learning and neurorehabilitation.

## Keywords

stroke; motor control; motor adaptation; motor impairment; systematic review; meta-analysis

## 32 **Introduction**

33 It is indisputable that stroke impairs motor control, as evidenced by symptoms like hemiparesis, rigidity,  
34 and loss of independent joint control.<sup>1-10</sup> However, it is still unclear whether stroke impairs motor adapta-  
35 tion, the ability to flexibly respond to changes in the body (e.g., muscle fatigue) and the environment (e.g.,  
36 walking on uneven terrain). The results of studies examining motor adaptation in individuals poststroke are  
37 mixed, with some finding impaired adaptation,<sup>11</sup> while others have found no impairments.<sup>12</sup>

38 These mixed results may be due to the heterogeneity of lesion locations, experimental tasks, or a combina-  
39 tion of both. Given that the right and left hemispheres appear to contribute differently to cognition<sup>13</sup> and  
40 motor control,<sup>14</sup> they may also be differentially involved in adaptation. Indeed, there is evidence pointing  
41 towards the selective involvement of the left hemisphere in adaptation.<sup>15</sup> And given that different experi-  
42 mental tasks may rely on different mechanisms,<sup>16</sup> the impact of a stroke may also differ between tasks that  
43 involve the upper limb (e.g., visuomotor adaptation) and those that involve the lower limb (e.g., split-belt  
44 adaptation). The time is ripe to comprehensively evaluate how the lesioned hemisphere and experimental  
45 task affect motor adaptation outcomes poststroke.

46 Here, we performed a meta-analysis to gain a better understanding of the effect of stroke on motor adapta-  
47 tion. By synthesizing adaptation behavior across 17 studies involving over 200 individuals poststroke, we  
48 determined the degree to which stroke impairs adaptation. By conducting subgroup analyses, we determined  
49 whether the level of impairment was influenced by lesion hemisphere and experimental task. Together,  
50 these findings may guide future mechanistic and applied research at the intersection of motor learning and  
51 neurorehabilitation.

## 52 **Methods**


53 **Study selection criteria.** We defined four criteria for determining whether studies were included in this  
54 meta-analysis: (1) studies included data from individuals poststroke as well as age-matched neurotypical  
55 controls; (2) outcome measures included those associated with motor adaptation; (3) measures of adaptation  
56 were collected during the perturbation block, and preferably, immediately after the perturbation was re-  
57 moved; and (4) studies were written in English. At every stage of this systematic review, we adhered to the  
58 Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines.<sup>17</sup>

59 **Article screening.** We identified and screened articles from several large databases including the Associa-  
60 tion for Computing Machinery Digital Library (ACM), the Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health

61 Literature (CINAHL), the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), ProQuest, Pub-  
62 Med, and Scopus (Figure 1). We used the following search terms: implicit OR explicit OR upper extremity  
63 OR lower extremity OR paretic OR non-paretic OR dominant OR non-dominant OR subcortical OR cortical  
64 OR cortex AND motor learning AND stroke. For studies that involved the lower extremity, we narrowed  
65 our inclusion criteria to focus specifically on the most common task: split-belt walking. We also solicited  
66 articles from social media, tables of contents from relevant journals (e.g., NNR), and citations from related  
67 systematic reviews.<sup>18,19</sup>

68 We included 20 datasets from 17 studies in our meta-analysis (Figure 1). We identified 8236 studies using  
69 the search terms in the above databases and sources. Two authors removed 952 articles that were duplicates  
70 and an additional 7240 articles based on the title and abstract. All authors then independently inspected the  
71 full text of 44 remaining articles based on our four eligibility criteria and agreed upon which articles should  
72 be included. We removed one study that did not have full text available, three that did not include age-  
73 matched neurotypical participants, two that were not written in English, and 21 that were outside the scope  
74 of motor adaptation. Of the 17 remaining studies, 15 were published in peer-reviewed journals and two  
75 were unpublished datasets. All data used for this meta-analysis are available on OSF (<https://osf.io/gfmdr/>).

76 From the 20 eligible datasets, we extracted the following: 1) sample size and average age of patients and  
77 controls; 2) lesion hemisphere and lesion location; 3) whether the intact limb or paretic limb was used in  
78 the behavioral task; and 4) motor adaptation, that is, the adaptive changes in behavior either during the  
79 perturbation block or the aftereffect block immediately after the perturbation was removed. We outline  
80 below how we standardized motor adaptation outcomes. In total, there were 247 participants with stroke  
81 and 208 controls. The sample sizes for independent datasets were relatively small (stroke:  $n = 2-27$ ; control:  
82  $n = 5-31$ ), further motivating a meta-analysis approach to synthesize data across the literature.



83

84 **Figure 1.** PRISMA flow diagram describing the study inclusion process of the systematic review. We identified 17 studies, resulting in 20 total datasets, that fulfilled our eligibility criteria.

