

Title: Gait differences in patients with multiple sclerosis who have low and high levels of disability.

Authors:

John J. Fraser, PT, DPT, PhD^{1*}

Jeannie B. Stephenson, PT, PhD²

Affiliations:

1. Physical Therapy Program, Department of Biology, The College of Staten Island City University of New York, Staten Island, NY

*Currently affiliated with the Warfighter Performance Department, Naval Health Research Center, San Diego, CA

2. School of Physical Therapy & Rehabilitation Sciences, USF Health Morsani College of Medicine, University of South Florida, Tampa, FL

Conflicts of Interest: None

Disclosures: All participants provided informed consent and this study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at the College of Staten Island, City University of New York in compliance with all applicable Federal regulations governing the protection of human subjects. This work was performed in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the master of science in physical therapy degree. Neither the Department of the Navy nor any other component of the Department of Defense has approved, endorsed, or authorized this manuscript.

Acknowledgements: Cira Fraser, RN, PhD for her assistance in study design. Sanjeev Chopra, PT, MS, Sally Romano, PT, MS, and Luigi Leone PT, MS, and Aaron Miller, MD for their assistance in data collection. Jeffrey Rothman, PT, EdD for administrative support. Jay Hertel, PhD, ATC for his assistance in review and editing the manuscript. Arthur Nelson, PT, PhD[†] for his guidance in conception, development, and oversight of the study. † Deceased 07 November 2010

Corresponding Author:

John J Fraser, Warfighter Performance Department, Naval Health Research Center, 140

Sylvester Road, San Diego, CA 92106 Phone: 757-438-0390 Email: john.j.fraser8.mil@mail.mil

ORCID: 0000-0001-9697-3795 Twitter: @NavyPT

Word Count: 2940

1 **Title:** Gait differences in people with multiple sclerosis who have low or high levels of disability

2 **Abstract:**

3 **Background:** Multiple Sclerosis (MS) often results in gait impairment and disability.

4 **Objective:** To investigate differences in spatiotemporal gait characteristics of people with MS
5 who have low versus high levels of disability. Between trial and inter-limb consistency and the
6 association of gait variables with level of disability were also investigated.

7 **Methods:** Participants with MS who had either low-disability [n=7; 3 females; EDSS mean:
8 2.7 ± 0.5 , range 2.0-4.5; BMI= 26.9 ± 6.6] or high-disability [n=11; 6 females; EDSS mean:
9 2.7 ± 0.5 , range 6.0-6.5; BMI= 27.8 ± 1.5] performed 2 trials of self-selected walking on an
10 instrumented walkway. Differences in group, limb, and group by limb interactions were assessed
11 using analysis of variance, independent-measures t-tests, and Cohen's *d* effect sizes (ES).

12 Between-trial consistency of gait were assessed with intra-class correlation coefficients (2, k).

13 **Results:** Participants in the high disability group had increased step time (ES=0.8), cycle time
14 (ES=0.8), and ambulation time (ES=1.2) while taking shorter strides (ES=0.9) and more steps at
15 a slower rate (ES=1.1). The high disability group demonstrated less between-trial consistency for
16 69% of gait variables when compared to the low disability group.

17 **Conclusion:** People with MS who have high levels of disability walk differently and with less
18 consistency than those with lower levels of disability.

19 **Key Words:** walking, motor disorders, coordination impairment, central nervous system, patient
20 outcome assessment

21

22 Multiple Sclerosis (MS) is a degenerative, autoimmune disorder that affects the central
23 nervous system of approximately 400,000 individuals in the United States (Anderson et al.,
24 1992) and usually manifests in the second to third decade of life.(Noseworthy et al., 2000)
25 People with MS walk differently when compared to healthy individuals due to neurological
26 impairment. They walk at slower velocities with an increased cadence, (Benedetti et al., 1999;
27 Givon, Zeilig & Achiron, 2009; Sacco et al., 2011; Sosnoff et al., 2011; Sosnoff, Sandroff &
28 Motl, 2012; Socie et al., 2013; Lizrova Preiningerova et al., 2015) demonstrate shorter step
29 length,(Givon, Zeilig & Achiron, 2009; Sosnoff et al., 2011; Socie et al., 2013; Lizrova
30 Preiningerova et al., 2015) and stride length,(Benedetti et al., 1999; Sacco et al., 2011) and a
31 wider base of support.(Givon, Zeilig & Achiron, 2009; Sosnoff et al., 2011; Socie et al., 2013)
32 People with MS also take longer to complete a single step (Givon, Zeilig & Achiron, 2009;
33 Sosnoff et al., 2011; Socie et al., 2013; Lizrova Preiningerova et al., 2015) and to complete a gait
34 cycle.(Benedetti et al., 1999; Sacco et al., 2011) They spend more time in periods of
35 single(Sacco et al., 2011) and double limb support,(Benedetti et al., 1999; Sacco et al., 2011;
36 Lizrova Preiningerova et al., 2015) and a decreased percentage of the gait cycle in swing
37 phase.(Sosnoff et al., 2011) Sacco and colleagues (2011) also observed increased stride to stride
38 variability in individuals with MS. Gait changes have been observed in individuals with MS
39 who have varying degrees of impairment, with individuals with higher impairment
40 demonstrating decreased gait velocity, step length, and step time and increased periods in double
41 limb support.(Lizrova Preiningerova et al., 2015)

