

Additional file 7: Results of post-hoc meta-regression regarding publication year, time post-stroke, applied current [mA], duration of stimulation session [min], number of stimulation sessions, electrode size [cm²], current density [mA/cm²], electric charge per session [C], and electric charge density per session [C/cm²]

Meta-regression on primary outcome, ADL capacity

Extracted and calculated data from included sham-controlled trials examining the effects of tDCS on ADL capacity.

| Study ID, Publication Year | Treatment | Time since stroke [months] | Applied current [mA] | Duration of stimulation session [min] | Number of stimulation sessions | Electrode size [cm ²] | Current density [mA/cm ²] | Charge per session [C] | Charge density per session [C/cm ²] |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------|---|
| Bolognini 2011 | anodal vs. sham | 35.21 | 2 | 40 | 10 | 35 | 0.06 | 4.8 | 0.14 |
| DiLazzaro 2014a | dual vs. sham | 0.09 | 2 | 40 | 5 | 35 | 0.06 | 4.8 | 0.14 |
| DiLazzaro 2014b | dual vs. sham | 0.11 | 2 | 40 | 5 | 35 | 0.06 | 4.8 | 0.14 |
| Hesse 2011 | anodal vs. sham | 0.83 | 2 | 20 | 30 | 35 | 0.06 | 2.4 | 0.07 |
| Hesse 2011 | cathodal vs. sham | 0.87 | 2 | 20 | 30 | 35 | 0.06 | 2.4 | 0.07 |
| Khedr 2013 | anodal vs. sham | 0.43 | 2 | 25 | 6 | 35 | 0.06 | 3.0 | 0.09 |
| Khedr 2013 | cathodal vs. sham | 0.41 | 2 | 25 | 6 | 35 | 0.06 | 3.0 | 0.09 |
| Kim 2010 | anodal vs. sham | 0.92 | 2 | 20 | 10 | 25 | 0.08 | 2.4 | 0.10 |
| Kim 2010 | cathodal vs. sham | 0.70 | 2 | 20 | 10 | 25 | 0.08 | 2.4 | 0.10 |
| Rocha 2016 | anodal vs. sham | 27.00 | 1 | 13 | 20 | 35 | 0.03 | 0.8 | 0.02 |
| Rocha 2016 | cathodal vs. sham | 30.35 | 1 | 9 | 20 | 35 | 0.03 | 0.5 | 0.02 |
| Straudi 2016 | dual vs. sham | 13.49 | 1 | 30 | 10 | 35 | 0.03 | 1.8 | 0.05 |
| Tedesco-Triccas 2015 | anodal vs. sham | 19.61 | 1 | 20 | 18 | 35 | 0.03 | 1.2 | 0.03 |
| Wu 2013 | cathodal vs. sham | 4.90 | 1.2 | 20 | 20 | 24.75 | 0.05 | 1.4 | 0.06 |

C: Coulomb; cm²: square centimetre; mA: milliampere, min: minutes, SE: standard error

Variables derived from meta-regression model of tDCS for improving ADL capacity.

| Variable | β | SE | P Value |
|---|----------|---------|---------|
| Intercept | -1274.10 | 1257.51 | 0.31 |
| Publication year | 0.63 | 0.62 | 0.31 |
| Time since stroke [months] | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.44 |
| Applied current [mA] | 2.05 | 5.17 | 0.69 |
| Duration of stimulation session [min] | 0.08 | 0.15 | 0.58 |
| Number of stimulation sessions | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.69 |
| Electrode size [cm ²] | -0.11 | 0.26 | 0.67 |
| Current density [mA/cm ²] | 90.41 | 171.02 | 0.60 |
| Charge per session [C] | -0.50 | 2.84 | 0.86 |
| Charge density per session [C/cm ² *session] | -22.72 | 120.70 | 0.85 |

C: Coulomb; cm²: square centimetre; mA: milliampere, min: minutes, SE: standard error

Meta-regression on secondary outcome, arm function.