86 **Data synthesis and analysis.** We analyzed a range of motor adaptation tasks including those that involved saccades, reaching, and walking. In reaching tasks, there were three types of paradigms that varied in the nature of the perturbation: in visuomotor rotation tasks, the participants reached to a visual target and received feedback in the form of a visual cursor whose radial distance was matched to the hand but angular distance rotated with respect to the hand (green; Figure 2A);<sup>20–25</sup> in visuomotor gain tasks, the visual cursor was perturbed along the radial dimension, while the angular distance was matched to that of the hand (red; Figure 2A);<sup>26</sup> and in force field adaptation tasks, the participants reached to a target with a robot arm applying forces to the hand (orange; Figure 2A).<sup>27</sup> In saccade adaptation tasks, the participants made goal-directed eye movements to targets, where the position of the target jumped immediately upon saccade initiation (yellow; Figure 2B).<sup>28,29</sup> In gait adaptation tasks, the participants walked on a split-belt treadmill with the left and right legs moving at different speeds (purple; Figure 2C).<sup>11,12,30–34</sup>

97 Despite these differences in movements and perturbations, these tasks can be used to study motor adaptation. Mechanistically, the introduction of a perturbation causes sensory prediction errors, that is, a mismatch

99 between predicted and actual sensory outcomes of a movement. In visuomotor rotation tasks, for example,  
 100 the sensory prediction errors are elicited by a discrepancy between the predicted cursor position and the  
 101 actual cursor position. With experience, people learn to iteratively reduce this error by reaching away from  
 102 the target in the direction opposite to the perturbation. When the perturbation is removed, there are often  
 103 residual aftereffects in the same direction as learning. Given that motor adaptation refers to changes in  
 104 feedforward control (i.e., how future movements are planned and executed), aftereffects are often regarded  
 105 as the key signature of learning since it is not influenced by online feedback corrections made during the  
 106 movement itself.

107 We focused our meta-analysis on two possible time points: late adaptation (i.e., towards the end of the  
 108 perturbation block) or aftereffects (i.e., immediately after the removal of the perturbation). Of the 20 da-  
 109 taset included in this meta-analysis, 4 measured adaptation only during the perturbation block whereas 16  
 110 measured both adaptation during the perturbation block and aftereffects (Figure 2D). We standardized  
 111 measures across datasets with different dependent variables (e.g., hand angle, step length asymmetry, and  
 112 saccade amplitude) by using the mean and standard deviation for patients and controls to calculate Cohen's  
 113  $d$  and 95% confidence intervals (CI). If the mean and standard deviation were not reported, we either used  
 114 F- or t-statistics that compared performance between groups,<sup>35</sup> or estimated these values using the GRABIT  
 115 software (Doke, MATLAB Central File Exchange). If a study grouped participants into different categories  
 116 (e.g., mild, moderate, and severe impairment), we estimated the combined mean and standard deviation.  
 117 For example, in the case of two groups, we used the following equations:

$$118 \quad \mu_c = \frac{(n_1\mu_1+n_2\mu_2)}{(n_1+n_2)} \quad (1)$$


$$119 \quad \sigma_c = \sqrt{\frac{((n_1-1)\sigma_1^2+n_1\mu_1^2+(n_2-1)\sigma_2^2+n_2\mu_2^2-(n_1+n_2)\mu_c^2)}{(n_1+n_2-1)}} \quad (2)$$

120 Where  $n$  is the sample size,  $\mu$  is the mean,  $\sigma$  is the standard deviation, a subscript of  $c$  represents the  
 121 combined value, and subscripts of 1 or 2 represent the values for individual groups. We validated this  
 122 method against simulated data.

123 We calculated the overall effect size using a random effects model, where the contribution of each dataset  
 124 was weighted by the sample size and uncertainty in the effect size. We interpreted effect sizes less than 0.2  
 125 as small, between 0.2 and 0.8 as medium, and greater than 0.8 as large, and defined the significance level  
 126 as  $\alpha = 0.05$ .<sup>36</sup> To assess the heterogeneity or variability in effect sizes between datasets, we calculated the  
 127 Q value, which compares the weighted effect sizes to the overall effect size. Smaller Q values indicate less

128 variance, while larger Q values indicate more variance. To determine whether this variability is greater than  
129 that expected by chance, we used Cochran's Q test, which compares the calculated Q value to a chi-squared  
130 distribution with degrees of freedom equal to the number of datasets minus one. A significant result ( $p <$   
131  $0.05$ ) indicates heterogeneity among effect sizes, meaning the datasets are not consistent with each other.  
132 All statistical analyses were performed using R and RStudio (code available at <https://osf.io/gfmdr/>).

133 **Subgroup analyses.** We conducted subgroup analyses related to two covariates: lesion hemisphere and  
134 experimental task (Figure 2D). To determine the effect of lesion hemisphere, we compared the five datasets  
135 that tested individuals with unilateral stroke in the left hemisphere ( $n = 43$ ) to the five datasets that tested  
136 individuals with unilateral stroke in the right hemisphere ( $n = 30$ ). This analysis did not include datasets  
137 that combined individuals with left and right hemisphere stroke ( $n = 174$ ). Note that the Wood et al. 2023  
138 study did not intend to compare laterality differences. However, given that each participant with stroke was  
139 yoked to an age-matched control and we had this information as well as information regarding the affected  
140 hemisphere for each participant, we chose to include these data in this analysis. Next, to determine the  
141 effect of experimental tasks, we compared nine visuomotor rotation datasets ( $n = 87$ ) with seven split-belt  
142 walking datasets ( $n = 125$ ), as these two tasks made up the majority of datasets. We also conducted subgroup  
143 analyses only in cases where there were four or more datasets. When testing for differences between sub-  
144 groups, we applied the same approach as when testing for differences between individual datasets. That is,  
145 we calculated the Q value comparing the subgroup effect sizes to the overall effect size. To determine  
146 whether variability between subgroups (left vs. right hemisphere lesions or visuomotor rotation vs. split-  
147 belt walking tasks) is greater than chance, we used Cochran's Q test with degrees of freedom equal to the  
148 number of subgroups minus one.



