

## Original research article

## An Observational Study to Assess the Influence of Advanced Age and Hypertension on Functional Gains of Stroke Patients Undergoing Rehabilitation.

Dr. Vikas Kumar

<sup>1</sup>Associate Professor and HOD, Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Anugrah Narayan Magadh Medical College, and Hospital, Gaya, Bihar, India.

Corresponding Author: Dr. Vikas kumar

### Abstract

**Aim:** To examine whether advanced age and hypertension influence the functional gains of stroke patients undergoing rehabilitation.

**Material and methods:** This was retrospective observational study Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Anugrah Narayan Magadh Medical College, Gaya, India for 18 months. Two hundred patients with thromboembolic strokes were included. The patients were divided into five age groups: below 50 years, 50-60 years, 60-70 years, 70-80 years and above 80 years. They were further classified into the hypertensive and non-hypertensive groups. Patients' functional performance was assessed on the Functional Independence Measure (FIM) on admission, weekly, and at discharge. For each group the averages of the length of stay (LOS), FIM score, and the efficiency ratio (ER) were obtained from the records. The ER is the difference of discharge to Admission FIM expressed as a fraction of the Length of Stay.

**Results:** There was significant difference ( $p < 0.0003$ ) among the five age groups for the means of ER for the male and female hypertensive and non-hypertensive patients together. The ER for patients below 60 years of age is found to be significantly higher than for patients over 60 years ( $p < 0.00001$ ). The means of the ER are 1.29, and 0.95 with the difference of 0.37 and its standard error of 0.108. Non-hypertensive patients had higher ER compared to the hypertensives for all the age groups (Tables 4a and 4b). This difference is significant for patients younger than 60 years ( $p < 0.01$ ) and older than 80 years ( $p < 0.00001$ ). ER for non-hypertensive patients below age 60 is significantly higher ( $p < 0.05$ ) than for the hypertensives. Among the patients over 60 years of age, there is no significant difference for the ER between non-hypertensives and hypertensives.

**Conclusion:** Younger non-hypertensive patients seem to show better progress with inpatient rehabilitation.

**Keywords:** stroke, hypertension, rehabilitation

### Introduction

The incidence of stroke is increasing once again, primarily in relation to the aging population.<sup>1,2</sup> Unfortunately, acute interventions, such as tissue plasminogen activator, have not had a large impact on stroke-related disability, primarily because this treatment can be offered to only a minority of ischemic stroke survivors. Subsequently, the demand for stroke rehabilitation services continues to increase,<sup>3</sup> and there is a growing need to optimize both the effectiveness and the efficiency of these limited resources. Age has been identified as a significant prognostic factor for recovery in a number of studies.<sup>4-7</sup> Jongbloed<sup>5</sup> has identified 14 studies that found age to be negatively correlated with function at or after discharge and 4 that did not find such a relationship. Such information has led to the suggestion that age be used in combination with severity of stroke to determine whether a patient should receive intensive interdisciplinary stroke rehabilitation, geriatric reactivation, or a "slower-stream" rehabilitation unit.<sup>8</sup> In view of

the strong evidence supporting the effectiveness of intensive stroke rehabilitation units, it is important to clearly identify the impact of age on functional outcome before embracing a system that denies access to these units based on a person's age. Numerous studies have reported associations between age and poor outcome. The predictive value of age in the literature, however, depends on evaluation of the outcome. The negative impact of age on functional outcome is most apparent when functional status at discharge is being assessed. Conversely, when change of function is assessed, age tends not to influence outcome negatively.<sup>4</sup> It is difficult to distinguish between age itself and such age-associated factors as comorbidities that have a negative influence on functional outcome, including ischemic heart disease, hypertension, diabetes, and altered cognitive capacity.<sup>5</sup>

