



## OPEN ACCESS

## EDITED BY

Jean-Claude Baron,  
University of Cambridge, United Kingdom

## REVIEWED BY

Weimin Yang,  
First Affiliated Hospital of Zhengzhou  
University, China

## \*CORRESPONDENCE

Haoyang Duan  
✉ duanhy101129@163.com

RECEIVED 11 March 2025

ACCEPTED 02 April 2025

PUBLISHED 16 April 2025

## CITATION

Wu H and Duan H (2025) Research progress in Pusher Syndrome after stroke.  
*Front. Neurol.* 16:1591872.  
doi: 10.3389/fneur.2025.1591872

## COPYRIGHT

© 2025 Wu and Duan. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License \(CC BY\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

# Research progress in Pusher Syndrome after stroke

Huayong Wu<sup>1</sup> and Haoyang Duan<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>College of Sports Science and Health, Harbin Sport University, Harbin, China, <sup>2</sup>Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, First Hospital of Jilin University, Changchun, China

Post-stroke Pusher Syndrome is a postural control disorder. It is characterized by active tilting toward the hemiplegic side and resistance to correction. This significantly impacts patients' motor function and quality of life. Its incidence varies greatly due to different research designs and assessment criteria. Literature reports an incidence ranging from 5% to 63%, and the incidence in patients with right brain damage (17.4%) is much higher than that in patients with left brain damage (9.5%). Etiological studies indicate that damage to the parietal lobe, thalamus, insula, and postcentral gyrus is the main pathological basis. The key mechanism is the interruption of thalamocortical connections. Typical clinical manifestations include trunk tilting in supine position, asymmetric weight-bearing in sitting, weight shift in standing, and impaired weight transfer during gait. Patients often have unilateral spatial neglect, which exacerbates balance disorders. Prognosis shows about 90% of patients recover within 6 months, but 10% to 15% may have long-term symptoms. Early rehabilitation intervention can significantly improve functional outcomes. This article comprehensively reviews the nomenclature, incidence, etiology, lesion sites, clinical manifestations, and prognosis of Pusher Syndrome, providing a research foundation for future studies on post-stroke Pusher Syndrome.

## KEYWORDS

Pusher Syndrome, stroke, rehabilitation, research progress, review

## 1 Introduction

Stroke is a major disease threatening human health (1–3). Its high incidence and mortality cause great pain to patients and impose a heavy economic and psychological burden on their families (53). Among post-stroke complications, balance and posture control disorders are common, significantly reducing patients' daily living abilities and quality of life. Pusher Syndrome, a typical post-stroke posture control disorder, is characterized by patients actively tilting their bodies toward the hemiplegic side and resisting correction (4). Epidemiological studies show it has a high incidence among stroke patients and is a key factor affecting functional rehabilitation and quality of life.

In recent years, with the deepening of neuroscience and rehabilitation medicine research, Pusher Syndrome has become a hot topic in rehabilitation medicine (5–7). This imposes higher diagnostic and therapeutic demands on clinical professionals. Therefore, exploring its development is theoretically and practically significant. This article aims to comprehensively review and comment on the research progress of post-stroke Pusher Syndrome.

## 2 The origin and naming of Pusher Syndrome

The concept and naming of Pusher Syndrome originated in 1985 when Davies first systematically proposed and described it. Davies emphasized in his pioneering research that

Pusher Syndrome is a unique postural control disorder in stroke patients. Through clinical observation, he found that patients in sitting, standing, or walking positions actively use their unaffected limbs to push their bodies toward the unaffected side, causing the center of gravity to abnormally shift to the hemiplegic side. They also strongly resist any external attempts to correct their posture. This abnormal movement pattern significantly impedes patients' ability to perform daily activities, especially in transferring from bed to chair, maintaining standing balance, walking, and self-care activities like dressing and washing (8). Davies' description not only clarified the core clinical features of Pusher Syndrome but also laid the theoretical foundation for subsequent research on pathogenesis and rehabilitation interventions.

