Supplementary Figure 6: Effects of therapy (Conventional vs Assisted vs Miscellaneous) combined with tDCS on stroke recovery as assessed by the <u>change scores</u> of the tDCS and sham groups for the Upper Extremity Fugl-Meyer Assessment. tDCS was beneficial when combined with conventional and miscellaneous therapy but not assistive therapy.

Study or Subgroup	tDCS Mean	tDCS SD	Total	Sham Mean	Sham SD	Total	Weight	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI
18.1.1 Conventional								
Alisar et al. 2019	9.12	19.26	16	1.74	23.55	16	1.3%	7.38 [-7.53, 22.29]
Allman et al. 2016	11.46	13.73	11	9.11	16.06	13	2.0%	2.35 [-9.57, 14.27]
Beaulieu et al. 2019	5.75	3.88	7	2.46	3.54	7	18.4%	3.29 [-0.60, 7.18]
Bornheim et al. 2019	11.62	20.64	25	4.7	20.64	25	2.1%	6.92 [-4.52, 18.36]
Kim et al. 2010 (Anodal)	14.57	11.92	6	8.31	11.7	7	1.7%	6.26 [-6.63, 19.15]
Kim et al. 2010 (Cathodal)	13.84	16.05	5	8.31	11.7	7	1.0%	5.53 [-10.99, 22.05]
Lindenberg et al. 2010	5.6	12.81	10	1.2	11.65	10	2.4%	4.40 [-6.33, 15.13]
Nair et al. 2011	4.1	12.17	7	1.7	10	7	2.0%	2.40 [-9.27, 14.07]
Prathum et al. 2021	7.09	11.27	12	3.1	11.27	12	3.4%	3.99 [-5.03, 13.01]
Subtotal (95% CI)			99			104	34.3%	3.92 [1.07, 6.77]
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.00; Chi² = 0.87, df = 8 (P = 1.00); I² = 0%								
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.70 (P = 0.007)								
18.1.2 Assisted								
Ang et al. 2015	0.9	5.91	10	2.8	6.39	9	9.0%	-1.90 [-7.45, 3.65]
Edwards et al. 2019	6.3	17.59	34	8.1	17.81	35	4.0%	-1.80 [-10.15, 6.55]
Hesse et al. 2011 (Anodal)	10.5	9.64	28	9.3	9.91	28	10.6%	1.20 [-3.92, 6.32]
Hesse et al. 2011 (Cathodal)	11	7.8	29	9.3	9.91	28	12.9%	1.70 [-2.94, 6.34]
Jin et al. 2019	3.3	15.79	10	1.2	17.72	10	1.3%	2.10 [-12.61, 16.81]
Liao et al. 2020	5.34	9.82	12	3.75	9.83	8	3.6%	1.59 [-7.20, 10.38]
Mazzoleni et al. 2019	12	18.86	20	15.73	15.43	19	2.4%	-3.73 [-14.52, 7.06]
Straudi et al. 2016	3.97	17.82	12	5.19	14.75	11	1.6%	-1.22 [-14.55, 12.11]
Triccas et al. 2015	8.73	16.13	12	7.73	14.99	11	1.7%	1.00 [-11.72, 13.72]
Viana et al. 2014	9.3	14.87	10	7.5	15.11	10	1.6%	1.80 [-11.34, 14.94]
Yao et al. 2020	10.1	17.21	20	6.4	15.81	20	2.7%	3.70 [-6.54, 13.94]
Subtotal (95% CI)			197			189	51.4%	0.44 [-1.89, 2.76]
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.00; Chi² = 2.51, df = 10 (P = 0.99); I² = 0%								
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.37 (P = 0.71)								
18.1.3 Miscellaneous								
Bolognini et al. 2011	6.15	11.97	7	2.23	14.53	7	1.4%	3.92 [-10.03, 17.87]
Rocha et al. 2015 (Anodal)	11.1	4.2	7	3.85	7.88	7	6.4%	7.25 [0.64, 13.86]
Rocha et al. 2015 (Cathodal)	7.3	3.96	7	3.85	7.88	7	6.5%	3.45 [-3.08, 9.98]
Subtotal (95% CI)			21			21	14.3%	5.19 [0.78, 9.60]
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.00; Chi² = 0.68, df = 2 (P = 0.71); I² = 0%								
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.30 (P = 0.02)								
Total (95% CI)			317			314	100.0%	2.31 [0.64, 3.98]
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.00; Chi² = 9.41, df = 22 (P = 0.99); I² = 0%								
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.71 (P = 0.007)								
Test for subgroup differences: Chi² = 5.35, df = 2 (P = 0.07), I² = 62.6%								

Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI

-20 -10 0 10 20
Favours sham   Favours tDCS