**DAFTAR PUSTAKA**

Academy of Neurologic Physical Therapy. Core Set of Outcome Measures for Adults with Neurologic Conditions. [Accessed 30 September 2023]

An SJ, Kim TJ, Yoon BW. Epidemiology, Risk Factors, and Clinical Features of Intracerebral Hemorrhage: An Update. J Stroke. 2017 Jan;19(1):3-10.

Aqueveque, P. *et al.* (2017) 'After Stroke Movement Impairments: A Review of Current Technologies for Rehabilitation', *Physical Disabilities - Therapeutic Implications*. doi: 10.5772/67577.

Bernhardt, J. *et al.* (2017) 'Agreed definitions and a shared vision for new standards in stroke recovery research : The Stroke Recovery and Rehabilitation Roundtable taskforce', 12(5), pp. 444–450. doi: 10.1177/1747493017711816.

Boukhennoufa, I. *et al.* (2022) 'Wearable sensors and machine learning in post-stroke rehabilitation assessment: A systematic review', *Biomedical Signal Processing and Control*, 71(PB), p. 103197. doi: 10.1016/j.bspc.2021.103197.

Buesing, C. *et al.* (2015) 'Effects of a wearable exoskeleton stride management assist system (SMA®) on spatiotemporal gait characteristics in individuals after stroke: A randomized controlled trial', *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, 12(1), pp. 1–14. doi: 10.1186/s12984-015-0062-0.

Campbell, B. C. V. (2019) 'Advances in stroke medicine', *Medical Journal of Australia*, 210(8), pp. 367–374. doi: 10.5694/mja2.50137.

Chae, S. H. *et al.* (2020) 'Development and clinical evaluation of a web-based upper limb home rehabilitation system using a smartwatch and machine learning model for chronic stroke survivors: Prospective comparative study', *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*, 8(7). doi: 10.2196/17216.

Cho and Possomato-Vieira, José S. and Khalil, R. A. K. (2016) 'Upper Limb Motor Impairment Post Stroke', *Physiology & behavior*, 176(1), pp. 139–

148. doi: 10.1016/j.pmr.2015.06.008.Upper.

Choi, S. U. *et al.* (2017) 'Stroke impact scale 3.0: Reliability and validity evaluation of the Korean version', *Annals of Rehabilitation Medicine*, 41(3), pp. 387–393. doi: 10.5535/arm.2017.41.3.387.

Coleman, E. R. *et al.* (2017) 'Early Rehabilitation After Stroke: a Narrative Review', *Current Atherosclerosis Reports*, 19(12). doi: 10.1007/s11883-017-0686-6.

Cumming, T. B. *et al.* (2019) 'Early mobilization and quality of life after stroke: Findings from AVERT', *Neurology*, 93(7), pp. E717–E728. doi: 10.1212/WNL.0000000000007937.

Dehem, S. *et al.* (2019) 'Effectiveness of upper-limb robotic-assisted therapy in the early rehabilitation phase after stroke: A single-blind, randomised, controlled trial', *Annals of Physical and Rehabilitation Medicine*, 62(5), pp. 313–320. doi: 10.1016/j.rehab.2019.04.002.

El-Kafy, E. M. A. *et al.* (2021) 'The Effect of Virtual Reality-Based Therapy on Improving Upper Limb Functions in Individuals With Stroke: a Randomized Control Trial', *Frontiers in aging neuroscience*, 13(101525824), p. 731343. doi: 10.3389/fnagi.2021.731343.

Furuta, H. *et al.* (2022) 'Functional Independence Measure Subtypes among Inpatients with Subacute Stroke: Classification via Latent Class Analysis', *Progress in Rehabilitation Medicine*, 7(0), p. n/a. doi: 10.2490/prm.20220021.

Godfrey, A. *et al.* (2018) 'From A to Z: Wearable technology explained', *Maturitas*, 113(April), pp. 40–47. doi: 10.1016/j.maturitas.2018.04.012.

Goffredo, M. *et al.* (2019) 'Overground Wearable powered exoskeleton for gait training in subacute stroke subjects: Clinical and gait assessments', *European Journal of Physical and Rehabilitation Medicine*, 55(6), pp. 710–721. doi: 10.23736/S1973-9087.19.05574-6.

Hodics, T. M. *et al.* (2012) 'Wolf motor function test for characterizing moderate
to severe hemiparesis in stroke patients', *Archives of Physical Medicine
and Rehabilitation*, 93(11), pp. 1963–1967. doi:
10.1016/j.apmr.2012.05.002.