In early literature, terms describing the "Pusher Syndrome" phenomenon were inconsistent. Pedersen et al. (9) first introduced the term "ipsilateral pushing" to refer to patients' active pushing toward the hemiplegic side (the side opposite to the brain injury). In 2000, the term "contraversive pushing" was proposed to describe patients' behavior of pushing their bodies toward the side opposite to the brain injury (10). D'Aquila et al. (11) defined "lateropulsion" as a postural control disorder where patients have the illusion of remaining upright when their bodies tilt to the hemiplegic side and resist postural correction. Karnath et al. interpreted "lateropulsion" differently, specifying it as a tendency to fall toward the same side as the brain injury, common in patients with lateral medullary syndrome. They also defined "pushing behavior" as patients pushing their bodies toward the hemiplegic side, accompanied by extension and abduction of the non-paralyzed limbs and resistance to passive postural correction. This description essentially refers to the same clinical phenomenon as "lateropulsion" proposed by D'Aquila et al. (12).

The term "Pusher Syndrome" comes from patients' unique Clinical manifestations: when walking or standing, they exhibit a noticeable "pushing" motion toward the hemiplegic side, vividly called "Pusher." In this review, we will uniformly use the term "Pusher Syndrome," whose definition includes all behaviors of actively pushing the body toward the hemiplegic side, such as "ipsilateral pushing," "contraversive pushing," "lateropulsion," "pushing behavior," and "tilting syndrome." Choosing this standardized term not only intuitively reflects patients' clinical characteristics but also helps unify academic discussions and promote in-depth research and academic exchange in this field.

### 3 Prevalence of Pusher Syndrome

The reported incidence of Pusher Syndrome varies significantly due to differences in research design, sample characteristics, and assessment criteria. Davies first described it in 1985 with an incidence of about 25% in stroke patients (8). In 1996, the Copenhagen Stroke Study found an incidence of 5%–10% (9). Other studies indicate an overall incidence of 5–20% in stroke patients (13, 14), particularly in those with recurrent or severe brain injury. Notably, some studies have reported an incidence as high as 63%, often in patients with severe neurological impairment (15).

Yang et al. (16) assessed 48 stroke patients, finding 56.3% had mild Pusher Syndrome and 16.7% severe at admission. By discharge, 47.9% remained mild, 43.8% had no symptoms, and no severe cases remained.

Abe et al. (13) assessed 1,660 acute stroke patients with a standardized contralateral tilt scale, finding 154 (9.4%) exhibited tilting behavior. Of these, 97 (17.4%) had right-brain damage, and 57 (9.5%) had left-brain damage. This shows right-brain damage patients are at higher risk of tilting behavior.

It should be noted that the incidence of Pusher Syndrome can be influenced by patient age, gender, and the timeliness and effectiveness of rehabilitation. Therefore, future research should focus on well-designed, adequately powered multicenter studies to better define the epidemiology of Pusher Syndrome and confirm these findings.

## 4 The etiology of Pusher Syndrome

Pusher Syndrome is a complex neurological disorder with no fully understood cause. Current research indicates stroke is the primary cause, especially when it affects key brain areas for spatial orientation and body awareness, such as the parietal lobe, thalamus, or posterior thalamus. Damage to these regions can lead to typical Pusher Syndrome manifestations (17, 18).

Brain injury from traumatic brain injury, which results from external force to the head, can disrupt brain function and increase the risk of Pusher Syndrome (19). Post-surgical brain complications, like local tissue damage or inflammation, may also trigger it.

In central nervous system diseases, conditions like multiple sclerosis, brain tumors, or CNS infections can be associated with Pusher Syndrome if they affect brain regions related to posture and balance. These diseases can impact brain function through various mechanisms, including direct neuronal damage, inflammation, or tumor-related brain compression (19). It is important to note that Pusher Syndrome likely results from multiple factors interacting, with significant individual variation. Therefore, the specific cause can vary from patient to patient.

## 5 Lesion sites of Pusher Syndrome

Since Davies first described Pusher Syndrome, many studies have explored the link between brain damage sites and the syndrome (20–22). However, no specific brain area has been clearly identified as its direct cause. This might be because Pusher Syndrome involves complex interactions among multiple neural networks, not just isolated damage to a single area.

Research shows that patients with right hemisphere lesions have a higher incidence of Pusher Syndrome (17.4%) compared to those with left hemisphere lesions (9.5%) (13). Dieterich et al. (23) supported this, noting the right hemisphere's special role in spatial orientation, memory, and navigation. Damage to these areas increases the risk of posture and spatial perception problems, thus raising the likelihood of Pusher Syndrome.