42 Clinically, the degree to which an individual is neurologically impaired and disabled is
43 rated using the Expanded Disability Status Scale (EDSS).(Kurtzke, 1983) The EDSS is a
44 ranking of disability ranging from 0 (normal) to 10 (death) determined by physical examination

45 findings.(Kurtzke, 1983) The distance a person with MS can walk without rest breaks, support,
46 or reliance on an assistive device (AD) are substantial factors in determination of the EDSS
47 score.(Kurtzke, 1983) An EDSS score of 0 is representative of a normal neurological
48 examination and full function. As the EDSS score increases to 5.5, the ability to walk distances
49 without an AD is diminished to 100-m without rests or support. At an EDSS score of 6.0, the
50 patient is dependent on a unilateral AD to walk 100-m without rests. While previous studies on
51 the effect of AD use on spatiotemporal gait variables in participants with MS were performed
52 using individuals who were relatively high functioning (median EDSS=4.8),(Gianfrancesco et
53 al., 2011) further study is needed in participants with higher levels of disability. The purpose of
54 this cross-sectional study was to investigate differences in spatiotemporal gait characteristics of
55 people with MS who have low versus high levels of disability. Between trial and inter-limb
56 consistency of these gait variables and the association of gait variables with level of disability
57 were also investigated.

58

59

METHODS

Design

61 A cross-sectional, observational study was conducted using a sample of convenience of
62 participants with MS in which the independent variables were group [mild to moderate (low)
63 disability, high-disability] and lower limb (left, right) and the dependent variables were
64 spatiotemporal gait parameters.

Participants

66 Twenty-one participants diagnosed with MS were recruited from an MS Care Center.
67 Sample size calculations estimated that 5 participants per group were needed to demonstrate

68 large effect sizes for spatiotemporal gait variables in this population.(Benedetti et al., 1999) Prior
69 to recruitment, a physical examination was performed by a board-certified neurologist who
70 determined EDSS scores. Participants met inclusion criteria if they scored between 2.0 and 6.5
71 on the EDSS; demonstrated pyramidal or cerebellar symptoms on physical exam; and could
72 ambulate at least 20 meters with or without an AD and/or orthotics. Group assignment was
73 determined by EDSS score.(Kurtzke, 1983) Participants with mild to moderate disability (EDSS
74 2.0-4.5), who were able to walk 300-m without aid or rests, were assigned to the low-disability
75 group.(Kurtzke, 1983) Participants with severe disability (EDSS 6.0-6.5), who relied on an AD
76 to walk at least 20-meters, were assigned to the high-disability group.(Kurtzke, 1983)
77 Participants were excluded if they were cognitively impaired and unable to follow instructions,
78 pregnant, or had any medical condition that would substantially impair their ability to walk.
79 Participants who met inclusion criteria provided informed consent and the study was approved
80 by the Institutional Review Board at the College of Staten Island, City University of New York.

81 ***Procedures***

82 All data collection was performed mid-morning to mitigate the effects of fatigue
83 commonly experienced by individuals with MS later in the day. Following enrollment,
84 participants provided demographic information and height, mass and leg length were measured.
85 Following familiarization with testing procedures, the subject walked the length of the
86 instrumented walkway at a self-selected pace utilizing the AD they depended on for ambulation.
87 Spatiotemporal gait parameters were collected using the GAITRite Walkway System (CIR
88 Systems Inc., Clifton, NJ), a portable instrumented 8.3 m x 0.9 m mat which contains imbedded
89 pressure-activated sensors and collects data at a sampling rate of 80 Hz. The GAITRite Walkway
90 system has been shown to be both valid and reliable in the assessment of spatiotemporal gait

91 parameters in adults with and without neurological deficit.(Nelson et al., 2002; Bilney, Morris &
92 Webster, 2003; Menz et al., 2004) Two walking trials were performed at a self-selected pace
93 separated by a 10-minute rest period.

94 ***Data Processing***

95 Spatiotemporal gait variables were processed using the GAITRite software package (CIR
96 Systems Inc., Clifton, NJ). Prior to export of data from each trial, pressure readings introduced
97 by an AD were deleted from each trial using the software footfall editor. The main outcome
98 measures were spatial gait variables [Functional Ambulation Profile (FAP), a composite measure
99 of gait performance(Gouelle, 2014)], gait velocity, cadence, step count, step length, stride length,
100 width of base of support, toe out] and temporal gait variables (ambulation time, step time, cycle
101 time, percent of gait cycle in swing and stance phase, stance time, and percentage of gait cycle in
102 single and double limb support). Gait variable data represent the average of all footfalls across
103 two walking trials.

