

Appendix 1 – Search Strategy

“stroke” OR “cerebrovascular accident”

AND

“neglect” OR “unilateral neglect” OR “hemispatial neglect” OR “visuospatial neglect” OR
 “personal neglect” OR “motor neglect” OR “peripersonal neglect” OR “extrapersonal neglect”
 OR “hemineglect”

AND

“propriocept*” OR “kinesth*” OR “position sense” OR “body image” OR “body schema” OR
 “body representation”

Appendix 2 – Reasons for Full Text Exclusion

Study	Reasons for Exclusion						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Amesz, 2016		✓					
Anderson, 1993		✓					✓
Antoniello, 2013	✓						
Baier, 2008		✓					
Balslev, 2013					✓		
Beis, 2001					✓		
Beis, 2007				✓			
Carey, 2011				✓			
Chalsen, 1987		✓					
Castiello, 2004					✓		
Dohle, 2009		✓					
Duclos, 2014					✓		
Fotopolou, 2011			✓				
Frassinetti, 2001			✓				
Glocker, 2006		✓					
Hawe, 2017	✓						
Herter, 2011	✓						
Herter, 2012	✓						
Jackson, 2000							✓
Lafosse, 2005		✓					
Lafosse, 2017					✓		
Liefert-Fiebach, 2013			✓				
Mark, 1990			✓				

<i>Mattingly, 1994</i>					✓		
<i>Neppi-Modona, 2007</i>					✓		
<i>Pascal, 2010</i>	✓						
<i>Pavani, 2005</i>			✓				
<i>Paysant, 2004</i>		✓					
<i>Reinhart, 2012</i>			✓				
<i>Suzuki, 2006</i>					✓		
<i>Smith, 1983</i>		✓					
<i>Tyryshkin, 2014</i>					✓		
<i>Tyson, 2008</i>		✓					
<i>Vocat, 2010</i>		✓					
<i>Watanabe, 2006</i>	✓						
<i>Welfringer, 2011</i>			✓				
<i>Welmer, 2007</i>						✓	
<i>Williams, 2015</i>	✓						

KEY: 1. Abstract only, 2. Insufficient data, 3. No UN- group, 4. No UN+ group, 5. No proprioception measure, 6. Participants with previous stroke, 7. Ineligible study design

Appendix 3 – AXIS Quality Assessment Full Results

Author / AXIS Item	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	RISK
Baas	✓	✓	x	✓	x	x	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	NA	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	x	MOD
Barra	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	LOW
Borde 1997	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	MOD
Borde 2006	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	NA	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	MOD
Cocchini	x	x	x	✓	✓	x	x	x	x	x	x	✓	x	NA	✓	x	✓	x	x	x	HIGH
Coslett*	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	NA	✓	x	✓	x	x	x	MOD
Di Vita	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	NA	✓	x	✓	x	✓	✓	MOD
Heilman	✓	✓	x	✓	x	x	x	✓	✓	x	x	x	x	NA	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	HIGH
Meyer	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	NA	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	MOD
Richard	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	NA	✓	x	✓	x	x	✓	MOD
Rosseaux	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	x	x	✓	x	✓	✓	x	x	NA	✓	✓	✓	x	x	✓	HIGH
Saj	✓	✓	x	✓	x	x	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	x	NA	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	MOD
Schmidt	✓	✓	x	✓	x	x	x	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	NA	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	MOD
Semrau 2015	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	x	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	NA	✓	✓	✓	x	x	✓	MOD
Semrau 2018	✓	✓	x	x	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	NA	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	MOD
Tosi	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	LOW
Van Stralen	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	x	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	NA	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	MOD
Vromen	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	NA	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	MOD

KEY: Y = satisfied item, N = did not satisfy item, NA = item not applicable.

Appendix 4: AXIS Assessment Description

<i>Introduction</i>	Yes / No / Do Not Know
1 Were the aims/objectives of the study clear?	
<i>Methods</i>	
2 Was the study design appropriate for the stated aim(s)?	
3 Was the sample size justified?	
4 Was the target/reference population clearly defined? (Is it clear who the research was about?)	
5 Was the sample frame taken from an appropriate population base so that it closely represented the target/reference population under investigation?	
6 Was the selection process likely to select subjects/participants that were representative of the target/reference population under investigation?	
7 Were measures undertaken to address and categorise non-responders?	
8 Were the risk factor and outcome variables measured appropriate to the aims of the study?	
9 Were the risk factor and outcome variables measured correctly using instruments/ measurements that had been trialled, piloted or published previously?	
10 Is it clear what was used to determined statistical significance and/or precision estimates? (eg, p values, CIs)	
11 Were the methods (including statistical methods) sufficiently described to enable them to be repeated?	
<i>Results</i>	
12 Were the basic data adequately described?	
13 Does the response rate raise concerns about non-response bias?	
14 If appropriate, was information about non-responders described?	
15 Were the results internally consistent?	
16 Were the results for the analyses described in the methods, presented?	
<i>Discussion</i>	
17 Were the authors' discussions and conclusions justified by the results?	
18 Were the limitations of the study discussed?	
<i>Other</i>	
19 Were there any funding sources or conflicts of interest that may affect the authors' interpretation of the results?	
20 Was ethical approval or consent of participants attained?	