Baier et al. (18) found that in right hemisphere damage, the posterior insula, tectal area, and superior temporal gyrus are significantly associated with Pusher Syndrome, possibly being key parts of the sensory vestibular cortical network for balance and spatial orientation. In left hemisphere damage, the anterior insula, tectal area, and fibers in the internal capsule projecting to the lateral thalamus are

linked to the syndrome, possibly directly related to posture control or processing vestibular balance information.

Karnath et al. (10) conducted a prospective study on 40 thalamic stroke patients, finding that right thalamic damage led to spatial neglect, while left thalamic damage resulted in aphasia. This highlights the thalamus's importance in posture control and spatial perception. Another study revealed significant damage in the ventral posterolateral areas of the thalamus in Pusher Syndrome patients, especially those with thalamic hemorrhage, and this was confirmed in a three-year follow-up, strengthening the link between Pusher Syndrome and thalamic damage (24).

Karnath later noted that Pusher Syndrome is mainly related to posterior thalamic damage, with some cases also involving the insula and postcentral gyrus (12). He also found that damage to other cortical and subcortical regions, such as the insular cortex or postcentral gyrus, could cause Pusher Syndrome (25).

Johannsen et al. (26) studied 45 patients with acute unilateral cerebral cortical damage (without thalamic damage) exhibiting Pusher Syndrome behaviors. Results showed that brain area damage associated with these behaviors mainly focused on the insular cortex and postcentral gyrus, with significant overlap. Lee et al. (17) expanded on this, identifying significant associations between Pusher Syndrome and multiple specific regions in the right hemisphere, including the precentral gyrus, postcentral gyrus, inferior frontal gyrus, insula, and inferior parietal lobule.

Santos-Pontelli et al. (27) used advanced neuroimaging to analyze 31 Pusher Syndrome patients' brains, finding the parietal lobe and thalamus as the most frequently affected regions. Later, using MRI perfusion imaging, they revealed significant hypoperfusion in the inferior frontal gyrus, middle temporal gyrus, and inferior parietal lobule. This suggests that hypoperfusion in these areas may directly impair posture control, indicating they could be key neuroanatomical bases for Pusher Syndrome (28).

Some studies link Pusher Syndrome to severe unilateral spatial neglect after parietal lobe damage, considering it a crucial pathological basis for Pusher behavior. However, other studies propose that posterior limb of the internal capsule damage might contribute to Pusher Syndrome by affecting sensory signal pathways (10). Jang et al. (20), in a diffusion tensor tractography study on intracerebral hemorrhage patients, found that as medial lemniscus nerve fibers repaired, Pusher Syndrome symptoms improved, indicating the medial lemniscus's potential role in symptom alleviation.

Babyar et al. (29), using perfusion-weighted imaging, found hypoperfusion mainly in the inferior parietal lobe, from Brodmann area 2 in the postcentral gyrus to Brodmann area 40 in the inferior parietal lobule. This further links hypoperfusion in this region to Pusher Syndrome. Research indicates that Pusher Syndrome is typically associated with unilateral lesions in areas like the thalamic posterior nucleus, posterior insular cortex, superior temporal gyrus, postcentral gyrus, and inferior parietal lobule, which are key parts of the multisensory cortical network (e.g., the central vestibular system).

Recent studies using diffusion tensor imaging have explored vestibular connectivity, revealing close functional and structural links between vestibular nuclei and the central vestibular system. These interactions are crucial for maintaining balance and spatial orientation (23). Yeo et al. (30) found that when vestibular projection pathways are damaged, patients exhibit severe Pusher Syndrome symptoms, which improve as these pathways recover.

Rosenzopf et al. (31) analyzed functional and structural disconnection in 124 stroke patients to investigate Pusher Syndrome's neural mechanisms. Using lesion network symptom mapping, they found functional deactivation in distant cortical areas (cerebellum, frontal, parietal, and temporal lobes) in thalamus-damaged Pusher Syndrome patients. Notably, this deactivation wasn't seen in cortex-only stroke patients, and there was no evidence of convergence between thalamic and cortical damage in shared functional networks. Structural disconnection analysis confirmed disrupted connections between the posterior thalamus and temporal, precentral, postcentral, and paracentral regions. Tractography showed that in cortex-damaged Pusher Syndrome patients, critical white matter damage disrupted connections between the posterior thalamus and these regions, rather than the cortex damage itself causing the syndrome. This provides the first direct evidence of thalamocortical connectivity's role in Pusher Syndrome, with the research team positing that the syndrome likely results from direct damage to the posterior thalamus or its connecting pathways.