104 ***Statistical Analysis***

105 Descriptive statistics were calculated for participant demographic and gait data. Group
106 differences were assessed using the point estimate and 90% confidence intervals (CI) of the
107 mean. Differences in group, limb, and group by limb interactions for gait variables that were
108 limb specific (normalized step and stride length, base of support, toe out, step and cycle time,
109 swing and stance %, and single and double limb support %) were assessed using a mixed
110 factorial ANOVA. Independent measures t-tests were conducted for the dependent variables of
111 FAP score, step count, cadence, normalized velocity, base of support, and ambulation time.
112 Cohen's *d* effect size (ES) point estimates and associated 90% CI were calculated to estimate the
113 magnitude and precision of group differences. Effect sizes were interpreted ≥ 0.80 as large, 0.50-

114 0.79 as moderate, 0.20-0.49 as small.(*Cohen, 2013*) Association of level of disability (AD use,
115 EDSS score) to each gait variable was assessed using Spearman's ρ correlation coefficient;
116 interpreted $\geq .75$ as good to excellent, .50-.74 moderate to good, .25-.49 fair, and 0-.25 little to no
117 association.(*Portney & Watkins, 2009*) Consistency of gait trials for the low-disability and high-
118 disability groups was assessed using the intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC, 2,*k*) and standard
119 error of measurement. Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences
120 Version 23.0 (IBM, Inc., Armonk, New York, IL). The *a priori* level of statistical significance
121 was set at $p \leq 0.05$ for all analyses.

122

123 **RESULTS**

124

125 The principle findings of this study were that there were differences in spatiotemporal
126 gait variables in participants with MS who had high compared to low levels of disability and that
127 there was an association between gait variables and level of disability.

128 Twenty-one adult participants with MS (10 males, 11 females) met criteria for inclusion
129 in the study. Data from 18 participants (9 males, 9 females) were available for analysis.

130 Participant demographic data are detailed in Table 1. One participant in the low-disability group
131 and all participants in the high-disability group utilized an AD for walking trials. There were no
132 significant differences between groups for age, BMI, or leg length. Gait data from three
133 participants was corrupted and was excluded from analysis.

134 Group means, standard deviations, range, group main effect, limb main effect, group by
135 limb interactions, and independent samples t-test results for spatiotemporal gait parameters are
136 detailed in Table 2. Participants in the high disability group took significantly more steps

137 (p=0.04) and required more time to walk along the 8.3-m walkway (p=0.02) than those in the
138 low disability group. There were no other significant main effects for group, limb, or group by
139 limb interactions.

140 Cohen's *d* ES point estimates and 90% CI comparing spatiotemporal gait variables in the
141 high versus low disability group are illustrated in Figures 1 and 2. Participants with high
142 disability took a longer time to complete a single step with the left foot (d=0.8), utilizing shorter
143 stride lengths with the left leg (d=0.9). They took more steps (d=1.1) at a slower rate (d=1.1) and
144 required more time to complete a gait cycle (Rt d=0.8, Lt d=0.9) and to walk the 8.3 m distance
145 (d=1.0). While not statistically different, there was a trend toward decreased FAP scores (d=0.6),
146 decreased normalized velocity (d=0.6), decreased normalized right stride length (d=0.7),
147 decreased percentage of the gait cycle in swing phase (Rt d=0.7), increased right step time
148 (d=0.8), increased percentage of the gait cycle spent in stance phase (Rt d=0.7), increased base of
149 support (d=0.6), and increased periods of double limb support (Rt d=0.7, Lt d=0.8) observed in
150 the high disability group (Figs. 1 & 2). These measures had moderate to large ES estimates, but
151 with CI that crossed the '0' threshold indicating statistical equivalence.

152 In the low disability group, between-trial consistency was excellent for FAP scores,
153 cadence, normalized velocity, limb dependent and total base of support, cycle time, and double
154 limb support %, and fair to good for step count, ambulation time, and toe out (Table 3). The low
155 disability group demonstrated variability between left and right lower limbs for normalized step
156 and stride length, step time, swing %, stance %, and single limb support %. In the high-disability
157 group, between-trial consistency was excellent for FAP scores, step count, and normalized stride
158 length; fair to good for cadence, limb dependent and total base of support, toe out, ambulation
159 time, step time, cycle time, swing %, and stance %; and poor for normalized step length. Inter-

160 limb (left versus right) variability was noted in the high disability group for single limb support
161 % and double limb support %.

162 Associations between level of disability and gait variables are detailed in Table 4.

163 Significant moderate to good associations were observed for use of an AD with step time, gait
164 cycle time, and cadence. Association of higher disability, as measured by EDSS score, ranged
165 from moderate to excellent for cadence, normalized stride length, ambulation time, step time,
166 cycle time and percentage of time spent in double limb support.