Hypertension is the first modifiable risk factor, accounting for 10.4 million deaths and 218 million attributable disability-adjusted life-years worldwide.<sup>9</sup> With a recently revised definition (a threshold shift from 140/90 mmHg to 130/80 mmHg), hypertension may concern nearly 50% of the US population<sup>10,11</sup> and thus is a truly crucial public health issue, especially as hypertension is still dramatically underdiagnosed. In a recent international study population that aimed to estimate hypertension prevalence, awareness, and medication control, only 46.5% of participants were aware that they suffered from hypertension, and only 32.5% of treated patients were pharmacologically controlled.<sup>12</sup> In line with this evidence, the French cross-sectional study ESTEBAN assessed between 2014 and 2016 the same 50% proportion of hypertension awareness and that only 47.3% patients were treated, while again only 55% were pharmacologically controlled.<sup>13</sup> Since hypertension is the major cause of strokes, in our study we have evaluated the effect of both age and hypertension on stroke patients using the Functional Independence Measure (FIM), a widely accepted functional outcome measure. We have examined the functional performance for both the hypertensive and non-hypertensive patients separately and for the male and female patients with or without hypertension.

### Material and methods

This was retrospective observational study Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Anugrah Narayan Magadh Medical College, Gaya, India for 18 months. after taking the approval of the protocol review committee and institutional ethics committee. The data were collected from medical records of stroke patients who underwent inpatient rehabilitation during this period. Two hundred patients with thrombo- embolic strokes were included. The patients were divided into five age groups: below 50 years, 50-60 years, 60-70 years, 70-80 years and above 80 years. They were further classified into the hypertensive and non-hypertensive groups. The location of the lesion, time interval between the onset of stroke and transfer to rehabilitation, neurologic deficits, discharge destination, and gender were comparable among the groups. Patients with ischemic strokes from all age groups with or without hypertension are included. Patients had to complete their inpatient rehabilitation without interruption of their rehabilitation stay. Patients with hemorrhagic strokes and those with previous strokes and whose rehabilitation was interrupted from any medical complications were excluded. Patients' functional performance was assessed on the Functional Independence Measure (FIM) on admission, weekly, and at discharge. For each group the averages of the length of stay (LOS), FIM score, and the efficiency ratio (ER) were obtained from the records. The ER is the difference of discharge to Admission FIM expressed as a fraction of the Length of Stay. We considered that ER as the main functional outcome measure. Co-morbidity, medical complications and presence or absence of visuo-spatial deficits were also recorded. There were 200 patients 20 of them were under 50 years, 35 between 50-60 years, 50 between 60-70years, 70 between 70-80 and 25 were over 80 years of age. Comorbidities for the five age groups were depression; diabetes mellitus, coronary artery disease and congestive heart failure were observed. There were 110 males comprising of 70 hypertensives and 40 non-

hypertensives. 60 were hypertensive and 30 were non-hypertensive of 90 female patients. The admission (ADM) FIM, discharge (D/C) FIM, Length of Stay and Efficiency Ratios were individually tabulated under male, female hypertensive and non hypertensive groups and all male and all female groups in hypertensive and non- hypertensive categories were also studied.

### Results

There were 110 males comprising of 70 hypertensive and 40 non-hypertensive. 60 were hypertensive and 30 were non-hypertensive of 90 female patients

**Table 1: Demographics n=200**

Age (years)	Below -50	50-60	60-70	70-80	Above 80
(n)	20	35	50	70	25
Male=110	9	21	30	38	12
Female=90	11	14	20	32	13
Lt. CVA	7	20	23	23	11
Rt. CVA	10	13	25	45	12
Br. Stem	3	2	2	2	2
Hypertensive=130	7	25	30	50	18
Non-hypertensive=70	13	10	20	20	7

**Abbreviations** CVA, cerebrovascular accident; BR, brain

**Table 2A: Male hypertensives n=70**

Age (years)		Below -50	50-60	60-70	70-80	Above 80
(n)		4	16	15	28	7
A-FIM	Avg.	47.3	37.2	50.2	41.9	51.5
	St. Dev.	18.9	14.2	13.2	15.2	15.6
D-FIM	Avg.	69.8	65.8	72.8	65.8	72.3
	St. Dev.	18.9	17.9	13.8	17.9	10.9
LOS	Avg.	23.5	33.2	21.9	32.7	25.1
	St. Dev.	12.3	15.9	10.2	12.3	9.7
ER	Avg.	1.50	1.5	1.34	0.95	0.98
	St. Dev.	0.92	0.74	1.7	0.61	0.38

