

1 **Arm choice post-stroke is habitual rather**
2 **than optimal in right-, but not in left-paretic**
3 **individuals**

4 Running title: Arm choice post-stroke

5
6 Sujin Kim, PhD^{1,2}, Cheol E. Han, PhD³, Bokkyu Kim, PhD^{1,4}, Carolee J. Winstein, PhD¹, and
7 Nicolas Schweighofer, PhD^{1*}

8
9 ¹Division of Biokinesiology and Physical Therapy, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA
10 90033, USA

11 ²Department of Physical Therapy, Jeonju University, Jeonju 55069, Republic of Korea

12 ³Department of Electronics and Information Engineering, Korea University, Sejong 30019, Republic of
13 Korea

14 ⁴Department of Physical Therapy Education, SUNY Upstate Medical University, Syracuse, NY 13210,
15 USA

16
17 * Correspondence should be addressed to Nicolas Schweighofer, 1540 Alcazar street #155, Division of
18 Biokinesiology and Physical Therapy, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90033. E-mail:
19 schweigh@usc.edu

21 * Author contributions: S.K. and N.S. wrote the paper; S.K., C.J.W., and N.S. designed the research; S.K.
22 performed the experiments; S.K., C.E.H., B.K., and NS analyzed the data ; C.J.W., B.K., and C.E.H. edited
23 the paper.

24 * This work was funded by grants NIH R01 HD065438 and R56 NS100528.

25 * Conflict of interest statement: None

26

27

28 **Abstract**

29
30 In non-disabled individuals, arm choice in pointing movements depends on expected
31 biomechanical effort, expected success, and a handedness bias. Following a stroke, is arm choice re-
32 optimized to account for the decreased motor performance, or does it follow a pre-injury habitual pattern?
33 Because premorbidly right-handed individuals with left hemiparesis generally use their affected arm less
34 than those with right hemiparesis, we hypothesized that arm choice follows a more habitual pattern in right-
35 than in left-hemiparetic individuals. Participants with mild to moderate chronic stroke who were right-
36 handed before stroke performed pointing movements in both free- and forced-choice blocks, both under a
37 no-time constraint condition and under a fast-time constraint condition designed to promote habitual choice.
38 Mixed-effects models of arm choice revealed that expected effort and side of stroke predicted choices
39 overall. However, expected success predicted choice in left-, but not of right-hemiparetic individuals.
40 Furthermore, while left-hemiparetic individuals tended to avoid unsuccessful movements in the fast
41 condition by selecting their non-paretic arm, right-hemiparetic individuals persevered in choosing their
42 more affected arm. In addition, reaction times decreased in left-hemiparetic individuals between the no-
43 time and the fast condition but showed no changes in right-hemiparetic individuals. Finally, arm choice in
44 the no-time condition correlated with a clinical measure of spontaneous arm use for right-, but not for left-
45 hemiparetic individuals. Our results thus show that, in premorbidly right-handed individuals with mild to
46 moderate chronic stroke, arm choice is habitual in right-hemiparetic individuals, but shows a greater degree
47 of optimality by taking account expected success in left-hemiparetic individuals.

48

49

50 **New & Noteworthy**

51

52 Although we are seldom aware of it, we constantly make decisions to use one arm or the other in
53 our daily activities. Here, we study whether these decisions change following a chronic mild to moderate
54 stroke that affects motor control. Our results show that chronic stroke survivors with a right hemiparesis
55 make arm choice using a habitual strategy, while those with left hemiparesis re-optimize their choices to
56 account for their impaired motor performance.

57

58 Key words: reaching movements; chronic stroke; arm choice; value-based models of choice; mixed
59 effects logistic regression models; biomechanical effort.

60

61

62 Introduction

63

64 Consider the apparently simple task of reaching a target as fast as possible. What arm should one
65 choose? In a previous study of arm choice for horizontal movements in right-handed non-disabled subjects
66 (Schweighofer et al. 2015), we showed that, for a given target, the arm that maximizes expected success
67 and minimizes expected effort is chosen with higher probability than the other arm, with an overall
68 handedness bias favoring the right arm. How does this pattern of arm choice change in chronic stroke
69 survivors who experience mostly unilateral motor deficits? In particular, is arm choice re-optimized to
70 account for the decreased performance in the more affected arm, or does it follow a pre-injury habitual
71 pattern?