167

168 DISCUSSION

169

170 To our knowledge, this is the first study to examine inter-limb spatiotemporal gait
171 variables and consistency of gait in participants with MS with low versus high levels of
172 disability.

173 *Gait differences*

174 Our findings are consistent with results of previously published studies. Sosnoff and
175 colleagues (2012) found that people with mild MS walked slower, with fewer, shorter and wider
176 steps, and spent more time in double limb support than healthy controls. However, they did not
177 compare these findings to participants with high disability.(Sosnoff, Sandroff & Motl, 2012) In
178 another study, Sosnoff and colleagues (2011) found that MS participants with severe disability
179 walked slower, took shorter steps and spent more time in double limb support when completing a
180 cognitive task than participants with mild to moderate disability. Lizrova-Preiningerova and
181 colleagues (2015) demonstrated that participants with MS with high disability walked slower and
182 exhibited decreased step length, increased step time, and increased double limb support

183 compared to individuals with MS with lower levels of disability. Although we did demonstrate a
184 significant difference in step count and ambulation time between low and high disability groups
185 in the present study, the differences found in gait velocity did not reach statistical significance.
186 The larger sample size in the study conducted by Lizrova-Preiningerova and colleagues (Lizrova
187 Preiningerova et al., 2015) may account for their finding of decreasing gait velocity with
188 increasing EDSS scores.

189 The present study adds to these previous findings by also documenting inter-limb gait
190 differences in individuals with low versus high levels of MS disability. Although there was no
191 main effect for limb or group by limb interactions observed, there were significant differences
192 noted in the ES for certain gait variables in one limb (shorter left stride length and longer left
193 step time) and statistical equivalence in the contralateral limb. Wide CI observed in ES estimates
194 may narrow with a larger sample size, demonstrating more distinct differences between groups
195 for these gait variables. Knowledge of inter-limb differences in gait variables may be clinically
196 meaningful information for physical therapists conducting gait training with these patients. For
197 example, therapists could specifically address these inter-limb differences with therapeutic
198 exercise or locomotor training to improve overall gait pattern consistency.

199 Previous studies have found that asymmetric lower extremity motor impairment of
200 participants with MS adversely affects gait performance.(Chung et al., 2008; Sandroff, Sosnoff
201 & Motl, 2013) High variability in many spatial and temporal gait parameters was observed in
202 both disability groups in the present study. Socie and colleagues (2013) found decreased gait
203 velocity, shorter step lengths, and increased step length variability in participants with MS who
204 had higher disability compared to controls. Sosnoff and colleagues (2012) observed that
205 participants with mild MS demonstrated greater step time variability and single support time

206 variability than healthy, matched controls. Lizrova-Preiningerova and colleagues (2015)
207 suggested that gait variability was not associated with level of disability in individuals with MS
208 and may not be an appropriate outcome measure. However, the gait variability observed in the
209 present study and in others indicates that this may be an appropriate measure of MS gait and an
210 appropriate measure to use in intervention studies.(Sosnoff et al., 2011; Socie et al., 2013)

211 *Consistency of Gait Parameters between Trials and between Limbs*

212 Both groups showed consistency of gait parameters between trials, but the low disability
213 group was more consistent. Participants in the low disability group were more consistent in
214 cadence, cycle time, base of support, percent of the gait cycle spent in stance and swing in the
215 left leg, and in double limb support compared to participants in the high disability group. This is
216 in contrast to the fair consistency observed in the high-disability group for % of the gait cycle
217 spent in swing and stance phase. Socie and colleagues (2013) reported that participants with MS
218 had greater variability in step and stride length compared to healthy controls and that variability
219 increased with use of an AD. Inter-limb differences in consistency of normalized step length
220 were observed in the present study in participants with high disability. This phenomenon was
221 also observed for cadence, base of support, cycle time, and double limb support %, findings
222 unique to this study. It is not surprising that individuals with higher levels of disability
223 demonstrate less consistency and gait rehabilitation could be aimed at methods to specifically
224 reduce between trial and inter-limb variability.

225

226 *Association of Gait Impairment and Disability*

227 Assistive device use had a moderate to good association with cadence, step time and
228 cycle time. Disability, as qualified by EDSS scores, had a strong association with gait cycle time

229 and moderate to good association with cadence, ambulation time, step time, and double limb
230 support %. Givon and colleagues (2009) found that EDSS score had a moderate to good
231 association with FAP score, gait velocity, total base of support, and double limb support % in
232 individuals with MS. Only the latter (double limb support %) was consistent with our results.
233 Socie and colleagues (2013) found excellent association of EDSS score with gait velocity and
234 moderate to good association with step length and step time. We demonstrated that those with
235 higher disability took longer to walk than those with lower levels of disability, however,
236 normalized velocity was not statistically significant. The disparate findings across these studies
237 may be attributed to the heterogeneity of neurologic impairment unique to MS, which may
238 manifest very differently between participants.