**Table 2B: Male non-hypertensives n=40**

Age (years)		Below -50	50-60	60-70	70-80	Above 80
(n)		6	7	14	9	4
A-FIM	Avg.	45.5	47.7	40.3	45.5	39.4
	St. Dev.	20.5	13.8	11.3	14.9	8.7
D-FIM	Avg.	74.5	72.6	66.6	66.5	62.7
	St. Dev.	5.5	5.7	11.7	12.7	16.5
LOS	Avg.	32.5	25.9	30.4	24.9	30.5
	St. Dev.	105	279	11.8	11.5	10.4
ER	Avg.	0.95	1.07	1.1	1.11	0.97
	St. Dev.	0.42	0.91	0.51	0.72	0.65

**Abbreviations** A-FIM, admission functional independence measure; D-FIM, discharge functional independence measure; LOS, Length of Stay; ER, efficiency ratio

**Table 3A: Female hypertensives n=60**

Age (years)		Below -50	50-60	60-70	70-80	Above 80
(n)		3	9	15	22	11
A-FIM	Avg.	48.6	38.5	49.6	42.8	50.9
	St. Dev.	19.4	13.8	12.9	14.8	15.2
D-FIM	Avg.	70.5	64.9	71.7	64.5	70.9
	St. Dev.	19.2	17.2	13.3	17.2	11.3
LOS	Avg.	22.8	32.8	22.2	31.8	24.5
	St. Dev.	12	15.6	9.5	13.6	9.4
ER	Avg.	1.41	1.2	1.31	0.87	0.92
	St. Dev.	0.88	0.71	1.4	0.57	0.41

**Table 3B: Female non-hypertensives n=30**

Age (years)		Below -50	50-60	60-70	70-80	Above 80
(n)		7	3	6	11	3
A-FIM	Avg.	41.5	48.7	32.7	46.9	42.3
	St. Dev.	15.8	19.7	11.8	16.8	11.2
D-FIM	Avg.	75.7	69.5	57.8	67.6	63.7
	St. Dev.	14.3	14.4	15.9	14.8	15.2
LOS	Avg.	24.7	23.2	39.2	26.2	23.1
	St. Dev.	13.9	11.7	10.5	9.3	11.1
ER	Avg.	1.7	1.02	0.72	0.9	1.24
	St. Dev.	1.29	0.84	0.45	0.47	0.91

**Table 4 A: All hypertensives n=130**

Age (years)		Below -50	50-60	60-70	70-80	Above 80
(n)		7	25	30	50	18
A-FIM	Avg.	47.4	43.5	43.7	43.9	45.2
	St. Dev.	18.8	18.5	12.6	16.2	13.7
D-FIM	Avg.	71.9	69.1	68.4	65.3	66.9
	St. Dev.	15.7	17.9	12.6	17.4	14.5
LOS	Avg.	26.4	30.3	27.9	28.9	27.4
	St. Dev.	12.7	15.8	11.2	14.1	10.5
ER	Avg.	1.24	1.08	1.12	0.94	0.92
	St. Dev.	0.71	0.7	0.79	0.65	0.50

**Table 4B All non-hypertensives n=70**

Age (years)		Below -50	50-60	60-70	70-80	Above 80
(n)		13	10	20	20	7
A-FIM	Avg.	43.2	57.4	38.7	45.9	41.8
	St. Dev.	12.4	15.5	16.5	16.3	13.2
D-FIM	Avg.	75.9	77.3	58.8	67.5	66.8
	St. Dev.	10.7	10.2	17.9	14.1	14.3
LOS	Avg.	23.9	18.3	20.5	29.6	23.9
	St. Dev.	11.5	8.7	11.1	14.9	11.5
ER	Avg.	1.6	1.4	0.61	0.82	1.25