72 To address this question, we adopted a contemporary decision framework according to which
73 human choices are driven by a combination of a goal-oriented system and a habitual system (Kable and
74 Glimcher 2009; Daw et al. 2011). The goal-directed system makes choices via mental simulation of the
75 decision environment to evaluate the outcomes of possible actions. Thus, decisions governed by the goal-
76 directed system can be quickly modified following environment changes to maintain optimal actions.
77 However, the mental simulations requires relatively long reaction times for decisions (Keramati et al. 2011).
78 In contrast, the habitual system performs choices through a direct comparison among learned expected
79 outcomes (or “values”) for each potential action (Daw et al. 2005; Gläscher et al. 2010). Due to its relative
80 inflexibility, the habitual system generates sub-optimal behavior in response to environmental changes,
81 such as reward devaluation, by maintaining pre-change patterns. However, since the habitual system simply
82 retrieves the values from memory without mental simulation, it is fast, e.g., with short reaction times (Daw
83 et al. 2005). As a result, decision making under time-pressure can enhance the expression of the time-
84 insensitive habitual system (Keramati et al. 2011; Hardwick et al. 2019). Here, we therefore compare arm
85 choices made by stroke survivors with mild to moderate impairments in a no-time constraint condition to

86 arm choices made in a fast-time constraint condition. We previously showed that arm choices made in the
87 fast condition, but not the no-time condition, show good test-retest reliability and correlate with a measure
88 of spontaneous arm use in individuals with chronic stroke hemiparesis (Kim et al. 2018).

89 In addition to expected success and expected effort, the side of hemiparesis also needs to be
90 considered as a factor in arm choice post-stroke. Previous research demonstrates that while overall use of
91 the paretic arm decreases after stroke in premorbidly right-handed individuals, right hemiparetic individuals
92 (RH) use their more-affected arm to a greater extent than left hemiparetic (LH) individuals (Haaland et al.
93 2012; Mani et al. 2013, 2014; Bailey et al. 2015). In addition, motor control strategies are different for the
94 dominant and non-dominant arms (Sainburg and Schaefer 2004; Haaland et al. 2012). In particular, in non-
95 disabled right-handed individuals, the right, arm, which is primarily under the control by the left
96 hemisphere, is better than the left at producing precise movement trajectories through feedforward control
97 (Coelho et al. 2013), and is primarily used as the main mover in daily activities (Vega-González and Granat
98 2005; Michielsen et al. 2012). Indeed, in previous work in pointing movements with right-handed
99 participants, we showed that even when the biomechanical effort is highly favorable to the left arm, there
100 is an overall bias towards using the right arm, with this bias increasing when higher precision is required
101 (Schweighofer et al. 2015).

102 We therefore hypothesized that, after stroke in premorbidly right-dominant individuals, a habitual
103 pattern of arm choice for reaching movements will be maintained in RH individuals even after repeated
104 unsuccessful movements (which are akin to reward devaluation) due to decreased performance of the more
105 affected arm. In contrast, because left arm use in reaching movements was less habitual pre-stroke, LH
106 individuals will exhibit goal-directed, more optimal, use of their more affected arm. Specifically, if arm
107 choice is habitual, participants will not change their arm choice nor their reaction times when success with
108 the paretic arm is reduced in the fast-time constraint. In contrast, if arm choice is goal-directed, both paretic

109 arm choices and reaction times will decrease in the fast-time condition compared to the non-time condition.
110 To test the sensitivity of choice to expected success in both RH and LH participants, we analyzed target-
111 specific choices with a mixed-effect logistic regression model of arm choice that extends our previous
112 model in non-disabled individuals (Schweighofer et al. 2015). Consistent with this previous study, we found
113 here that expected biomechanical effort largely influences arm choice in post-stroke individuals. However,
114 we found that expected success differently influenced arm choice between the RH and the LH groups: as
115 LH individuals were sensitive to failures, they were more likely to switch their arm choice from the paretic
116 to the non-paretic side in the fast time constraint condition. In contrast, RH individuals were less likely to
117 switch arm regardless of the time constraints. In addition, reaction times decreased in left-hemiparetic
118 individuals between the no-time and the fast condition, but showed no changes in right-hemiparetic
119 individuals. Finally, we found that arm choice in the no-time constraint condition correlates with a clinical
120 measure of habitual arm use, the Actual Amount of Use Test (AAUT), in right-, but not left-hemiparetic
121 individuals.