Reference	N <sub>PT</sub>	N <sub>CT</sub>	Lesion side and location	Effector	Outcome	Reference	N <sub>PT</sub>	N <sub>CT</sub>	Lesion side and location	Effector	Outcome
Mutha et al (2011a)	10	10	L R frontal and parietal regions	ipsilesional	aftereffect	Tyrell et al (2014)	16	16	L R multiple regions	paretic	adaptation
Mutha et al (2011a)	10	10	L R frontal and parietal regions	ipsilesional	aftereffect	Reisman et al (2007)	13	13	L R multiple regions	paretic	aftereffect
Mutha et al (2011b)	5	7	L R parietal regions	contralesional	aftereffect	Malone and Bastian (2014)	22	7	L R cerebellum	paretic	aftereffect
Mutha et al (2011b)	5	7	L R parietal regions	contralesional	aftereffect	de Kam et al (2020)	14	14	L R cerebrum	paretic	aftereffect
Taylor and Ivry (2014)	10	9	L R prefrontal cortex	both	aftereffect	Hirata et al (2019)	22	9	L R multiple regions	paretic	adaptation
Taylor and Ivry (2009)	10	10	L R prefrontal cortex	ipsilesional	aftereffect	Lauziere et al (2014)	20	10	L R multiple regions	paretic	aftereffect
Schaefer et al (2009)	5	7	L R multiple regions	ipsilesional	aftereffect	Wood et al (2023)	18	18	L R multiple regions	paretic	aftereffect
Schaefer et al (2009)	5	7	L R multiple regions	ipsilesional	aftereffect	Scheidt and Stoeckmann (2007)	11	6	L R multiple regions	ipsilesional	aftereffect
Binyamin-Netser et al (2023)	27	31	L R multiple regions	ipsilesional	adaptation	Panouillères et al (2013)	9	6	L R multiple regions	ipsilesional	aftereffect
Palluel-Germain et al (2011)	13	5	L R left hemisphere	ipsilesional	adaptation	Alahyane et al (2008)	2	6	L R cerebellum	ipsilesional	aftereffect


Patients (PT)  
Controls (CT)

149

150 **Figure 2.** Overview of datasets included in this meta-analysis. Schematic of motor adaptation tasks involv-  
 151 ing (A) reaching, (B) saccades, and (C) walking. (D) The number of patients (PT) and controls (CT), lesion  
 152 side and location, limb used by participants poststroke (effector), and outcome measure for each dataset.  
 153 Darker shading indicates lesion hemisphere (left, right, or both, meaning that the dataset includes individ-  
 154 uals with both left and right hemisphere lesions), limb used (contralesional, ipsilesional, or both), and out-  
 155 come measure (late adaptation or aftereffect).

156 **Results**


157 **The detrimental effect of stroke on motor adaptation.** Across 20 datasets, motor adaptation was impaired  
 158 in individuals poststroke compared to age-matched neurotypical controls ( $d = -0.64$ ; 95% CI  $[-1.06, -0.22]$ ;  
 159  $t_{19} = -3.20$ ;  $p = 0.0047$ ; Figure 3A and 3B). To test the reliability of this finding, we repeated this analysis  
 160 after excluding one outlier (Lauziere et al. 2014) and again found that motor adaptation was impaired in  
 161 individuals poststroke ( $d = -0.49$ ; 95% CI  $[-0.74, -0.25]$ ;  $t_{18} = -4.25$ ;  $p = 0.00048$ ). We next repeated this  
 162 analysis for late adaptation, taking into consideration that, in some paradigms (i.e., split-belt adaptation),  
 163 the aftereffect measurement may depend on the initial perturbation, the magnitude of which is not always  
 164 the same in stroke patients and controls. We found that late adaptation was also impaired in individuals  
 165 poststroke ( $d = -0.44$ ; 95% CI  $[-0.85, -0.029]$ ;  $t_{19} = -2.24$ ;  $p = 0.037$ ; Figure S1A and S1B). Lastly, we found  
 166 that effect sizes varied across these 20 datasets with  $I^2 = 62.4\%$  (heterogeneity based on  $\chi^2$ :  $Q_{19} = 50.54$ ;  $p$   
 167  $= 1.09 \times 10^{-4}$ ), further motivating our subgroup analyses.



168  
 169 **Figure 3.** Stroke impairs motor adaptation. **A.** Forest plot comparing the performance of individuals post-  
 170 stroke to neurotypical controls, where negative values indicate greater adaptation in controls (i.e., impaired  
 171 adaptation poststroke). The overall effect size is indicated by the blue dashed line, and the 95% confidence  
 172 interval is indicated by the blue shading. Each circle represents a single dataset with its size indicating the  
 173 weight assigned to that dataset in the random-effects model. Whiskers represent the 95% confidence inter-  
 174 vals. **B.** Violin plot displaying the distribution of effect sizes. Each blue dot represents a single dataset, the  
 175 black dot represents the mean across datasets, and the black whiskers represent the standard error.