	St. Dev.	0.95	0.88	0.42	0.5	0.75
--	----------	------	------	------	-----	------

**Table 5A: Male hypertensives and non-hypertensives together n=110**

Age (years)		Below -50	50-60	60-70	70-80	Above 80
(n)		9	21	30	38	12
A-FIM	Avg.	44.7	54.2	41.2	44.9	39.7
	St. Dev.	12.8	18.3	13.7	15.5	10.8
D-FIM	Avg.	75.5	76.6	64.7	67.2	64.8
	St. Dev.	5.2	13.8	14.8	13.2	15.9
LOS	Avg.	26.1	22.2	30.5	28.7	28.7
	St. Dev.	9.5	13.9	11.8	15.7	11.2
ER	Avg.	1.32	1.23	0.92	0.96	1.08
	St. Dev.	0.45	0.76	0.57	0.64	0.8

**Table 5B: Female hypertensives and non-hypertensives together n=90**

Age (years)		Below -50	50-60	60-70	70-80	Above 80
(n)		11	14	20	32	13
A-FIM	Avg.	44.9	41.9	43.1	44.5	48.6
	St. Dev.	17.1	16.2	14.7	16.2	14.5
D-FIM	Avg.	73.6	66.7	66.5	65.9	68.9
	St. Dev.	16.5	16.5	15.7	17.8	12.4
LOS	Avg.	24.2	29.7	22.7	29.5	24.2
	St. Dev.	13.5	14.7	9.2	13.2	10.4
ER	Avg.	1.71	1.04	1.08	0.85	0.96
	St. Dev.	1.12	0.68	0.95	0.56	0.58

**Table 6: Hypertensive and non-hypertensive males and females n=200**

Age (years)		Below -50	50-60	60-70	70-80	Above 80
(n)		20	35	50	70	25
A-FIM	Avg.	44.8	49.5	41.9	44.7	44.2
	St. Dev.	15.2	18.5	14.2	16.2	13.5
D-FIM	Avg.	74.3	72.5	65.5	66.7	66.9
	St. Dev.	12.8	15.8	15.2	15.7	14.5
LOS	Avg.	24.9	25.2	30.2	28.8	26.5
	St. Dev.	11.8	14.5	12.6	14.5	10.4
ER	Avg.	1.55	1.17	0.97	0.92	1.2
	St. Dev.	0.92	0.76	0.75	0.55	0.56

**Table 7: Analysis of variance (ANOVA). F- ratio and p-value**

	Males		Females		Males and females	
Hypertensive	n = 70		n = 60		n = 130	
	F	p	F	p	F	p

A-FIM	1.07	0.4	1.61	0.21	0.3	0.96
D-FIM	1.21	0.32	0.70	0.55	0.55	0.68
LOS	0.92	0.51	2.37	0.07	0.4	0.91
ER	0.1	0.97	1.51	0.27	0.95	0.45
Non- hypertensive	n = 40		n = 30		n =70	
	F	p	F	p	F	p
A-FIM	2.81	0.03	1.72	2.61	4.29	0.003
D-FIM	4.51	0.004	1.95	0.14	5.95	0.0002
LOS	3.89	0.007	0.44	0.81	3.55	0.01
ER	4.47	0.003	44	0.006	8.14	0.00005
Hypertensive and						
Non- hypertensive	n =110		n = 90		n = 200	
	F	p	F	p	F	p
A-FIM	4.18	0.0032	0.54	0.72	1.65	0.17
D-FIM	4.52	0.002	0.79	0.54	3.21	0.0141
LOS	2.02	0.09	2.44	0.05	1.77	0.14
ER	2.05	0.09	3.97	0.004	5.31	0.0004