122

123 **Methods and Methods**

124

125 **Participants**

126 Data from twenty-two individuals post-stroke with mild to moderate impairment, twelve with RH
127 (1 female, means \pm SD aged 62.83 ± 13.95 years) and ten with LH (4 females, mean \pm SD aged $56.90 \pm$
128 13.53 years), were analyzed. The participants had had their stroke from 0.47 years to 14.38 years before
129 participation. In addition, eleven age-matched nondisabled participants (Controls; 6 females, mean \pm SD
130 aged 54.36 ± 10.58 years) were recruited for comparison.

131 Participants post-stroke were a sub-set of those included in the DOSE rehabilitation clinical trial,
132 for whom arm choice data were available. The DOSE trial was designed to investigate the effect of therapy
133 dose on arm/hand function (NCT 01749358; Winstein et al. 2019). Here, we only analyzed arm choice
134 and performance data at “baseline” before any therapy intervention. Detailed inclusion criteria for
135 participants were previously reported (Kim et al. 2018). Notably, participants post-stroke were included if
136 they had a stroke more than 5 months ago; had mild to moderate motor impairment (upper extremity Fugl-
137 Meyer motor (UEFM) > 19 out of 66); could reach with the paretic arm from the home position to a target
138 25 cm away within 5 seconds; had no arm/hand neglect as determined by Albert Test; and self-reported
139 premorbidly right-handed. Control participants were included if they reported no prior neurological
140 disorders and self-reported to be right-handed. The study was approved by the Human Research and Review
141 Committee of the University of Southern California and each participant signed and received a copy of an
142 informed consent. Clinical assessments for screening, UEFM and Amount of Arm Use Test (AAUT), as
143 well as arm choice tests were performed by two trained and standardized experimenters.

144 **Experimental setup and design**

145 *Experimental Setup.* Details of the experimental set-up, shown in Figure 1A, can be found in (Kim
146 et al. 2018). Briefly, participants sat in a wooden chair in front of a table with a restraining belt to minimize
147 compensatory trunk motion during pointing movements. At each trial, a target, appearing at one of the pre-
148 defined 35 target locations, was projected on the table from an overhead projector. Participants were
149 instructed to move their index finger from the home position to the target as rapidly and accurately as
150 possible and to keep their finger on the target for at least 0.5 s before returning to the home position. A
151 pleasant sound was provided following successful reaches, i.e., when the target was reached within the
152 given time; an unpleasant sound was provided otherwise. In addition, participants received a “reward” point
153 for each successful trial. Two Mini-Bird magnetic sensors (Ascension Technology Corporation) were

154 placed on the nail of the right and the left index fingers to measure hand trajectory and arm choice (sampling
155 100 Hz). Position data from the magnetic sensors were filtered at 5Hz with a Butterworth low pass filter.

156 In the no-time constraint condition, the targets were displayed until the participants' index finger
157 landed inside the target disk; in contrast, in the fast-time constraint condition, the targets disappeared ~0.5
158 sec after movement onset. Movement time limits in the fast-time constraint condition were estimated from
159 previous aiming data in non-disabled right-handed participants (Park et al. 2015), and ranged between 350
160 ms and 580 ms (see Figure 1B).

161 *Experimental Design.* Participants performed blocks of forced choice trials and spontaneous choice
162 trials, in no-, medium-, and fast-time constraint conditions to an array of 35 targets (see Figure 1B). In the
163 forced choice blocks participants reached each of the 35 targets once with each arm. In the spontaneous
164 choice blocks participants reached to each target with the arm of their choice, with two trials per target (thus
165 for a total 70 targets, see Figure 1C). The no-time constraint condition was given before the fast-time
166 constraint condition (Figure 1C), because we observed in a pilot study that stroke participants often did not
167 select their more-affected arm when they started with the more challenging condition first. Similarly, the
168 medium-time constraint was included because we noticed in a second pilot study that some participants
169 stopped using their more-affected arm entirely if the fast-time constraint condition directly followed the no-
170 time constraint condition. For simplification, we do not report here choices in the medium-time constraint
171 condition. Reminder sessions, which were similar to the spontaneous choice blocks but with fewer trials
172 (35 trials), were included before the medium and fast-time constraint conditions to remind the participants
173 of the time limits for these condition (See Figure 1C).