239 *Clinical Implications*

240 Use of an instrumented walkway, in addition to observational gait analysis, may provide
241 more objective information about spatiotemporal gait parameters in individuals with MS.
242 Knowledge of MS gait patterns, particularly distinguishing those with low versus high disability,
243 may allow physical therapists to tailor rehabilitation to patient's individualized needs. Based on
244 the findings of our study, clinicians evaluating patients with MS with higher levels of disability
245 should consider assessing for and providing gait training to address changes in velocity, cadence,
246 stride length, base of support, and proportion of time spent in stance and swing phase of gait.
247 Assessment of consistency between walking trials and inter-limb consistency may also provide
248 important insight into the patient's ability to safely and efficiently execute the motor task of
249 walking. Interventions to address spasticity and impaired lower extremity strength, power,
250 endurance, and balance and providing appropriate assistive devices may help improve gait in
251 these patients. (Lord, Wade & Halligan, 1998; Gutierrez et al., 2005; Chung et al., 2008;

252 Cameron & Wagner, 2011; Sandroff, Sosnoff & Motl, 2013) Additionally, differences in gait
253 parameters amongst individuals with low versus high MS disability should be considered when
254 designing clinical trials.

255 *Study Limitations*

256 The current study has some limitations. The authors relied on the EDSS score as the
257 primary measure of disability, with additional delimitations of pyramidal or cerebellar deficit.
258 Thus, participants assigned to each group were heterogeneous in presentation with possible
259 differences in how they walked. This is evident in the wide CIs observed in the ES graphs in
260 Figs. 1 and 2. For future research, we recommend that investigators who study individuals with
261 MS with varying degrees of disability consider utilizing a patient reported outcome measure
262 validated for use with this population, such as the Multiple Sclerosis Impact Scale,(Schäffler et
263 al., 2013) to further qualify level of disability. Larger sample sizes and assessment of slow and
264 fast walking speeds are required to demonstrate definitive group differences and provide further
265 information about gait patterns in people with MS.

266

267 **CONCLUSIONS**

268

269 Individuals with MS who have high levels of disability walk differently and with less
270 consistency than those with lower levels of disability. Differences between left and right lower
271 limbs were observed for certain gait variables and a high level of gait variability within groups
272 and between gait trials were observed. Higher levels of disability were associated with shorter
273 steps, decreased cadence, increased time in double limb support, greater gait variability and
274 increased step time and gait cycle time. Clinically, it is important to delineate patients with MS

275 who have low versus high levels of disability when examining gait and in order to provide
276 tailored interventions to improve walking. More objective and longitudinal investigation of
277 changes in gait characteristics of individuals with MS is needed to determine the most
278 appropriate interventions at each stage of the disease.

279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302

REFERENCES

Anderson DW, Ellenberg JH, Leventhal CM, Reingold SC, Rodriguez M, Silberberg DH. 1992. Revised estimate of the prevalence of multiple sclerosis in the United States. *Annals of neurology* 31:333–336.

Benedetti MG, Piperno R, Simoncini L, Bonato P, Tonini A, Giannini S. 1999. Gait abnormalities in minimally impaired multiple sclerosis patients. *Multiple Sclerosis* 5:363–368. DOI: 10.1177/135245859900500510.

Bilney B, Morris M, Webster K. 2003. Concurrent related validity of the GAITRite® walkway system for quantification of the spatial and temporal parameters of gait. *Gait & Posture* 17:68–74. DOI: 10.1016/S0966-6362(02)00053-X.

Cameron MH, Wagner JM. 2011. Gait abnormalities in multiple sclerosis: pathogenesis, evaluation, and advances in treatment. *Current Neurology and Neuroscience Reports* 11:507–515. DOI: 10.1007/s11910-011-0214-y.

Chung LH, Remelius JG, Van Emmerik REA, Kent-Braun JA. 2008. Leg power asymmetry and postural control in women with multiple sclerosis. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise* 40:1717–1724. DOI: 10.1249/MSS.0b013e31817e32a3.

Cohen J. 2013. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. Academic Press.

Gianfrancesco MA, Triche EW, Fawcett JA, Labas MP, Patterson TS, Lo AC. 2011. Speed- and cane-related alterations in gait parameters in individuals with multiple sclerosis. *Gait & Posture* 33:140–142. DOI: 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2010.09.016.

Givon U, Zeilig G, Achiron A. 2009. Gait analysis in multiple sclerosis: Characterization of temporal–spatial parameters using GAITRite functional ambulation system. *Gait & Posture* 29:138–142. DOI: 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2008.07.011.