Huang, C. Y. *et al.* (2016) 'Improving the utility of the Brunnstrom recovery
stages in patients with stroke: Validation and quantification', *Medicine
(United States)*, 95(31). doi: 10.1097/MD.0000000000004508.

Ishibashi, K. *et al.* (2021) 'Gait Training after Stroke with a Wearable Robotic
Device: A Case Report of Further Improvements in Walking Ability after
a Recovery Plateau', *Progress in Rehabilitation Medicine*, 6(0), p. n/a.
doi: 10.2490/prm.20210037.

Jung, H. T. *et al.* (2017) 'Feasibility of using the RAPAEL Smart Glove in upper
limb physical therapy for patients after stroke: A randomized controlled
trial', *Proceedings of the Annual International Conference of the IEEE
Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society, EMBS*, pp. 3856–3859. doi:
10.1109/EMBC.2017.8037698.

Kuriakose, D. and Xiao, Z. (2020) 'Pathophysiology and treatment of stroke:
Present status and future perspectives', *International Journal of Molecular
Sciences*, 21(20), pp. 1–24. doi: 10.3390/ijms21207609.

Lee, J. Der *et al.* (2016) 'Prediction of quality of life after stroke rehabilitation',
*Neuropsychiatry*, 6(6), pp. 369–375. doi:
10.4172/Neuropsychiatry.1000163.

Li, D.-X. *et al.* (2021) 'Effect of Robot Assisted Gait Training on Motor and
Walking Function in Patients with Subacute Stroke: A Random Controlled
Study', *Journal of Stroke and Cerebrovascular Diseases*, 30(7), p.
105807. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jstrokecerebrovasdis.2021.105807.

Li, Lifang *et al.* (2015) 'Improved walking ability with wearable robot-assisted
training in patients suffering chronic stroke1', *Bio-Medical Materials and*

*Engineering*, 26, pp. S329–S340. doi: 10.3233/BME-151320.

Liu, Y. T. *et al.* (2021) 'Effects of orthopedic insoles on postural balance in patients with chronic stroke: A randomized crossover study', *Gait and Posture*, 87(April), pp. 75–80. doi: 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2021.04.014.

MacEira-Elvira, P. *et al.* (2019) 'Wearable technology in stroke rehabilitation: Towards improved diagnosis and treatment of upper-limb motor impairment', *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, 16(1). doi: 10.1186/s12984-019-0612-y.

Miller, K. K. *et al.* (2017) 'Exercise after stroke: Patient adherence and beliefs after discharge from rehabilitation', *Topics in Stroke Rehabilitation*, 24(2), pp. 142–148. doi: 10.1080/10749357.2016.1200292.

Mirelman, A. *et al.* (2018) 'Gait', *Handbook of Clinical Neurology*, 159, pp. 119–134. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-444-63916-5.00007-0.

Miyagawa, D. *et al.* (2023) 'Gait training with a wearable powered robot during stroke rehabilitation: a randomized parallel-group trial', *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, 20(1), pp. 1–6. doi: 10.1186/s12984-023-01168-x.

Ohura, T. *et al.* (2017) 'Validity and reliability of a performance evaluation tool based on the modified Barthel Index for stroke patients', *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 17(1), pp. 1–8. doi: 10.1186/s12874-017-0409-2.

Önal, B., Karaca, G. and Sertel, M. (2020) 'Immediate Effects of Plantar Vibration on Fall Risk and Postural Stability in Stroke Patients: A Randomized Controlled Trial', *Journal of Stroke and Cerebrovascular Diseases*, 29(12), pp. 1–6. doi: 10.1016/j.jstrokecerebrovasdis.2020.105324.

Page, M. J. *et al.* (2021) 'PRISMA 2020 explanation and elaboration: Updated guidance and exemplars for reporting systematic reviews', *The BMJ*, 372. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n160.

Park, C. S. and An, S. H. (2016) 'Reliability and validity of the modified

    functional ambulation category scale in patients with hemiparalysis',
*Journal of Physical Therapy Science*, 28(8), pp. 2264–2267. doi:
10.1589/jpts.28.2264.

Park, Y.-S., An, C.-S. and Lim, C.-G. (2021) 'Effects of a Rehabilitation Program

    Using a Wearable Device on the Upper Limb  Function, Performance of
Activities of Daily Living, and Rehabilitation Participation in Patients
with Acute Stroke.', *International journal of environmental research and
public health*, 18(11). doi: 10.3390/ijerph18115524.