174 *Stroke participants:* Participants post-stroke were tested with the arm-reaching task on Days 1, 2,
175 and 3, with at least 2 weeks between testing days to minimize learning effects on the test. In the forced
176 choice blocks on Day 1, participants reached all 35 targets first with their less-affected arm and then with

177 their paretic, more-affected, arm. In the forced choice blocks on Day 2 and 3, participants reached all targets
178 with their paretic arm only. In the spontaneous choice block in the fast-time constraint condition,
179 participants were instructed to minimize unsuccessful trials either by moving fast or by using the less-
180 affected arm when expecting failure with the more-affected arm. We previously demonstrated excellent
181 test-retest reliability of arm choice in the spontaneous choice block of the fast-time constraint condition and
182 good reliability in the spontaneous choice block of the no-time constraint condition in the same stroke
183 participants (Kim et al. 2018).

184 *Control participants:* Control participants were tested on Days 1 and 2, with 1 week between testing
185 days. In forced choice blocks on Day 1, control participants reached to all 35 targets first with their right
186 arm and then with their left arm, while on Day 2 they reached the targets with their right arm only.
187 Spontaneous choice blocks were given on Days 1 and 2.

188 **Data measurement and processing**

189 *Overall probability of arm choice:* Probability of arm choice for each target in each condition was
190 measured from spontaneous choice blocks on Days 1, 2 and 3 for the stroke group and on Days 1 and 2 for
191 the control group (Figure 1C).

192 *Overall success rate:* Success rates for the more-affected arm in each condition were computed
193 from forced choice blocks on Days 1, 2 and 3 for the stroke group, and on Days 1 and 2 for the control
194 group.

195 *Effort estimation:* Effort for both arms was estimated from movement trajectories in the forced
196 choice block on Day 1. We assumed planar movements, and performed inverse kinematics followed by an
197 inverse dynamics transformation with left and right planar 2DOF arm models that include a shoulder and

198 an elbow joint, as in our previous study (Schweighofer et al. 2015). The index finger position (x,y) was first
199 transformed into joint angles (i.e., shoulder and elbow joint angles) using inverse kinematics of a 2 DOF
200 arm model (Figure 1E). The shoulder and elbow torques were then estimated using inverse dynamics
201 (Figure 1F). All arm parameters were taken from (Van Beers et al. 2004). Note that we computed “absolute
202 effort” defined by summing the absolute torques at both joints from the movement start to the end, since
203 such effort has been recently shown to better account for arm movement planning (Shadmehr et al. 2016)
204 and was a better predictor of choice than effort derived from summing the squared torques.

205 *Reaction times:* Reaction times were computed in each spontaneous choice block in both time
206 constraint conditions. Reaction time was defined as the time between the target appearance and the time at
207 which the index finger’s tangential velocity exceeded 5% of maximum velocity (Figure 1D).

208 **Clinical assessment of arm use**

209 We administered the Actual Amount of Use Test (AAUT) to the stroke participants to assess
210 spontaneous use of the paretic arm and hand in the real-world (Taub et al. 1998). In the AAUT, participants
211 perform 14 upper-extremity daily tasks, such as opening a file folder, and writing on and folding up a piece
212 of paper with the hands of their choice (including bimanually) without any prompts. A trained evaluator
213 watched video recordings of the test and graded spontaneous arm use behaviors based on quality of
214 movement scale (QOM). The QOM score for each item was averaged over the 14 tasks. If participants
215 habitually use their more-affected arm, then we expect arm choice measured by our reaching system should
216 correlate with arm use as assessed by the covert AAUT.