176 **The impact of experimental tasks on measures of motor adaptation poststroke.** We did not find any  
 177 significant differences in motor adaptation poststroke between visuomotor rotation and split-belt walking  
 178 tasks ( $Q_1 = 0.39$ ;  $p = 0.53$ ), suggesting that differences between tasks are not the underlying driver of mixed  
 179 results in the literature. When examining each task in isolation, the results were less robust as compared to  
 180 our analysis of all tasks combined. However, we still observed medium-to-large effect sizes related to the  
 181 negative impact of stroke on adaptation in both visuomotor rotation ( $d = -0.56$ ; 95% CI [-1.14, +0.019];  $t_8$   
 182  $= -2.23$ ;  $p = 0.056$ ; Figure 4A and 4B) and split-belt walking ( $d = -0.90$ ; 95% CI [-2.08, +0.28];  $t_6 = -1.87$ ;  
 183  $p = 0.11$ ; Figure 4A and 4B) tasks.



184  
 185 **Figure 4.** Minimal impact of experimental tasks on motor adaptation poststroke. **A.** We assigned subgroups  
 186 based on whether datasets used visuomotor rotation or split-belt walking tasks and then compared perfor-  
 187 mance of individuals poststroke to controls in each subgroup. The effect size for each subgroup (purple for  
 188 visuomotor rotation and green for split-belt walking) is indicated by the dashed line and 95% confidence  
 189 intervals by the shading. Each circle represents a single dataset with its size indicating its weight and whisk-  
 190 ers representing 95% confidence intervals. **B.** Violin plot comparing the distribution of effect sizes between  
 191 datasets using visuomotor rotation (purple) and split-belt walking (green). The black dot represents the  
 192 mean value for each subgroup and the black whiskers represent the standard error.

193 **The impact of lesion hemisphere on measures of motor adaptation poststroke.** While nearly all studies  
 194 in this meta-analysis tested individuals with unilateral stroke, many did not examine the impact of lesion  
 195 hemisphere on motor adaptation (i.e., left vs. right hemisphere lesions). When we examined datasets that

196 did report the lesioned hemisphere and provide corresponding results, we found that motor adaptation was  
 197 selectively impaired in individuals with left hemisphere lesions ( $d = -0.79$ ; 95% CI  $[-1.61, +0.027]$ ,  $t_4 = -$   
 198  $2.69$ ,  $p = 0.055$ ; Figure 5A and 5B) but intact in individuals with right hemisphere lesions ( $d = -0.14$ ; 95%  
 199 CI  $[-1.14, +0.86]$ ,  $t_4 = -0.39$ ,  $p = 0.71$ ; Figure 5A and 5B). When we performed a direct comparison of  
 200 motor adaptation with left vs. right hemisphere lesions, we observed an effect of hemisphere ( $d = -1.11$ ;  
 201 95% CI  $[-2.68, 0.45]$ ), albeit one that was not robust ( $Q_1 = 1.97$ ,  $p = 0.16$ ). One reason for this lack of  
 202 robustness may be low statistical power with only five datasets in each group. Another reason may be that  
 203 other covariates, such as brain regions within each hemisphere and the limb used during the task, influenced  
 204 adaptation measures (see Discussion). Despite these caveats, these results hint toward the left hemisphere  
 205 being a neural locus for motor adaptation.



206  
 207 **Figure 5.** Motor adaptation is impaired in individuals with left hemisphere lesions but intact in individuals  
 208 with right hemisphere lesions. **A.** Subgroups were assigned based on whether datasets compared motor  
 209 adaptation between individuals with left hemisphere lesions or right hemisphere lesions against controls.  
 210 The effect size for each subgroup (red for left hemisphere and orange for right hemisphere) is indicated by  
 211 the dashed line and 95% confidence intervals by the shading. Each circle represents a single dataset with  
 212 its size indicating its weight and whiskers representing 95% confidence intervals. **B.** Violin plot comparing  
 213 the distribution of effect sizes between datasets examining left hemisphere lesions (red) and right hemi-  
 214 sphere lesions (orange). The black dot represents the mean value for each subgroup and the black whiskers  
 215 represent the standard error.

## 216 **Discussion**

217 We conducted a comprehensive review to examine the impact of stroke on motor adaptation. By synthesiz-  
218 ing 20 datasets involving over 200 individuals poststroke, we found that motor adaptation was impaired in  
219 individuals poststroke compared to neurotypical controls. Notably, impairments in motor adaptation were  
220 consistent across various sensorimotor tasks. In contrast to this consistency across paradigms, our initial  
221 results reveal that these impairments may be influenced by lesioned hemisphere: motor adaptation was  
222 impaired in individuals with left hemisphere lesions but intact in individuals with right hemisphere lesions.  
223 This meta-analysis not only highlights the detrimental effect of stroke on motor adaptation but also hints  
224 toward the left hemisphere serving as a critical locus for this process.