Parker, J., Powell, L. and Mawson, S. (2020) 'Effectiveness of upper limb

    wearable technology for improving activity and participation in adult
stroke survivors: Systematic review', *Journal of Medical Internet
Research*, 22(1), pp. 1–18. doi: 10.2196/15981.

Pirker, W. and Katzenschlager, R. (2017) 'Gait disorders in adults and the elderly:

    A clinical guide', *Wiener Klinische Wochenschrift*, 129(3–4), pp. 81–95.
doi: 10.1007/s00508-016-1096-4.

Sacco, R. L. *et al.* (2013) 'An updated definition of stroke for the 21st century: A

    statement for healthcare professionals from the American heart
association/American stroke association', *Stroke*, 44(7), pp. 2064–2089.
doi: 10.1161/STR.0b013e318296aeca.

Spaich, E. G. *et al.* (2014) 'Rehabilitation of the hemiparetic gait by nociceptive

    withdrawal reflex-based functional electrical therapy: A randomized,
single-blinded study', *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*,
11(1), pp. 1–10. doi: 10.1186/1743-0003-11-81.

Sullivan, K. J. *et al.* (2011) 'Fugl-meyer assessment of sensorimotor function after

    stroke: Standardized training procedure for clinical practice and clinical
trials', *Stroke*, 42(2), pp. 427–432. doi:
10.1161/STROKEAHA.110.592766.

Suri, R. *et al.* (2018) 'Post-stroke Movement Disorders: The Clinical, Neuroanatomic, and Demographic Portrait of 284 Published Cases', *Journal of Stroke and Cerebrovascular Diseases*, 27(9), pp. 2388–2397. doi: 10.1016/j.jstrokecerebrovasdis.2018.04.028.

Swanson, V. A. *et al.* (2023) 'Optimized Home Rehabilitation Technology Reduces Upper Extremity Impairment Compared to a Conventional Home Exercise Program: A Randomized, Controlled, Single-Blind Trial in Subacute Stroke', *Neurorehabilitation and Neural Repair*, 37(1), pp. 53–65. doi: 10.1177/15459683221146995.

Taki, S. *et al.* (2020) 'Effects of Exoskeletal Lower Limb Robot Training on the Activities of Daily Living in Stroke Patients: Retrospective Pre-Post Comparison Using Propensity Score Matched Analysis', *Journal of Stroke and Cerebrovascular Diseases*, 29(10), p. 105176. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jstrokecerebrovasdis.2020.105176.

Tanaka, H. *et al.* (2019) 'Spatiotemporal gait characteristic changes with gait training using the hybrid assistive limb for chronic stroke patients', *Gait and Posture*, 71(May), pp. 205–210. doi: 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2019.05.003.

Tomida, K. *et al.* (2019) 'Randomized Controlled Trial of Gait Training Using Gait Exercise Assist Robot (GEAR) in Stroke Patients with Hemiplegia', *Journal of Stroke and Cerebrovascular Diseases*, 28(9), pp. 2421–2428. doi: 10.1016/j.jstrokecerebrovasdis.2019.06.030.

Villafañe, J. H. *et al.* (2018) 'Efficacy of Short-Term Robot-Assisted Rehabilitation in Patients With Hand Paralysis After Stroke: A Randomized Clinical Trial', *Hand*, 13(1), pp. 95–102. doi: 10.1177/1558944717692096.

Winstein, C. J. *et al.* (2016) *Guidelines for Adult Stroke Rehabilitation and Recovery: A Guideline for Healthcare Professionals from the American Heart Association/American Stroke Association*, *Stroke*. doi: 10.1161/STR.0000000000000098.

Yeung, L. F. *et al.* (2018) 'Randomized controlled trial of robot-assisted gait
     training with dorsiflexion assistance on chronic stroke patients wearing
     ankle-foot-orthosis', *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*,
     15(1), pp. 1–12. doi: 10.1186/s12984-018-0394-7.

Yeung, L. F. *et al.* (2021) 'Effects of wearable ankle robotics for stair and over-
     ground training on sub-acute stroke: a randomized controlled trial',
     *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, 18(1), pp. 1–10. doi:
     10.1186/s12984-021-00814-6.