217 **Overall behavioral and clinical measures analyses**

218 To investigate the effects of time constraint on all behavioral data including choice of paretic arm,

219 effort, success rate, and reaction time, we developed linear mixed-effect models in which condition (no-
220 time and fast-time constraints) and side of stroke (RH and LH) were entered as fixed effects and participants
221 as random intercepts. Log-likelihood ratio tests (LRT) were used to verify the need for inclusion of the
222 random effect term. Visual inspection of residual versus fit plots and qq-plots was performed to check for
223 heteroscedasticity or non-normal distribution of the residuals. When needed, post-hoc analyses were
224 performed using the Tukey test to correct for multiple comparisons. In addition, correlations between the
225 arm choice measured by the reaching system and arm use measured by AAUT in both stroke groups (LH
226 and RH) were conducted using spearman's correlation after Shapiro-Wilk test for normality. Finally,
227 between-group differences in stroke onset and UEFM were analyzed using either independent t-test or
228 Wilcoxon rank sum test after Shapiro-Wilk test for normality. Possible differences in age for RH, LH, and
229 Control groups were tested using the Kruskal-Wallis test. All statistical analyses were performed with the
230 R statistical package version 3.6.2 (R Core Team 2012). Significance levels were set to $p = .05$ for these
231 overall analyses and all results are given in mean \pm standard error.

232 **Target-by-target arm choice analysis: Mixed-effect logistic regression** 233 **models**

234 To test whether the probability of arm choice measured in the spontaneous choice blocks was
235 different between RH and LH groups, and whether that probability is predicted by expected success and
236 expected effort measured in the forced choice blocks, we developed mixed-effect logistic regression models
237 of arm choice. The models are based on our previous model for non-disabled individuals, in which we
238 showed that between-arm differences in expected effort and expected success accurately predicted arm
239 choice (Schweighofer et al. 2015). Here, we tested the following regressors for inclusion in the stroke
240 model: 1) between-arm differences in effort, 2) between-arm differences in success, and 3) side affected by

241 stroke, which was entered as a binary variable (0 for RH and 1 for LH). To take into account large
242 differences in participants' characteristics and account for the repeated measurements, we used random
243 slopes and intercepts (see below). For stroke participants, success was highly predictive of condition:
244 success was 100% in the no-time constraint condition but largely reduced in the fast-time constraint
245 condition. Thus, to reduce model complexity (that is, the number of parameters to estimate) and avoid high
246 collinearity, we included success but not time constraint condition as a factor. In the control participant
247 model, we only included effort, because success was near 100% for this group for both fast-time and no-
248 time constraint conditions.

249 We developed the logistic regression models using a forward step-wise approach. We started with
250 the simplest (base) model with mixed intercepts. Next, for the stroke participants, we added one predictor
251 among effort, success, and paretic side (RH or LH). We then extended the model by including two
252 predictors among effort, success, and paretic side, and finally with all three predictors as main effects, and
253 with interactions between paretic side with effort and success.

254 For instance, for a RH stroke participant j , the model given the probability of using the more-
255 affected arm for a target i for participant j , as a function of effort and success is given by the following
256 equation:

257

$$P(MA, i, j) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp^{- (a_j (\langle Effort_{MA,i,j} \rangle - \langle Effort_{LA,i,j} \rangle) + b_j (\langle Success_{MA,i,j} \rangle - \langle Success_{LA,i,j} \rangle) + c_j)}$$

258

259 where, c_j is a constant parameter that biases overall arm choice for the subject j , and a_j and b_j are weighting
260 parameters for differences between the more-affected arm (MA) and less-affected arm (LA) in effort and
261 success during the no-time and fast-time constraint conditions. The mixed-effect parameters for each
262 participant j (a_j , b_j , and c_j) are drawn from a Gaussian distribution centered on the mean of all participants

263 (the fixed effects). The brackets $< >$ indicate expected effort and success for movement to target i in
264 subject j . Expected effort and success were computed from the movements to this target in forced choice
265 blocks (see above). The probability of choosing the less-affected arm is given by $P_{(LA,i,j)} = 1 - P_{(MA,i,j)}$.