### 225 **Left hemisphere as a neural correlate of motor adaptation**

226 Our meta-analysis points toward the left hemisphere as a neural correlate of motor adaptation. This finding  
227 aligns with the notion that the left hemisphere primarily contributes to feedforward control, while the right  
228 hemisphere contributes more to feedback control.<sup>14,15</sup> Another possibility is that the left hemisphere is crit-  
229 ical for logical reasoning, which may be needed for the development of a successful explicit strategy, par-  
230 ticularly in visuomotor adaptation tasks (refer to next section for methods that effectively isolate implicit  
231 recalibration and explicit strategies).<sup>37,38</sup> Given limited studies that control for lesion hemisphere (and lesion  
232 location), future studies using methods such as lesion-symptom mapping are needed to precisely determine  
233 the contribution of these factors to motor adaptation.<sup>39</sup>

### 234 **Investigating the impact of stroke on implicit recalibration and explicit strategies**

235 Our meta-analysis not only clarified the detrimental impact of stroke on motor adaptation but also identified  
236 an important gap in our understanding: *how* does stroke impact the different learning processes supporting  
237 motor adaptation? Here, we focus on upper extremity tasks like visuomotor adaptation as it is now well  
238 established that multiple learning processes support changes in this behavior.<sup>40-43</sup> There is more work to be  
239 done to determine whether these same processes contribute to adaptation in lower extremity tasks such as  
240 split-belt walking. For these upper extremity tasks, two of the most salient processes include *implicit recal-*  
241 *ibration*, which keeps our motor system well-calibrated in a gradual and subconscious manner, and *explicit*  
242 *strategies*, which, in contrast, enables rapid and volitional motor corrections.<sup>38</sup> Existing studies have not  
243 cleanly examined the impact of stroke on each process.

244 There are many experimental tools for dissociating the processes that underlie adaptation.<sup>38,44-49</sup> These tools  
245 will be especially useful for identifying how stroke impacts these processes. The first method for isolating


246 implicit recalibration involves clearly instructing participants immediately prior to aftereffect trials, in  
247 which the perturbation is removed, to forgo any explicit strategies they may have been using (Figure 6A).  
248 While most of the studies included in this meta-analysis measured aftereffects, we could not ascertain  
249 whether proper instructions were provided (e.g., “Move your hand directly to the target and do not aim  
250 away from the target.”). Interestingly, a recent study that provided proper instructions found no effect of  
251 stroke on implicit recalibration.<sup>25</sup> Given the singular nature of this study, it will be enlightening to re-ex-  
252 amine how stroke impacts this implicit process after several more studies adopt this approach. The second  
253 approach is to use clamped visual feedback.<sup>38,46</sup> Unlike standard visuomotor rotation tasks, the clamped  
254 visual cursor moves at a fixed angle away from the target and is not contingent on the participant’s hand  
255 angle (Figure 6A). Critically, we inform participants of this manipulation and instruct them to always reach  
256 directly to the target and ignore the clamped visual feedback. Despite these instructions, participants exhibit  
257 robust implicit recalibration, with learning occurring outside of conscious awareness.<sup>50</sup>

258 Paralleling the methodological advances for studying implicit recalibration, new approaches have been de-  
259 veloped to examine explicit re-aiming strategies. One approach involves asking participants to indicate  
260 where they are aiming prior to each reach, revealing the dynamics of explicit re-aiming (Figure 6C).<sup>22,50</sup>  
261 Another approach involves *delayed* rotated feedback, a manipulation that robustly attenuates implicit re-  
262 calibration and thus isolates explicit re-aiming (Figure 6C).<sup>51</sup> A final approach involves manipulations of  
263 preparation time. When manipulating the amount of time a visual target is presented before a reach begins,  
264 longer preparation time enables the use of explicit strategies that are resource-demanding, whereas shorter  
265 preparation time limits deliberation and minimizes the contribution of these explicit strategies (Figure  
266 6C).<sup>52-54</sup> Taken together, upper extremity tasks provide well-controlled methods for isolating implicit and  
267 explicit processes, which are either not present or not easily isolated in other experimental paradigms. Fu-  
268 ture studies using fine-grained experimental and computational methods to evaluate these processes in in-  
269 dividuals poststroke will shed light on the neural correlates of different sensorimotor learning mechanisms  
270 (Figure 6B).

## 271 **From fundamental learning mechanisms to targeted rehabilitation strategies**

272 A better understanding of how stroke affects motor adaptation will motivate targeted rehabilitation inter-  
273 ventions that are tailored to the specific motor deficits and affected brain regions. Given that stroke impairs  
274 feedforward processes, rehabilitation programs could instead capitalize on the intact feedback processes.  
275 For example, reinforcement learning, the process of refining actions through reward or punishment feed-  
276 back, may be an effective alternative.<sup>61</sup> In addition, given that individuals with right hemisphere lesions

277 appear to have intact feedforward processes, rehabilitation therapists might consider interventions that cap-  
 278 italize on this.<sup>30,55,56</sup> Individuals with left hemisphere lesions, who may have feedforward deficits, could  
 279 also benefit from exploiting existing neural resources via task-specific intensive training,<sup>55,57,58</sup> or explore  
 280 compensatory learning processes via reinforcement feedback.<sup>2,59,60</sup> Regardless of the exact approach, we  
 281 anticipate that finer-grained neuropsychological work will deepen our understanding of how stroke affects  
 282 motor adaptation and inform future rehabilitation strategies aimed at repairing or remodeling affected neu-  
 283 ral circuits.<sup>62-64</sup>



284  
 285 **Figure 6. A.** Methods for isolating implicit recalibration. **B.** Evidence suggesting which brain regions are  
 286 involved in which learning processes.<sup>20,22,24,31,65,66</sup> The solid arrows indicate studies that involve populations  
 287 with stroke and open arrows indicate studies that involve populations with progressive neurodegenerative  
 288 disorders. **C.** Methods for isolating explicit re-aiming strategies.