**Table 8: Correlation of (r) age and ER and Student's t**

	Males		Females		Males and females	
Hypertensive						
	n = 70		n = 60		n = 130	
	r	t	r	t	r	t
	-0.09	-0.77	-0.21	-0.17	-0.15	-1.91
Non- hypertensive	n = 40		n = 30		n = 70	
	r	t	r	t	r	t
	-0.3	-2.5	-0.48	-3.8	-0.39	-4.4
Hypertensive and Non- hypertensive	n =		n = 90		n = 200	
	110					
	r	t	r	t	r	t
	-0.2	-2.45	-0.35	-3.98	-0.25	-4.6

In this study, the differences among the averages of the five age groups for each of the four functional measures A-FIM, D-FIM, LOS and ER are statistically analyzed. The evaluation is conducted separately for the male-female and hypertensive-non-hypertensive groups. The Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) method, F-ratios and Student's t-tests were employed for the statistical evaluation. The ANOVA is an extension of the Student's t-test employed to examine the hypothesis related to the differences among the means of more than two groups. The effect of age is further examined from its correlation with ER. Correlation significantly different from zero indicates difference of ER among the age groups. Examining this correlation is statistically equivalent to the evaluation of the relation between ER and age through regression analysis.

The averages and standard deviations of the four functional measures appear in (Tables 2) (Tables 3) (Tables 4) (Tables 5) (Tables 6). The F-ratios and p-values for the ANOVA tests are presented in Table 7. The correlations of age with ER along with the corresponding values of

the Student's *t* are presented in Table 8. The following observations are made from all these tables, from (Tables 7) (Tables 8).

**Age:** There is a significant difference ( $p < 0.0003$ ) among the five age groups for the means of ER for the male and female hypertensive and non-hypertensive patients together. The ER for patients below 60 years of age is found to be significantly higher than for patients over 60 years ( $p < 0.00001$ ). The means of the ER are 1.29, and 0.95 with the difference of 0.37 and its standard error of 0.108. Non-hypertensive patients had higher ER compared to the hypertensives for all the age groups (Tables 4a and 4b). This difference is significant for patients younger than 60 years ( $p < 0.01$ ) and older than 80 years ( $p < 0.00001$ ).

**Hypertension:** ER for non-hypertensive patients below age 60 is significantly higher ( $p < 0.05$ ) than for the hypertensives. Among the patients over 60 years of age, there is no significant difference for the ER between non-hypertensives and hypertensives, (Tables 2A), (Table 2B) and (Tables 3A), (Table 3B).

The average lengths of stay (LOS) for the five age groups were 25, 25, 30, 29 and 26 days, respectively. The mean efficiency ratios for the groups were 1.55, 1.17, 0.97, 0.92 and 1.2 respectively (see Table. 6). The difference of the average ER among the five age groups is significant for the non-hypertensive males as well as for females. The hypertensive patients' LOS in general is longer compared to non-hypertensives. The average ER for the age groups 60-70 and 70-80 is less than one but  $>1$  for the remaining three age groups. The ADM and D/C FIM scores were lower for the non hypertensives for the 60-70 group to account for the lower ER. For the hypertensive males and females, the differences among the means for the functional measures are not significant. These results may be attributed to either stable hypertension or better management of hypertension during their rehabilitation stay. The male non-hypertensives, the difference among the means is significant for each of the four functional measures;  $p < 0.02$  for A-FIM and  $< 0.007$  for the remaining three measures. the female non-hypertensives, the difference among the means of the age groups is significant only for the ER ( $p < 0.007$ ), but not for the remaining three measures (Tables 7). The 60 -80 year- old (male and female) non-hypertensives, the LOS is longer relative to the remaining four age groups. For the (60-70 age group) male non-hypertensives, the FIM gain is smaller relative to the remaining four age groups. These are the two reasons for the significant differences in (a) and (b) for the ERs of both males and females (Table 2B). For the male as well as female non-hypertensives in the age groups (60-70) and (70-80), the LOS is longer relative to the other three groups (Table 2B) & (Table 3B), resulting in the  $ER < 1$  compared to  $>1$  for the other age groups. The male and female hypertensives, the differences among the age groups are not significant for the four functional measures, especially the ER. It is only slightly significant for the LOS of the female hypertensives ( $p < 0.07$ ) (Tables 7).