- 303 Gouelle A. 2014. Use of Functional Ambulation Performance Score as measurement of gait
304 ability: Review. *Journal of Rehabilitation Research and Development* 51:665–674. DOI:
305 10.1682/JRRD.2013.09.0198.
- 306 Gutierrez GM, Chow JW, Tillman MD, McCoy SC, Castellano V, White LJ. 2005. Resistance
307 Training Improves Gait Kinematics in Persons With Multiple Sclerosis. *Archives of*
308 *Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation* 86:1824–1829. DOI: 10.1016/j.apmr.2005.04.008.
- 309 Kurtzke JF. 1983. Rating neurologic impairment in multiple sclerosis An expanded disability
310 status scale (EDSS). *Neurology* 33:1444–1444. DOI: 10.1212/WNL.33.11.1444.
- 311 Lizrova Preiningerova J, Novotna K, Ruzs J, Sucha L, Ruzicka E, Havrdova E. 2015. Spatial and
312 temporal characteristics of gait as outcome measures in multiple sclerosis (EDSS 0 to
313 6.5). *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation* 12. DOI: 10.1186/s12984-015-
314 0001-0.
- 315 Lord S, Wade D, Halligan P. 1998. A comparison of two physiotherapy treatment approaches to
316 improve walking in multiple sclerosis: a pilot randomized controlled study. *Clinical*
317 *Rehabilitation* 12:477–486.
- 318 Menz HB, Latt MD, Tiedemann A, Mun San Kwan M, Lord SR. 2004. Reliability of the
319 GAITRite walkway system for the quantification of temporo-spatial parameters of gait in
320 young and older people. *Gait & Posture* 20:20–25. DOI: 10.1016/S0966-6362(03)00068-
321 7.
- 322 Nelson AJ, Zwick D, Brody S, Doran C, Pulver L, Roosz G, Sadownick M, Nelson R, Rothman J.
323 2002. The validity of the GaitRite and the Functional Ambulation Performance scoring
324 system in the analysis of Parkinson gait. *NeuroRehabilitation* 17:255–262.

- 325 Noseworthy JH, Lucchinetti C, Rodriguez M, Weinshenker BG. 2000. Multiple Sclerosis. *New*
326 *England Journal of Medicine* 343:938–952. DOI: 10.1056/NEJM200009283431307.
- 327 Portney LG, Watkins MP. 2009. *Foundations of Clinical Research: Applications to Practice*.
328 Pearson/Prentice Hall.
- 329 Sacco R, Bussman R, Oesch P, Kesselring J, Beer S. 2011. Assessment of gait parameters and
330 fatigue in MS patients during inpatient rehabilitation: a pilot trial. *Journal of Neurology*
331 258:889–894. DOI: 10.1007/s00415-010-5821-z.
- 332 Sandroff BM, Sosnoff JJ, Motl RW. 2013. Physical fitness, walking performance, and gait in
333 multiple sclerosis. *Journal of the Neurological Sciences* 328:70–76. DOI:
334 10.1016/j.jns.2013.02.021.
- 335 Schäffler N, Schönberg P, Stephan J, Stellmann J-P, Gold SM, Heesen C. 2013. Comparison of
336 patient-reported outcome measures in multiple sclerosis. *Acta Neurologica Scandinavica*
337 128:114–121. DOI: 10.1111/ane.12083.
- 338 Socie MJ, Motl RW, Pula JH, Sandroff BM, Sosnoff JJ. 2013. Gait variability and disability in
339 multiple sclerosis. *Gait & Posture* 38:51–55. DOI: 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2012.10.012.
- 340 Sosnoff JJ, Boes MK, Sandroff BM, Socie MJ, Pula JH, Motl RW. 2011. Walking and Thinking
341 in Persons With Multiple Sclerosis Who Vary in Disability. *Archives of Physical*
342 *Medicine and Rehabilitation* 92:2028–2033. DOI: 10.1016/j.apmr.2011.07.004.
- 343 Sosnoff JJ, Sandroff BM, Motl RW. 2012. Quantifying gait abnormalities in persons with
344 multiple sclerosis with minimal disability. *Gait & Posture* 36:154–156. DOI:
345 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2011.11.027.
- 346

347 **List of Tables**

348 **TABLE 1.** Demographics of participants with Multiple Sclerosis with low or high-level
349 of disability.

350

351 **TABLE 2.** Gait variables of participants with Multiple Sclerosis with low or high-
352 disability. SD = standard deviation, s = seconds, min = minute, cm = centimeter, deg = degrees

353

354 **TABLE 3.** Association of gait variables with level of disability in participants with
355 Multiple Sclerosis. FAP = Functional Ambulation Profile, Lt = left, Rt = right, ρ_s = Spearman's
356 *rho* correlation coefficient, highlighted/shaded text indicates a statistically significant correlation
357 with $p \leq 0.05$

358

359 **TABLE 4.** Consistency of gait trials in participants with Multiple Sclerosis with low or
360 high levels of disability.

361

362

TABLE 1. Demographics of participants with Multiple Sclerosis with low or high-disability.