289 **References**

- 290 1. Takahashi CD, Reinkensmeyer DJ. Hemiparetic stroke impairs anticipatory control of arm movement.  
291 *Exp. Brain Res.* 2003;149:131–140.
- 292 2. Krakauer JW, Carmichael ST. *Broken Movement: The Neurobiology of Motor Recovery after Stroke.*  
293 MIT Press; 2022.
- 294 3. Noskin O, Krakauer JW, Lazar RM, et al. Ipsilateral motor dysfunction from unilateral stroke: implica-  
295 tions for the functional neuroanatomy of hemiparesis. *J. Neurol. Neurosurg. Psychiatry.* 2008;79:401–  
296 406.
- 297 4. Hadjiosif AM, Branscheidt M, Anaya MA, et al. Dissociation between abnormal motor synergies and  
298 impaired reaching dexterity after stroke. *J. Neurophysiol.* 2022;127:856–868.
- 299 5. Rathore SS, Hinn AR, Cooper LS, Tyroler HA, Rosamond WD. Characterization of incident stroke  
300 signs and symptoms: findings from the atherosclerosis risk in communities study. *Stroke.* 2002;33:2718–  
301 2721.
- 302 6. Garland SJ, Gray VL, Knorr S. Muscle activation patterns and postural control following stroke. *Motor*  
303 *Control.* 2009;13:387–411.
- 304 7. Levin MF. Interjoint coordination during pointing movements is disrupted in spastic hemiparesis.  
305 *Brain.* 1996;119:281–293.
- 306 8. Hadjiosif AM, Kita K, Albert ST, Scheidt RA, Shadmehr R, Krakauer JW. Separating the control of  
307 moving and holding still in post-stroke arm paresis. *bioRxiv.* 2023. Available at:  
308 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.26.517884>.
- 309 9. Zackowski KM, Dromerick AW, Sahrman SA, Thach WT, Bastian AJ. How do strength, sensation,  
310 spasticity and joint individuation relate to the reaching deficits of people with chronic hemiparesis? *Brain.*  
311 2004;127:1035–1046.
- 312 10. Haaland KY, Delaney HD. Motor deficits after left or right hemisphere damage due to stroke or tu-  
313 mor. *Neuropsychologia.* 1981;19:17–27.
- 314 11. Lauzière S, Miéville C, Betschart M, Duclos C, Aissaoui R, Nadeau S. Plantarflexion moment is a  
315 contributor to step length after-effect following walking on a split-belt treadmill in individuals with stroke

- 316 and healthy individuals. *J. Rehabil. Med.* 2014;46:849–857.
- 317 12. Tyrell CM, Helm E, Reisman DS. Learning the spatial features of a locomotor task is slowed after  
318 stroke. *J. Neurophysiol.* 2014;112:480–489.
- 319 13. Gazzaniga MS. Cerebral specialization and interhemispheric communication: does the corpus callo-  
320 sum enable the human condition? *Brain.* 2000;123:1293–1326.
- 321 14. Mani S, Mutha PK, Przybyla A, Haaland KY, Good DC, Sainburg RL. Contralesional motor deficits  
322 after unilateral stroke reflect hemisphere-specific control mechanisms. *Brain.* 2013;136:1288–1303.
- 323 15. Mutha PK, Haaland KY, Sainburg RL. The effects of brain lateralization on motor control and adapta-  
324 tion. *J. Mot. Behav.* 2012;44:455–469.
- 325 16. Donchin O, Rabe K, Diedrichsen J, et al. Cerebellar regions involved in adaptation to force field and  
326 visuomotor perturbation. *J. Neurophysiol.* 2012;107:134–147.
- 327 17. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, PRISMA Group. Preferred reporting items for system-  
328 atic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *Ann. Intern. Med.* 2009;151:264–269.
- 329 18. Dzewaltowski AC, Hedrick EA, Leutzinger TJ, Remski LE, Rosen AB. The Effect of Split-Belt  
330 Treadmill Interventions on Step Length Asymmetry in Individuals Poststroke: A Systematic Review With  
331 Meta-Analysis. *Neurorehabil. Neural Repair.* 2021;35:563–575.
- 332 19. Kal E, Winters M, van der Kamp J, et al. Is Implicit Motor Learning Preserved after Stroke? A Sys-  
333 tematic Review with Meta-Analysis. *PLoS One.* 2016;11:e0166376.
- 334 20. Mutha PK, Sainburg RL, Haaland KY. Left parietal regions are critical for adaptive visuomotor con-  
335 trol. *J. Neurosci.* 2011;31:6972–6981.
- 336 21. Mutha PK, Sainburg RL, Haaland KY. Critical neural substrates for correcting unexpected trajectory  
337 errors and learning from them. *Brain.* 2011;134:3647–3661.
- 338 22. Taylor JA, Ivry RB. Cerebellar and prefrontal cortex contributions to adaptation, strategies, and rein-  
339 forcement learning. *Prog. Brain Res.* 2014;210:217–253.
- 340 23. Schaefer SY, Haaland KY, Sainburg RL. Dissociation of initial trajectory and final position errors  
341 during visuomotor adaptation following unilateral stroke. *Brain Res.* 2009;1298:78–91.