Extracted and calculated data from included sham-controlled trials examining the effects of tDCS on arm function as measured by Upper Extremity Fugl-Meyer assessment.

| Study-ID, Publication Year | Treatment | Time since stroke [months] | Applied current [mA] | Duration of stimulation session [min] | Number of stimulation sessions | Electrode size [cm ²] | Current density [mA/cm ²] | Charge per session [C] | Charge density per session [C/cm ²] |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------|---|
| Allman 2016 | anodal vs. sham | 54.13 | 1 | 20 | 9 | 35 | 0.03 | 1.2 | 0.03 |
| Bolognini 2011 | anodal vs. sham | 35.21 | 2 | 40 | 10 | 35 | 0.06 | 4.8 | 0.14 |
| Fusco 2014 | cathodal vs. sham | 0.63 | 1.5 | 10 | 10 | 35 | 0.04 | 0.9 | 0.03 |
| Hesse 2011 | anodal vs. sham | 0.83 | 2 | 20 | 30 | 35 | 0.06 | 2.4 | 0.07 |
| Hesse 2011 | cathodal vs. sham | 0.87 | 2 | 20 | 30 | 35 | 0.06 | 2.4 | 0.07 |
| Kim 2010 | anodal vs. sham | 0.92 | 2 | 20 | 10 | 25 | 0.08 | 2.4 | 0.10 |
| Kim 2010 | cathodal vs. sham | 0.70 | 2 | 20 | 10 | 25 | 0.08 | 2.4 | 0.10 |
| Lindenberg 2010 | dual vs. sham | 35.40 | 1.5 | 30 | 5 | 16.3 | 0.09 | 2.7 | 0.17 |
| Nair 2011 | cathodal vs. sham | 30.50 | 1 | 30 | 5 | NA | NA | 1.8 | NA |
| Rocha 2016 | anodal vs. sham | 27.00 | 1 | 13 | 20 | 35 | 0.03 | 0.8 | 0.02 |
| Rocha 2016 | cathodal vs. sham | 30.35 | 1 | 9 | 20 | 35 | 0.03 | 0.5 | 0.02 |
| Rossi 2013 | anodal vs. sham | 0.32 | 2 | 20 | 5 | 35 | 0.06 | 2.4 | 0.07 |
| Sattler 2015 | anodal vs. sham | 0.18 | 1.2 | 13 | 5 | 35 | 0.03 | 0.9 | 0.03 |
| Straudi 2016 | dual vs. sham | 13.49 | 1 | 30 | 10 | 35 | 0.03 | 1.8 | 0.05 |
| Tedesco-Triccas 2015 | anodal vs. sham | 19.61 | 1 | 20 | 18 | 35 | 0.03 | 1.2 | 0.03 |
| Viana2014 | anodal vs. sham | 33.45 | 2 | 13 | 15 | 35 | 0.06 | 1.6 | 0.04 |
| Wu 2013 | cathodal vs. sham | 4.90 | 1.2 | 20 | 20 | 24.75 | 0.05 | 1.4 | 0.06 |

C: Coulomb; cm²: square centimetre; mA: milliampere, min: minutes, NA: not available, SE: standard error

Variables derived from meta-regression model of tDCS for improving arm function.

| Variable | β | SE | P Value |
|---|----------|---------|---------|
| Intercept | -3537.66 | 7120.91 | 0.62 |
| Publication year | 1.79 | 3.54 | 0.61 |
| Time since stroke [months] | 0.16 | 0.14 | 0.27 |
| Applied current [mA] | 29.92 | 33.66 | 0.37 |
| Duration of stimulation session [min] | -0.29 | 0.89 | 0.74 |
| Number of stimulation sessions | 0.17 | 0.29 | 0.54 |
| Electrode size [cm ²] | -2.57 | 1.32 | 0.05 |
| Current density [mA/cm ²] | -758.41 | 865.13 | 0.38 |
| Charge per session [C] | 4.83 | 14.45 | 0.74 |
| Charge density per session [C/cm ² *session] | -38.66 | 292.23 | 0.89 |

C: Coulomb; cm²: square centimetre; mA: milliampere, min: minutes, SE: standard error