	Low-disability Group (n=7, 4 males, 3 females) Mean \pm 90% CI	High-disability Group (n=11, 5 males, 6 females) Mean \pm 90% CI
Age (years)	49.1 \pm 3.8	49.2 \pm 6.9
BMI (kg/m ²)	26.9 \pm 6.6	27.8 \pm 1.5
Leg Length, (cm)	Lt 90.4 \pm 3.1	90.8 \pm 2.5
	Rt 90.4 \pm 3.1	90.8 \pm 2.5
Expanded Disability Severity Score	2.7 \pm 0.5	6.1 \pm 0.2
Lt = left, Rt = right, cm=centimeters, SE=standard error, CI=confidence interval		

TABLE 2. Gait variables in participants with Multiple Sclerosis with low or high-disability.

	Low-disability Group (n=7)			High-disability Group (n=11)			Group (p)	Limb (p)	Group * Limb (p)		
	Mean	SD	Range	Mean	SD	Range					
Spatial	FAP Score	75.5	15.6	(48.0-93.0)	66.6	15.7	(45.0-91.5)	.26	-	-	
	Step Count	10.1	3.0	(5.5-14.0)	13.4	3.2	(9.5-18.0)	.04	-	-	
	Cadence (steps/min)	99.9	24.3	(60.2-142.7)	80.1	14.2	(48.7-94.7)	.08	-	-	
	Normalized Velocity	0.80	0.32	(0.27-1.17)	0.70	0.20	(0.31-0.81)	.26	-	-	
	Normalized Step Length	Lt	0.52	0.22	(0.06-0.71)	0.47	0.14	(0.06-0.71)	.43	.41	.94
		Rt	0.56	0.12	(0.35-0.67)	0.53	0.16	(0.35-0.67)			
	Normalized Stride Length	Lt	1.16	0.13	(1.00-1.35)	1.01	0.20	(0.97-1.35)	.10	.17	.74
		Rt	1.19	0.12	(1.00-1.39)	1.08	0.20	(0.97-1.39)			
	Base of Support (cm)	Lt	11.4	9.0	(1.0-26.7)	15.1	4.9	(5.6-20.5)	.27	.62	1.00
		Rt	11.6	8.9	(0.2-27.6)	15.3	4.9	(7.0-21.2)			
Total Base of Support (cm)		23.1	17.9	(1.8-54.4)	30.5	9.8	(12.7-41.2)	.34	-	-	
Toe Out (deg)	Lt	6.2	14.3	(-10.9-28.4)	9.5	7.7	(-8.0-18.0)	.13	.13	.72	
	Rt	11.0	7.7	(0.3-18.4)	12.5	7.0	(-0.1-23.3)				
Temporal	Ambulation Time (s)	6.4	2.5	(3.2-10.0)	10.7	4.1	(6.4-19.4)	.02	-	-	
	Step Time (s)	Lt	0.61	0.19	(0.40-1.00)	0.78	0.21	(0.63-1.48)	.11	.24	.66
		Rt	0.66	0.20	(0.44-1.06)	0.80	0.18	(0.60-1.21)			
	Cycle Time (s)	Lt	1.27	0.34	(0.87-1.99)	1.57	0.37	(1.25-2.50)	.10	.14	.62
		Rt	1.29	0.39	(0.84-2.10)	1.60	0.36	(1.32-2.55)			
	Swing %	Lt	39.3	7.5	(27.5-49.0)	37.9	6.3	(28.0-49.3)	.27	.34	.78
		Rt	41.8	3.5	(37.6-47.5)	39.2	3.6	(32.1-43.2)			
	Stance %	Lt	60.7	7.5	(51.0-72.6)	62.1	6.3	(50.8-72.0)	.27	.34	.78
		Rt	58.2	3.5	(52.5-62.4)	60.8	3.6	(56.8-67.9)			
	Single Support %	Lt	42.0	4.0	(37.0-50.0)	40.2	4.6	(32.9-48.4)	.29	.13	.97
Rt		39.0	7.1	(28.8-48.4)	37.0	5.9	(29.0-48.0)				
Double Support %	Lt	24.3	8.6	(15.1-40.0)	29.5	5.7	(22.9-41.4)	.14	.07	.80	
	Rt	23.1	7.2	(15.1-33.8)	28.0	6.7	(22.1-45.3)				

SD = standard deviation, Lt=left, Rt=right, s = seconds, min = minute, cm = centimeter, deg = degrees

TABLE 3. Consistency of gait trials in participants with Multiple Sclerosis with low or high levels of disability.