Ziu E, Khan Suheb MZ, Mesfin FB. Subarachnoid Hemorrhage. [Updated 2022
     Nov 30]. In: StatPearls [Internet]. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls
     Publishing; 2023 Jan-. Available from:
     https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK441958/ (Accessed: 7 April
     2023)

# LAMPIRAN

*Quality Assessment Tool for Case Control Studies*

| Criteria | Yes | No | Other (CD, NR, NA)* |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Was the research question or objective in this paper clearly stated and appropriate? | | | |
| 2. Was the study population clearly specified and defined? | | | |
| 3. Did the authors include a sample size justification? | | | |
| 4. Were controls selected or recruited from the same or similar population that gave rise to the cases (including the same timeframe)? | | | |
| 5. Were the definitions, inclusion and exclusion criteria, algorithms or processes used to identify or select cases and controls valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants? | | | |
| 6. Were the cases clearly defined and differentiated from controls? | | | |
| 7. If less than 100 percent of eligible cases and/or controls were selected for the study, were the cases and/or controls randomly selected from those eligible? | | | |
| 8. Was there use of concurrent controls? | | | |
| 9. Were the investigators able to confirm that the exposure/risk occurred prior to the development of the condition or event that defined a participant as a case? | | | |
| 10. Were the measures of exposure/risk clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently (including the same time period) across all study participants? | | | |
| 11. Were the assessors of exposure/risk blinded to the case or control status of participants? | | | |
| 12. Were key potential confounding variables measured and adjusted statistically in the analyses? If matching was used, did the investigators account for matching during study analysis? | | | |

*Quality Assessment Tool for Observational Cohort and Cross-Sectional Studies*

| Criteria | Yes | No | Other (CD, NR, NA)* |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Was the research question or objective in this paper clearly stated? | | | |
| 2. Was the study population clearly specified and defined? | | | |
| 3. Was the participation rate of eligible persons at least 50%? | | | |
| 4. Were all the subjects selected or recruited from the same or similar populations (including the same time period)? Were inclusion and exclusion criteria for being in the study prespecified and applied uniformly to all participants? | | | |
| 5. Was a sample size justification, power description, or variance and effect estimates provided? | | | |
| 6. For the analyses in this paper, were the exposure(s) of interest measured prior to the outcome(s) being measured? | | | |
| 7. Was the timeframe sufficient so that one could reasonably expect to see an association between exposure and outcome if it existed? | | | |
| 8. For exposures that can vary in amount or level, did the study examine different levels of the exposure as related to the outcome (e.g., categories of exposure, or exposure measured as continuous variable)? | | | |
| 9. Were the exposure measures (independent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants? | | | |
| 10. Was the exposure(s) assessed more than once over time? | | | |
| 11. Were the outcome measures (dependent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants? | | | |
| 12. Were the outcome assessors blinded to the exposure status of participants? | | | |
| 13. Was loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less? | | | |
| 14. Were key potential confounding variables measured and adjusted statistically for their impact on the relationship between exposure(s) and outcome(s)? | | | |

*Quality Assessment Tool for Before-After (Pre-Post) Studies With No Control*
*Group*

| Criteria | Yes | No | Other (CD, NR, NA)* |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Was the study question or objective clearly stated? | | | |
| 2. Were eligibility/selection criteria for the study population prespecified and clearly described? | | | |
| 3. Were the participants in the study representative of those who would be eligible for the test/service/intervention in the general or clinical population of interest? | | | |
| 4. Were all eligible participants that met the prespecified entry criteria enrolled? | | | |
| 5. Was the sample size sufficiently large to provide confidence in the findings? | | | |
| 6. Was the test/service/intervention clearly described and delivered consistently across the study population? | | | |
| 7. Were the outcome measures prespecified, clearly defined, valid, reliable, and assessed consistently across all study participants? | | | |
| 8. Were the people assessing the outcomes blinded to the participants' exposures/interventions? | | | |
| 9. Was the loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less? Were those lost to follow-up accounted for in the analysis? | | | |
| 10. Did the statistical methods examine changes in outcome measures from before to after the intervention? Were statistical tests done that provided p values for the pre-to-post changes? | | | |
| 11. Were outcome measures of interest taken multiple times before the intervention and multiple times after the intervention (i.e., did they use an interrupted time-series design)? | | | |
| 12. If the intervention was conducted at a group level (e.g., a whole hospital, a community, etc.) did the statistical analysis take into account the use of individual-level data to determine effects at the group level? | | | |

*Quality Assessment Tool for Case-Series Studies*

| Criteria | Yes | No | Other (CD, NR, NA)* |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Was the study question or objective clearly stated? | | | |
| 2. Was the study population clearly and fully described, including a case definition? | | | |
| 3. Were the cases consecutive? | | | |
| 4. Were the subjects comparable? | | | |
| 5. Was the intervention clearly described? | | | |
| 6. Were the outcome measures clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants? | | | |
| 7. Was the length of follow-up adequate? | | | |
| 8. Were the statistical methods well-described? | | | |
| 9. Were the results well-described? | | | |