- 342 24. Taylor & Ivry. Reach Adaptation Study. 2009. Available at: <https://osf.io/gfmdr/>.
- 343 25. Binyamin-Netser R, Goldhamer N, Avni I, Ressel Zviely A, Shmuelof L. Cognitive Impairments Af-  
344 ter Stroke Do Not Attenuate Explicit Visuomotor Adaptation in Reaching and Savings With the Unaf-  
345 fected Arm. *Neurorehabil. Neural Repair*. 2023;37:444–457.
- 346 26. Palluel-Germain R, Jax SA, Buxbaum LJ. Visuo-motor gain adaptation and generalization following  
347 left hemisphere stroke. *Neurosci. Lett*. 2011;498:222–226.
- 348 27. Scheidt RA, Stoeckmann T. Reach adaptation and final position control amid environmental uncer-  
349 tainty after stroke. *J. Neurophysiol*. 2007;97:2824–2836.
- 350 28. Panouillères M, Alahyane N, Urquizar C, et al. Effects of structural and functional cerebellar lesions  
351 on sensorimotor adaptation of saccades. *Exp. Brain Res*. 2013;231:1–11.
- 352 29. Alahyane N, Fonteille V, Urquizar C, et al. Separate neural substrates in the human cerebellum for  
353 sensory-motor adaptation of reactive and of scanning voluntary saccades. *Cerebellum*. 2008;7:595–601.
- 354 30. Reisman DS, Wityk R, Silver K, Bastian AJ. Locomotor adaptation on a split-belt treadmill can im-  
355 prove walking symmetry post-stroke. *Brain*. 2007;130:1861–1872.
- 356 31. Malone LA, Bastian AJ. Spatial and temporal asymmetries in gait predict split-belt adaptation behav-  
357 ior in stroke. *Neurorehabil. Neural Repair*. 2014;28:230–240.
- 358 32. de Kam D, Iturralde PA, Torres-Oviedo G. Cerebral Contribution to the Execution, But Not Recali-  
359 bration, of Motor Commands in a Novel Walking Environment. *eNeuro*. 2020;7.
- 360 33. Hirata K, Hanawa H, Miyazawa T, et al. Adaptive changes in foot placement for split-belt treadmill  
361 walking in individuals with stroke. *J. Electromyogr. Kinesiol*. 2019;48:112–120.
- 362 34. JM Wood, DS Reisman, HE Kim. Locomotor Adaptation Study. 2023. Available at:  
363 <https://osf.io/gfmdr/>.
- 364 35. Lakens D. Calculating and reporting effect sizes to facilitate cumulative science: a practical primer for  
365 t-tests and ANOVAs. *Front. Psychol*. 2013;4:863.
- 366 36. Cohen J. *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum  
367 Associates; 1988.




- 368 37. Hartwigsen G, Bengio Y, Bzdok D. How does hemispheric specialization contribute to human-defin-  
369 ing cognition? *Neuron*. 2021;109:2075–2090.
- 370 38. Kim HE, Avraham G, Ivry RB. The Psychology of Reaching: Action Selection, Movement Imple-  
371 mentation, and Sensorimotor Learning. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* 2021;72:61–95.
- 372 39. Timmann D, Konczak J, Ilg W, et al. Current advances in lesion-symptom mapping of the human cer-  
373 ebellum. *Neuroscience*. 2009;162:836–851.
- 374 40. Huberdeau DM, Krakauer JW, Haith AM. Dual-process decomposition in human sensorimotor adap-  
375 tation. *Curr. Opin. Neurobiol.* 2015;33:71–77.
- 376 41. Smith MA, Ghazizadeh A, Shadmehr R. Interacting adaptive processes with different timescales un-  
377 derlie short-term motor learning. *PLoS Biol.* 2006;4:e179.
- 378 42. French MA, Morton SM, Reisman DS. Use of explicit processes during a visually guided locomotor  
379 learning task predicts 24-h retention after stroke. *J. Neurophysiol.* 2021;125:211–222.
- 380 43. Finley JM, Bastian AJ, Gottschall JS. Learning to be economical: the energy cost of walking tracks  
381 motor adaptation. *J. Physiol.* 2013;591:1081–1095.
- 382 44. Taylor JA, Krakauer JW, Ivry RB. Explicit and implicit contributions to learning in a sensorimotor  
383 adaptation task. *J. Neurosci.* 2014;34:3023–3032.
- 384 45. Bond KM, Taylor JA. Flexible explicit but rigid implicit learning in a visuomotor adaptation task. *J.*  
385 *Neurophysiol.* 2015;113:3836–3849.
- 386 46. Morehead JR, Taylor JA, Parvin DE, Ivry RB. Characteristics of Implicit Sensorimotor Adaptation  
387 Revealed by Task-irrelevant Clamped Feedback. *J. Cogn. Neurosci.* 2017;29:1061–1074.
- 388 47. McDougle SD, Bond KM, Taylor JA. Explicit and Implicit Processes Constitute the Fast and Slow  
389 Processes of Sensorimotor Learning. *J. Neurosci.* 2015;35:9568–9579.
- 390 48. McDougle SD, Ivry RB, Taylor JA. Taking Aim at the Cognitive Side of Learning in Sensorimotor  
391 Adaptation Tasks. *Trends Cogn. Sci.* 2016;20:535–544.
- 392 49. McDougle SD, Taylor JA. Dissociable cognitive strategies for sensorimotor learning. *Nat. Commun.*  
393 2019;10:40.