## 6 The characteristic manifestations of Pusher Syndrome

Pusher Syndrome, a common post-stroke postural control disorder, has distinct and consistent clinical manifestations (32).

In supine position, patients exhibit a typical tilt toward the hemiplegic side due to trunk asymmetry, shortening the affected trunk. This compromises comfort and limits self-turning and movement. To compensate, patients often turn their head to the healthy side, opposite to the trunk tilt (33–35). Notably, even at rest, patients may experience vertical spatial perception errors, gripping the healthy bedrail to prevent falls (16, 36, 37).

In sitting position, patients display postural abnormalities from hemiplegic side hypertonia and trunk asymmetry: the affected trunk tilts, the buttocks bear weight, and the healthy trunk shortens, creating a pronounced asymmetry. This increases the difficulty of maintaining a seated position and fall risk. For compensation, patients turn their head to the healthy side, counteracting the trunk tilt but worsening sitting balance. During dynamic activities like transfers, patients struggle due to hemiplegic side resistance and balance issues, especially when moving to the healthy side. Some patients also have unilateral spatial neglect, exacerbating balance problems and risks (21, 38).

In standing position, patients show significant weight shift to the affected side, tilting the trunk there and struggling to maintain upright balance. Some lean backward, needing therapist or device support. Kinesiologically, the affected lower limb has flexor hypertonia and extensor weakness, limiting weight-bearing. Patients have difficulty initiating gait due to impaired weight shift to the healthy side. Notably, those with spatial neglect may have additional balance and environmental judgment issues (39, 40). This instability causes significant fear of falling, leading to over-reliance on others or supports (32).

During gait cycle, patients have significant weight transfer deficits, struggling to shift weight from the affected to healthy side, reducing gait stability and causing a lateral lean. This mainly stems from affected lower limb flexor-extensor imbalance: hypertonia and weakness respectively, maintaining a flexed posture and impairing

weight-bearing. At gait initiation, the healthy lower limb has stepping difficulty, shorter support phase, and smaller step length due to limited weight shift. The affected lower limb lacks sufficient extensor activation for antigravity support during stance phase, increasing fall risk. To compensate, patients show typical postural adjustments: turning the head to the healthy side for visual balance and tilting the trunk to the affected side to reduce weight on it (41).

These clinical manifestations highlight the multidimensional postural control deficits in Pusher Syndrome patients post-stroke. These deficits severely impact motor functions like position changes, sitting balance, standing stability, and gait control, negatively affecting daily activities, social participation, and quality of life. Moreover, this unique postural disorder can prolong rehabilitation, increase its difficulty, and influence overall prognosis (7, 42). Thus, understanding these clinical features is crucial for developing targeted rehabilitation strategies and improving patient outcomes.

## 7 Prognosis of Pusher Syndrome

Research on Pusher Syndrome prognosis presents diverse findings. Evidence suggests it significantly delays rehabilitation compared to other post-stroke disorders, particularly in the early stage, with the delay lasting weeks to months, yet generally not affecting final functional recovery (15, 43). Prognostic differences are mainly attributed to etiological factors [e.g., traumatic brain injury or brain tumors, which often require longer recovery (19)], lesion site impact [right-brain-damaged patients usually recover slower than left-brain-damaged ones (13)], and comorbidities [patients with proprioceptive or visual-spatial disorders typically need longer rehabilitation (44)]. Danells et al. (18) found a significant link between Pusher Syndrome duration and unilateral spatial neglect in their longitudinal study of 39 patients.

Long-term prognosis research results are inconsistent. Karnath's prospective study shows about 90% of patients recover nearly fully within 6 months, with no significant long-term functional impact (45). However, clinical observations indicate 10%–15% of patients still have symptoms 2 years post-stroke, which may continuously affect daily activities (43).

Early identification and intervention are crucial for improving prognosis. Systematic rehabilitation significantly enhances postural control and balance, shown in: improved daily activity ability, enhanced self-care ability, better quality of life, reduced complication rate (46, 47). Thus, establishing an early diagnosis system and creating individualized rehabilitation plans are crucial for optimizing Pusher Syndrome patient prognosis.