		Low-disability Group (n=7)			High-disability Group (n=11)			
		ICC	SEM	MDC	ICC	SEM	MDC	
Spatial	FAP Score	0.96	3.1	8.6	0.77	7.5	20.9	
	Step Count	0.52	2.1	5.7	0.85	1.3	3.5	
	Cadence (steps/min)	0.96	4.9	13.5	0.47	10.3	28.7	
	Normalized Velocity	0.96	0.1	0.2	0.70	0.1	0.3	
	Normalized Step Length	Lt	0.55	0.1	0.4	0.13	0.1	0.4
		Rt	0.13	0.1	0.3	0.11	0.2	0.4
	Normalized Stride Length	Lt	0.65	0.1	0.2	0.97	<0.1	0.1
		Rt	0.82	0.1	0.1	0.81	0.1	0.2
	Base of Support (cm)	Lt	0.87	3.3	9.0	0.40	3.8	10.6
		Rt	0.90	2.8	7.8	0.44	3.7	10.2
Total Base of Support (cm)		0.90	5.7	15.7	0.43	7.4	20.5	
Toe Out (deg)	Lt	0.54	9.7	26.9	0.74	3.9	10.9	
	Rt	0.67	4.4	12.3	0.51	4.9	13.7	
Temporal	Ambulation Time (s)	0.72	1.3	3.7	0.73	2.1	5.9	
	Step Time (s)	Lt	0.54	0.1	0.4	0.66	0.1	0.3
		Rt	0.37	0.2	0.4	0.50	0.1	0.4
	Cycle Time (s)	Lt	0.99	< 0.1	0.1	0.64	0.2	0.6
		Rt	0.98	0.1	0.2	0.65	0.2	0.6
	Swing %	Lt	0.76	3.7	10.2	0.54	4.3	11.8
		Rt	-0.14	3.7	10.4	0.73	1.9	5.2
	Stance %	Lt	0.76	3.7	10.2	0.53	4.3	11.9
		Rt	-0.14	3.7	10.4	0.73	1.9	5.2
	Single Support %	Lt	0.08	3.8	10.6	0.83	1.9	5.3
Rt		0.80	3.2	8.8	0.58	3.8	10.6	
Double Support %	Lt	0.96	1.7	4.8	0.30	4.7	13.1	
	Rt	0.83	3.0	8.2	0.59	4.3	11.8	

ICC=intraclass correlation coefficient, SEM=standard error of measurement, MDC=minimal detectable change, FAP = Functional Ambulation Profile, Lt = left, Rt = right

TABLE 4. Association of gait variables with level of disability in participants with Multiple Sclerosis.

		Assistive Device Use		EDSS		
		ρ s	p	ρ s	p	
Spatial	FAP Score	-0.04	.86	-0.42	.08	
	Step Count	0.08	.76	0.45	.06	
	Cadence (steps/min)	-0.56	.02	-0.71	.001	
	Normalized Velocity	-0.11	.66	-0.36	.15	
	Normalized Step Length	Lt	0.30	.23	-0.19	.46
		Rt	-0.28	.27	-0.39	.11
	Normalized Stride Length	Lt	0.17	.51	-0.43	.07
		Rt	0.14	.57	-0.44	.07
	Base of Support (cm)	Lt	-0.10	.70	0.24	.34
		Rt	-0.21	.41	0.22	.39
	Total Base of Support (cm)		-0.14	.57	0.24	.34
	Toe Out (deg)	Lt	-0.17	.51	0.04	.87
Rt		0.12	.63	0.10	.69	
Temporal	Ambulation Time (s)	0.38	.12	0.66	.003	
	Step Time (s)	Lt	0.60	.01	0.65	.003
		Rt	0.60	.01	0.63	.01
	Cycle Time (s)	Lt	0.66	.003	0.73	.001
		Rt	0.59	.01	0.75	<.001
	Swing %	Lt	0.02	.93	-0.16	.52
		Rt	-0.01	.97	-0.23	.37
	Stance %	Lt	-0.03	.90	0.15	.55
		Rt	0.01	.97	0.23	.37
	Single Support %	Lt	-0.08	.76	-0.17	.51
		Rt	0.10	.70	-0.21	.41
	Double Support %	Lt	0.33	.18	0.525	.03
Rt		0.36	.14	0.48	.05	

FAP = Functional Ambulation Profile, Lt = left, Rt = right

366 **List of Figures**


367

368 **FIGURE 1.** Cohen's d effect size point estimates and 90% confidence intervals comparing spatial gait
369 variables in participants with high-disability to participants with low-disability. FAP = Functional Ambulation
370 Profile, Lt = left, Rt = right


371

372 **FIGURE 2.** Cohen's d effect size point estimates and 90% confidence intervals comparing temporal
373 gait variables in participants with high-disability to participants with low-disability. FAP = Functional
374 Ambulation Profile, Lt = left, Rt = right

375



378 *Figure 1. Cohen's d effect size point estimates and 90% confidence intervals comparing spatial gait variables in participants with high-disability to participants with low-*
 379 *disability. FAP = Functional Ambulation Profile, Lt = left, Rt = right*



380

381 *Figure 2. Cohen's d effect size point estimates and 90% confidence intervals comparing temporal gait variables in participants with high-disability to participants with low-*
 382 *disability. FAP = Functional Ambulation Profile, Lt = left, Rt = right*