The correlations of ER with age are negative for the male-female as well as the hypertensive-no hypertensive groups (see Table 8), that is, ER decreases with age for all these categories. Further, the decrease of ER with age is significant for the non-hypertensive males as well as females. Similar results can be expected from the regression of ER on age.

### Discussion

Effect of hypertension and its impact on an individual's outcome measured in FIM scale has not been studied previously. Our study examined the presence or absence of hypertension and its impact retrospectively and found that presence of hypertension itself had a clear impact on the functional outcome as measured by ER. It is significantly higher for the non-hypertensive patients in the younger age groups ( $n=32$ ) vs 23 patients under 60 years of age

(2.69 vs 1.21). Hypertension did not affect functional progress of stroke patients (n=80) between 60-80 years of age. The possible explanation is that older individuals are more likely to have pre-existing disease and disabilities which may have effects on their functional recovery. It is possible that other factors such as co-morbidities may have had a stronger impact on functional recovery in older age groups, and thus presence or absence of hypertension did not make a significant difference in those groups. There is no consensus on the influence of age on the outcome of rehabilitation after stroke. Most studies in the literature showed negative outcomes with increasing age. A few studies pointed out the absence of the effect of age on the outcomes. Earlier studies reflected utilizing the Barthel index to measure functional progress of patients in rehabilitation settings. Our study showed that patients younger than 60 years of age with no history of hypertension had better progress in rehabilitation. This group of 47 patients with no hypertension showed better functional performance on FIM scores and ER. Also the oldest group of 25 patients >80 years have shown better functional outcomes in this study. The FIM is a widely accepted functional outcome measure, currently used in the rehabilitation units across the US. In a Meta-analysis of 11 studies by Ottenbacher and Granger,<sup>14</sup> the FIM instrument demonstrated acceptable reliability across a wide variety of settings, raters, and patients. The study by Bagg et al.<sup>15</sup> found that advanced age had no effect on the FIM scores. In their sample of 561 patients age is reported to be a significant prognostic factor for acute and long-term mortality and functional recovery. The study by Adler<sup>16</sup> suggested that compared to younger patients, older individuals may have more severe deficits from strokes and hence do less well. As age advances, cognitive skills may also decline. In our study, we had excluded patients with dementia or cognitive deficits.

It was also postulated by some researchers that older brains may intrinsically have less ability to recover, although the elderly may be more likely to employ compensatory strategies to overcome some of the neural impairment that remains after stroke. More studies are required to show that age itself is not a factor in determining the outcome after stroke. Research also needs to focus on patients older than 80 years.

The clinical impact of this study is enormous when the stroke statistics are taken into consideration. Every year about 140,000 Americans die from stroke. In 2016, stroke accounted for about one out of every 19 deaths in the US. Every 40 seconds, someone in the United States has a stroke and there is a death every 4 minutes from stroke.<sup>17</sup> Stroke risk varies by age. In 2009, 34% of people hospitalized for stroke were less than 65 years old.<sup>18</sup> Stroke reduces mobility in more than half of stroke survivors age 65 and over.<sup>19</sup> Memis and colleagues<sup>20</sup> found in their study that age had no effect on functional status and disability of stroke patients.

Feigin et al<sup>21</sup> described the global impact of stroke and its consequences emphasizing the need for more efficient prevention strategies. Hypertension being the major contributor for the disease, our study evaluated its impact especially on functional outcomes.

The limitations of the study are that it is a retrospective analysis and we were unable to find how many of the hypertensives had swings or variability of their blood pressures and whether they were symptomatic from it during rehabilitation. Patients' admission blood pressures and their effect on the participation in therapies were not reported. The collection of the FIM scores to assess maintenance of the functional gains at 3 months and at one year would have been helpful to determine the influence of age and hypertension in this population. Future studies are needed to study the impact of the variations in blood pressure of stroke patients during rehabilitation and their functional gains.

## Conclusion

Stroke Patients younger than 60 years of age with no hypertension showed better progress with inpatient rehabilitation as measured on the Functional Independent Measure in our retrospective study of 200 subjects.