## 8 Advances in the treatment of Pusher Syndrome

Transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) is a non-invasive brain stimulation technique that modulates cortical neuronal activity by applying weak direct current to the scalp. Its mechanism is based on changing neuronal resting membrane potential: anodal stimulation increases neuronal excitability, while cathodal stimulation decreases it. In treating Pusher Syndrome, tDCS mainly modulates cortical areas related to balance control. Studies show that tDCS applied to the scalp

or mastoid can effectively improve post-stroke limb motor and cognitive dysfunction, positively affecting posture control and significantly promoting patient rehabilitation (4, 48, 49).

Transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) is another non-invasive brain stimulation technique that induces cortical current changes via a magnetic field generated through the scalp, modulating neuronal excitability. Its effects depend on stimulation frequency and intensity: high frequency enhances neuronal excitability, while low frequency reduces it. In Pusher Syndrome treatment, TMS mainly improves motor function and balance control. By stimulating specific brain regions like the motor and vestibular cortices, TMS promotes neuroplasticity, significantly enhancing motor ability and posture control. Notably, repetitive TMS is recognized by the American Heart Association/American Stroke Association as an effective method for improving Pusher Syndrome-related neglect symptoms, with evidence level IIB and grade B (50).

Brain stimulation techniques show broad prospects in treating Pusher Syndrome. They precisely modulate cortical excitability, effectively improving motor function and balance control, offering new rehabilitation ideas. However, further research is needed on optimal stimulation parameters, target area selection, and long-term efficacy. Future studies should focus on developing individualized treatment strategies and combined protocols of brain stimulation with traditional rehabilitation training for optimal Pusher Syndrome rehabilitation.

Studies indicate that virtual reality technology offers continuous visual feedback to patients, guiding correct posture and promoting central nervous system restructure (54). The research of Kim et al. (41) confirms that virtual reality, through real-time visual feedback, corrects abnormal postures and accelerates neuroplasticity, enhancing rehabilitation outcomes. Combining visual guidance with core stability training also effectively improves tilting posture and enhances body vertical perception.

Research further explores the combined use of virtual reality and robotics. This technology provides highly repetitive training and allows for early upright posture training via harness assistance. Although more effective than conventional physical therapy combined with visual feedback, it remains unclear whether real-time therapist guidance and correction are included during robotic-assisted treatment (51, 52).

Both traditional mirror visual feedback and computer-based virtual reality technologies have positively influenced posture control, improving quality of life. Despite the advantages of computer visual feedback systems in therapeutic effects and precision, their high equipment costs limit their widespread use in clinical and home settings.

## 9 Summary

This article comprehensively reviews research on Pusher Syndrome post-stroke, covering its origin, naming, incidence, etiology, lesion sites, clinical manifestations, and prognosis. Pusher Syndrome is a complex neurological disorder where patients actively tilt toward the hemiplegic side and resist postural correction, significantly impacting motor function and quality of life. Its causes are diverse, mainly related to damage of the multisensory cortical network from stroke, such as in the parietal lobe, thalamus, insula, and

postcentral gyrus. Studies show a higher incidence in patients with right-brain damage than left-brain damage, with different brain injuries linked to varying clinical manifestations and prognoses. Typical manifestations include trunk tilting in supine position, asymmetric weight-bearing in sitting, weight shift in standing, and impaired weight transfer during gait. For prognosis, most patients recover within 6 months post-stroke, but some have long-term symptoms. Early rehabilitation significantly improves functional outcomes. Future research should clarify its pathological mechanisms to refine diagnostic and therapeutic strategies.

## Author contributions

HW: Writing – original draft. HD: Investigation, Writing – review & editing.

## Funding

The author(s) declare that financial support was received for the research and/or publication of this article. This work was supported by grants from Science and Technology Achievements Transformation Fund of the First Hospital of Jilin University (no. JDYYZH-2022012).