- 394 50. Tsay JS, Parvin DE, Ivry RB. Continuous reports of sensed hand position during sensorimotor adapta-  
395 tion. *J. Neurophysiol.* 2020;124:1122–1130.
- 396 51. Brudner SN, Kethidi N, Graeupner D, Ivry RB, Taylor JA. Delayed feedback during sensorimotor  
397 learning selectively disrupts adaptation but not strategy use. *Journal of Neurophysiology.* 2016;115:1499–  
398 1511.
- 399 52. Haith AM, Huberdeau DM, Krakauer JW. The Influence of Movement Preparation Time on the Ex-  
400 pression of Visuomotor Learning and Savings. *J. Neurosci.* 2015;35:5109–5117.
- 401 53. Leow L-A, Gunn R, Marinovic W, Carroll TJ. Estimating the implicit component of visuomotor rota-  
402 tion learning by constraining movement preparation time. *J. Neurophysiol.* 2017;118:666–676.
- 403 54. Hadjiosif AM, Krakauer JW. The explicit/implicit distinction in studies of visuomotor learning: Con-  
404 ceptual and methodological pitfalls. *Eur. J. Neurosci.* 2021;53:499–503.
- 405 55. Reisman DS, McLean H, Keller J, Danks KA, Bastian AJ. Repeated split-belt treadmill training im-  
406 proves poststroke step length asymmetry. *Neurorehabil. Neural Repair.* 2013;27:460–468.
- 407 56. Reisman DS, Wityk R, Silver K, Bastian AJ. Split-belt treadmill adaptation transfers to overground  
408 walking in persons poststroke. *Neurorehabil. Neural Repair.* 2009;23:735–744.
- 409 57. Lang CE, Macdonald JR, Reisman DS, et al. Observation of amounts of movement practice provided  
410 during stroke rehabilitation. *Arch. Phys. Med. Rehabil.* 2009;90:1692–1698.
- 411 58. Waddell KJ, Birkenmeier RL, Moore JL, Hornby TG, Lang CE. Feasibility of high-repetition, task-  
412 specific training for individuals with upper-extremity paresis. *Am. J. Occup. Ther.* 2014;68:444–453.
- 413 59. Tsay JS, Winstein CJ. Five Features to Look for in Early-Phase Clinical Intervention Studies. *Neu-  
414 rorehabil. Neural Repair.* 2021;35:3–9.
- 415 60. Varghese R, Gordon J, Sainburg RL, Winstein CJ, Schweighofer N. Adaptive control is reversed be-  
416 tween hands after left hemisphere stroke and lost following right hemisphere stroke. *Proceedings of the  
417 National Academy of Sciences.* 2023;120:e2212726120.
- 418 61. Sutton RS, Barto AG. *Reinforcement Learning, second edition: An Introduction.* MIT Press; 2018.
- 419 62. Powell MP, Verma N, Sorensen E, et al. Epidural stimulation of the cervical spinal cord for post-

- 420 stroke upper-limb paresis. *Nat. Med.* 2023:1–11.
- 421 63. Krakauer JW. Motor learning: its relevance to stroke recovery and neurorehabilitation. *Curr. Opin.*  
422 *Neurol.* 2006;19:84–90.
- 423 64. Jones TA. Motor compensation and its effects on neural reorganization after stroke. *Nat. Rev. Neuro-*  
424 *sci.* 2017;18:267–280.
- 425 65. Leow L-A, Bernheine L, Carroll TJ, Dux PE, Filmer HL. Dopamine increases accuracy and lengthens  
426 deliberation time in explicit motor skill learning. *bioRxiv.* 2023. Available at:  
427 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.31.526542>.
- 428 66. Tsay JS, Schuck L, Ivry RB. Cerebellar Degeneration Impairs Strategy Discovery but Not Strategy  
429 Recall. *Cerebellum.* 2022:1–11.

## Supplemental Material



431

432 **Figure S1.** Late adaptation. **A.** Forest plot comparing the performance of individuals poststroke to neuro-  
 433 typical controls, where negative values indicate greater adaptation in controls (i.e., impaired adaptation  
 434 poststroke). The overall effect size is indicated by the blue dashed line, and the 95% confidence interval is  
 435 indicated by the blue shading. Each circle represents a single dataset with its size indicating the weight  
 436 assigned to that dataset in the random-effects model. Whiskers represent the 95% confidence intervals. **B.**  
 437 Violin plot displaying the distribution of effect sizes. Each blue dot represents a single dataset, the black  
 438 dot represents the mean across datasets, and black whiskers represent the standard error.