## Reference

1. Tu JV, Porter J. Stroke Care in Ontario: Hospital Survey Results. Toronto, Ont, Canada: Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences, Queen's Printer for Ontario; 1999.
2. Garraway WM, Whisnant JP, Drury I. The changing pattern of survival following stroke. *Stroke*. 1983;14:699–703.
3. Ebrahim S, Harwood R. Stroke: Epidemiology, Evidence and Clinical Practice. New York, NY: Oxford University Press; 1999.
4. Lehmann JF, DeLateur BJ, Fowler RS, Warren CG, Arnhold R, Schertzer G, Hurka R, Whitmore JJ, Masock AJ, Chambers KH. Stroke rehabilitation: outcome and prediction. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 1975;56: 383–389.
5. Jongbloed L. Prediction of function after stroke: A critical review. *Stroke*. 1986;17:765–776.
6. Kalra L. The influence of stroke unit rehabilitation on functional recovery from stroke. *Stroke*. 1994;25:821–825.
7. Nakayama H, Jorgenson HS, Rassachou HO, Olsen TS. The influence of age on stroke outcome: the Copenhagen Stroke Study. *Stroke*. 1994;25: 808–813.
8. Teasell RW. Stroke rehabilitation: who needs it? *Can J CME*. 1998;10: 21–31.
9. Stanaway J D, Afshin A, Gakidou E et al., “Global, regional, and national comparative risk assessment of 84 behavioural, environmental and occupational, and metabolic risks or clusters of risks for 195 countries and territories, 1990–2017: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2017,” *The Lancet*.2018;392(10159):1923–1994
10. Bakris G and Sorrentino M, “Redefining hypertension—assessing the new blood-pressure guidelines,” *New England Journal of Medicine*.2018;378(6):497–499
11. Santisteban M M and Iadecola C, “Hypertension, dietary salt and cognitive impairment,” *Journal of Cerebral Blood Flow & Metabolism*.2018; 38(12):2112–2128.
12. Chow C K, Teo K K, Rangarajan S et al., “Prevalence, awareness, treatment, and control of hypertension in rural and urban communities in high-, middle-, and low-income countries,” *JAMA*.2013;310(9):959–968.
13. Perrine A L L C, Blacher J , and Olié V. “L’hypertension artérielle en France: prévalence, traitement et contrôle en 2015 et évolutions depuis 2006,” *Bulletin Épidémiologique Hebdomadaire*.2018;10:170–179.
14. Ottenbacher KJ, Hsu Y, Granger CV, et al. The reliability of the functional independence measure: a quantitative review. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 1996;77(12):1226–1232.
15. Bagg S, Pombo AP, Wilma P. Effects of age on functional outcomes after stroke rehabilitation. *Stroke*. 2002;33(1):179–185.
16. Adler, MK, Brown CC, Acton P. Stroke rehabilitation--is age a determinant?. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 1980;28(11):499–503
17. Vital Signs: Recent trends in stroke death rates—United States, 2000–2015. *MMWR*; 2017:66.
18. Hall MJ, Levant S, DeFrances CJ. Hospitalization for stroke in U.S. hospitals, 1989–2009. *National center for health statistics*. 2012;(95):1–8.
19. Benjamin EJ, Blaha MJ, Chiuve SE, et al. on behalf of the American Heart Association Statistics Committee and stroke statistics subcommittee. heart disease and stroke statistics—2017 update: a report from the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2017;135:e229—e445.

20. Memis D, Kozanoglu E, Kelle B, et al. Assessment of demographic and clinical characteristics on functional status and disability of patients with stroke. *Neurosciences*. 2016;21(4):352–357.
21. Feigin VL, Krishnamurthi RV, Parmar P, et al. Update on the global burden of ischemic and hemorrhagic stroke in 1990-2013: The GBD 2013 study. *Neuroepidemiology*. 2015;45(3):161–176.

**Received: 09-08-2020 // Revised: 07-09-2020 // Accepted: 25-09-2020**