## References

1. GBD 2016 Dementia Collaborators. Global, regional, and national burden of Alzheimer's disease and other dementias, 1990–2016: a systematic analysis for the global burden of disease study 2016. *Lancet Neurol.* (2019) 18:88–106. doi: 10.1016/S1474-4422(18)30403-4
2. Lindsay MP, Norrving B, Sacco RL, Brainin M, Hacke W, Martins S, et al. World stroke organization (WSO): global stroke fact sheet 2019. *Int J Stroke.* (2019) 14:806–17. doi: 10.1177/1747493019881353
3. Ekker MS, Boot EM, Singhal AB, Tan KS, Debette S, Tuladhar AM, et al. Epidemiology, aetiology, and management of ischaemic stroke in young adults. *Lancet Neurol.* (2018) 17:790–801. doi: 10.1016/S1474-4422(18)30233-3
4. Yamaguchi T, Satow T, Komuro T, Mima T. Transcranial direct current stimulation improves pusher phenomenon. *Case Rep Neurol.* (2019) 11:61–5. doi: 10.1159/000497284
5. Gandolfi M, Geroini C, Ferrari F, la Marchina E, Varalta V, Fonte C, et al. Rehabilitation procedures in the management of postural orientation deficits in patients with poststroke pusher behavior: a pilot study. *Minerva Med.* (2016) 107:353–62.
6. Yeo SS, Jang SH, Kwon JW. Lateral medullary syndrome following injury of the vestibular pathway to the core vestibular cortex: diffusion tensor imaging study. *Neurosci Lett.* (2018) 665:147–51. doi: 10.1016/j.neulet.2017.12.010
7. Pardo V, Galen S. Treatment interventions for pusher syndrome: a case series. *Neuro Rehabil.* (2019) 44:131–40. doi: 10.3233/NRE-182549
8. Davies PM. Steps to follow: A guide to the treatment of adult hemiplegia. Berlin: Springer-Verlag (1985).
9. Pedersen P, Wandel A, Jørgensen H, Nakayama H, Raaschou HO, Olsen TS. Ipsilateral pushing in stroke: incidence, relation to neuropsychological symptoms, and impact on rehabilitation. The Copenhagen stroke study. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* (1996) 77:25–8. doi: 10.1016/s0003-9993(96)90215-4
10. Karnath HO, Ferber S, Dichgans J. The origin of contraversive pushing: evidence for a second graviceptive system in humans. *Neurology.* (2000) 55:1298–304. doi: 10.1212/wnl.55.9.1298
11. D'Aquila MA, Smith T, Organ D, Lichtman S, Reding M. Validation of a lateropulsion scale for patients recovering from stroke. *Clin Rehabil.* (2004) 18:102–9. doi: 10.1191/0269215504cr709a
12. Karnath HO. Pusher syndrome—a frequent but littleknown disturbance of body orientation perception. *J Neurol.* (2007) 254:415–24. doi: 10.1007/s00415-006-0341-6
13. Abe H, Kondo T, Oouchida Y, Suzukamo Y, Fujiwara S, Izumi SI. Prevalence and length of recovery of pusher syndrome based on cerebral hemispheric lesion side in

## Acknowledgments

The authors thank all study participants.

## Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

## Generative AI statement

The authors declare that no Gen AI was used in the creation of this manuscript.

## Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

14. Baccini M, Paci M, Nannetti L, Bircolli C, Rinaldi LA. Scale for contraversive pushing: cutoff scores for diagnosing “pusher behavior” and construct validity. *Phys Ther.* (2008) 88:947–55. doi: 10.2522/ptj.20070179
15. Danells CJ, Black SE, Gladstone DJ, WE MI. Poststroke “pushing” natural history and relationship to motor and functional recovery. *Stroke.* (2004) 35:2873–8. doi: 10.1161/01.STR.0000147724.83468.18
16. Yang MX, Jiang Y. Study of the burke lateropulsion scale to evaluate pusher syndrome rehabilitation. *Physiotherapy.* (2015) 101:e683. doi: 10.1016/j.physio.2015.03.3527
17. Lee KB, Yoo SW, Ji EK, Hwang WS, Yoo YJ, Yoon MJ, et al. Is lateropulsion really related with a specific lesion of the brain? *Brain Sci.* (2021) 11:354. doi: 10.3390/brainsci11030354
18. Baier B, Janzen J, Müller-Forell W, Fechir M, Müller N, Dieterich M. Pusher syndrome: its cortical correlate. *J Neurol.* (2012) 259:277–83. doi: 10.1007/s00415-011-6173-z
19. Santos-Pontelli TE, Pontes-Neto OM, Colafemina JF, de Araujo DB, Santos AC, Leite JP. Contraversive pushing in non-stroke patients. *J Neurology.* (2004) 251:1324–8. doi: 10.1007/s00415-004-0532-y
20. Jang SH, Lee HD. Recovery of an injured medial lemniscus with concurrent recovery of pusher syndrome in a strokepatient: a case report. *Medicine.* (2018) 97:e10963. doi: 10.1097/MD.00000000000010963
21. Zhang Q, Zhang L, He W, Zheng X, Zhao Z, Li Y, et al. Case report: visual deprivation in pusher syndrome complicated by hemispatial neglect after basal ganglia stroke. *Front Neurol.* (2021) 12:706611. doi: 10.3389/fneur.2021.706611
22. Babyar SR, Peterson MGE, Reding M. Time to recovery from lateropulsion dependent on key stroke deficits: aretrospective analysis. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair.* (2015) 29:207–13. doi: 10.1177/1545968314541330
23. Dieterich M, Brandt T. Global orientation in space and the lateralization of brain functions. *Curr Opin Neurol.* (2018) 31:96–104. doi: 10.1097/WCO.0000000000000516
24. Karnath HO, Ferber S, Dichgans J. The neural representation of postural control in humans. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA.* (2000) 97:13931–6. doi: 10.1073/pnas.240279997
25. Karnath HO, Suchan J, Johannsen L. Pusher syndrome after ACA territory infarction. *Eur J Neurol.* (2008) 15:84–5. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-1331.2008.02187.x
26. Johannsen L, Broetz D, Naegelte T, Karnath HO. “Pusher syndrome” following cortical lesions that spare the thalamus. *J Neurol.* (2006) 253:455–63. doi: 10.1007/s00415-005-0025-7

27. Santos-Pontelli TE, Pontes-Neto OM, Araujo DB, Santos AC, Leite JP. Neuroimaging in stroke and non-stroke pusher patients. *Arg Neuropsiquiatr.* (2011) 69:914–9. doi: 10.1590/s0004-282x2011000700013
28. Santos-Pontelli TE, Pontes-Neto OM, de Araujo DB, Santos AC, Leite JP. Persistent pusher behavior after a stroke. *Clinics.* (2011) 66:2169–71. doi: 10.1590/S1807-59322011001200025
29. Babyar SR, Smeragliuolo A, Albazron FM, Putrino D, Reding M, Boes AD. Lesion localization of post stroke lateropulsion. *Stroke.* (2019) 50:1067–73. doi: 10.1161/STROKEAHA.118.023445
30. Yeo SS, Jang SH, Oh S, Kwon JW. Role of diffusion tensor imaging in analyzing the neural connectivity of the parieto-insular vestibular cortex in pusher syndrome: as case report. *Medicine.* (2020) 99:e19835. doi: 10.1097/MD.00000000000019835
31. Rosenzopf H, Klingbeil J, Wawrzyniak M, Röhrig L, Sperber C, Saur D, et al. Thalamocortical disconnection involved in pusher syndrome. *Brain.* (2023) 146:3648–61. doi: 10.1093/brain/awad096
32. Nolan J, Jacques A, Godecke E, Abe H, Babyar S, Bergmann J. Clinical practice recommendations for management of lateropulsion after stroke determined by a Delphi expert panel. *Clin Rehabil.* (2023) 37:1559–74. doi: 10.1177/02692155231172012
33. Paci M, Macchioni G, Ferrarello F. Treatment approaches for pusher behaviour: a scoping review. *Top Stroke Rehabil.* (2023) 30:119–36. doi: 10.1080/10749357.2021.2016098
34. Obrero-Gaitán E, Lomas-Vega R, MDC L-R, García-López H, Cortés-Pérez I, et al. Misperception of body verticality inneurological disorders: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Brain Behav.* (2024) 14:e3496. doi: 10.1002/brb3.3496
35. Saeys W, Herssens N, Verwulgen S, Truijen S. Sensory information and the perception of verticality in post-stroke patients. Another point of view in sensory reweighting strategies. *PLoS One.* (2018) 13:e199098. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0199098
36. Boetz D, Karnath HO. New aspects for the physiotherapy of pushing behavior. *Neuro Rehabilitation.* (2005) 20:133–8. doi: 10.3233/nre-2005-20209
37. Mikotajewska E. Rehabilitacja pacjentów z zespołem odpychania. *Postepy Psychiatrii Neurol.* (2011) 20:291–6.
38. Chen XW, Lin CH, Zheng H, Lin ZL. Chinese patient with pusher syndrome and unilateral spatial neglect syndrome. *Can J Neurol Sci.* (2014) 41:493–7. doi: 10.1017/s0317167100018540
39. Katz N, Hartman-Maeir A, Ring H, Soroker N. Functional disability and rehabilitation outcome in right hemisphere damaged patients with and without unilateral spatial neglect. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* (1999) 80:379–84. doi: 10.1016/S0003-9993(99)90273-3
40. Wiart L, Saint Côme AB, Debelleix X, Petit H, Joseph PA, Mazaux JM, et al. Unilateral neglect syndrome rehabilitation by trunk rotation and scanning training. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* (1997) 78:424–9. doi: 10.1016/s0003-9993(97)90236-7
41. Kim MS. Effect of robot assisted rehabilitation based on visual feedback in post stroke pusher syndrome. *J Korea Acad Ind Coop Soc.* (2016) 17:562–8. doi: 10.5762/KAIS.2016.17.10.562
42. Van Crielinge T, Truijen S, Jonas S, Maebe Z, Blancaert K, van der Waal C, et al. The effectiveness of trunk training on trunk control, sitting and standing balance and mobility post-stroke: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin Rehabil.* (2019) 33:992–1002. doi: 10.1177/0269215519830159
43. Babyar S, Peterson M, Reding M. Case-control study of impairments associated with recovery from “pusher after stroke: logistic regression analyses syndrome”. *J Stroke Cerebrovasc Dis.* (2017) 26:25–33. doi: 10.1016/j.jstrokecerebrovasdis.2016.08.024
44. Babyar SR, White H, Shaf N, Reding M. Outcomes with stroke and lateropulsion: a case-matched controlled study. *Neurorehabil Neural Res.* (2008) 22:415–23. doi: 10.1177/1545968307313511
45. Karnath HO, Johannsen L, Broetz D, Ferber S, Dichgans J. Prognosis of contraversive pushing. *J Neurol.* (2002) 249:1250–3. doi: 10.1007/s00415-002-0824-z
46. Nolan J, Godecke E, Spilsbury K, Singer B. Post-stroke lateropulsion and rehabilitation outcomes: a retrospective analysis. *Disabil rehab.* (2022) 44:5162–70. doi: 10.1080/09638288.2021.1928300
47. Ballester BR, Ward NS, Brander F, Maier M, Kelly K, Verschure PFMJ. Relationship between intensity and recovery in post-stroke rehabilitation: a retrospective analysis. *J Neurol Neurosurg Ps.* (2022) 93:226–8. doi: 10.1136/jnnp-2021-326948
48. Klomjai W, Aneksan B, Pheungphrattanantrai A, Chantanachai T, Choowong N, Bunleukhet S, et al. Effect of single-session dual-tDCS before physical therapy on lower-limb performance in sub-acute stroke patients: a randomized sham-controlled crossover study. *Ann Phys Rehabil Med.* (2018) 61:286–91. doi: 10.1016/j.rehab.2018.04.005
49. Babyar S, Santos T, Will-Lemos T, Mazin S, Edwards D, Reding M. Sinusoidal transcranial direct current versus galvanic vestibular stimulation for treatment of lateropulsion poststroke. *J Stroke Cerebrovasc Dis.* (2018) 27:3621–5. doi: 10.1016/j.jstrokecerebrovasdis.2018.08.034
50. Winstein CJ, Stein J, Arena R, Bates B, Cherney LR, Cramer SC, et al. Guidelines for adult stroke rehabilitation and recovery: a guideline for healthcare professionals from the American heart association/American stroke association. *Stroke.* (2016) 47:e98–e169. doi: 10.1161/STR.0000000000000098
51. Krewer C, Rieß K, Bergmann J, Müller F, Jahn K, Koenig E. Immediate effectiveness of single-session therapeutic interventions in pusher behaviour. *Gait Posture.* (2013) 37:246–50. doi: 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2012.07.014
52. Yun N, Joo MC, Kim S, Kim SM. Robot-assisted gait training effectively improved lateropulsion in subacute stroke patients: a single-blinded randomized controlled trial. *Eur J Phys Rehabil Med.* (2018) 54:827–36. doi: 10.23736/S1973-9087.18.05077-3
53. Kim J, Thayabaranathan T, Donnan GA, Howard G, Howard VJ, Rothwell PM, et al. Global stroke statistics 2019. *Int J Stroke.* (2020) 15:819–38. doi: 10.1177/1747493020909545
54. Yang YR, Chen YH, Chang HC, Chan RC, Wei SH, Wang RY. Effects of interactive visual feedback training on post-stroke pusher syndrome: a pilot randomized controlled study. *Clin Rehabil.* (2015) 29:987–93. doi: 10.1177/0269215514564898