266 All predictors were z-transformed before inclusion in the models such that the parameters could be
267 compared. We compared nested models using the Akaike Information Criteria (AIC) and with the
268 Likelihood Ratio Tests (LRT) using the *anova()* function in *R*. Because of the data-driven forward approach
269 model development and selection, we set a strict significance threshold of $p = .005$ for both model selection
270 with the LRT and for significance of the fixed effects. Note that the models were developed with binary
271 choice data from all participants in both stroke groups (stroke model, with choice data from Day 3) and
272 control group (control model, with choice data from Day 2), with a maximum of 35 targets * 2 trials per
273 target * 2 conditions = 140 data points for each participant. However, 4.5% of data for stroke group and
274 5.5% for control group were missing, yielding totals of 2936 and 1420 useful data points for the stroke and
275 control models, respectively. Missing data was due to the 1) inability to obtain the whole reaching trajectory
276 when participants used the opposite arm by mistakes in the forced choice block, or 2) abnormally long
277 movement duration, as detected by > 3 standard deviations (such long durations were often due to
278 unexpected movements such that the participants rubbed their eyes or noses).

279 **Switch – Stay analysis to determine the effect of failures on arm choices**

280 We then assessed whether participants post-stroke switched to their less-affected arm in the spontaneous
281 choice blocks when failing to reach targets with their more-affected arm in the forced choice blocks of the
282 fast-time constraint condition. Specifically, for this analysis, we first considered the targets for which the
283 participants used their more-affected arm in the spontaneous choice blocks in the no-time constraint
284 condition. Next, among this first target sub-set, we selected the targets that were unsuccessfully reached
285 with the more-affected arm in the forced choice blocks in the fast-time constraint condition. Finally, among

286 this second target sub-set, we studied arm choice in the spontaneous choice blocks in the fast condition.
287 The participants could either “switch” to the less-affected arm, or “stay” with the more-affected arm. Chi-
288 square test was used to compare the proportion of subjects who switch and/or stay between the RH and LH
289 groups

290

291 **Results**

292

293 **Participant demographics and clinical data**

294 Participants in the RH, LH, and control groups did not differ in age ($p = .272$, Kruskal-Wallis Test).
295 The UEFM scores of participants ranged from 19 to 57 and were not different between the LH and RH
296 groups (LH: 41.6 ± 3.3 , RH: 44.9 ± 3.2 , Mann-Whitney U test, $p = .453$). There was no difference in time
297 since stroke onset between LH and RH groups (LH: 3.4 ± 1.5 years, RH: $2.2 \pm .4$ years, Mann-Whitney U
298 test, $p = .496$). Consistent with the entry criteria, all participants reported to be right hand-dominant before
299 stroke.

300 **Overall choice, success, and effort**

301 Table 1 summarizes the overall probability of arm choice, success rate, and estimated effort of both
302 arms for the RH, LH, and control groups in each condition. The RH group showed no change in more-
303 affected arm’s choice across time constraint conditions ($p = .840$), whereas the LH group showed decreased
304 in more-affected arm’s choice in the fast-time constraint condition compared to the no-time constraint
305 condition ($p < .001$). The more-affected left arm choice in the LH group was lower than the more-affected
306 right arm’s choice in the RH group in the fast time condition ($p < .001$), but not in the no time condition (p

307 = .430) – See Table 1 and Figure 2A. The RH group showed decreased in right arm choice compared to the
308 control group in both conditions ($p < .001$), but the LH group showed significant decreased in left arm choice
309 compared to the control group only in the fast time condition ($p < .001$). Both stroke groups showed 100%
310 success rates for the more-affected arm in the no-time condition (which is not surprising given that reaching
311 to the farthest target within 5 seconds with the affected arm with an inclusion criterion), but their success
312 rates significantly decreased in the fast-time constraint condition ($t = 22.1, p < .001$ and $t = 28.4, p < .001$
313 for the RH and LH groups, respectively). The success rates of the more-affected arm in the fast-time
314 constraint condition did not differ across the two stroke groups, although there as a trend for greater success
315 in the RH group (61.6 ± 1.4 vs 46.2 ± 1.4 for the RH and LH groups, respectively; $t = 2.37, p = .110$) (Table
316 1). Effort of the more-affected arm was also not different between the LH and RH groups, but effort in the
317 fast-time constraint condition was higher than in the no-time constraint condition ($t = 4.07, p < .001$ for
318 both groups).

319 **Expected success differentially influences arm choice in the RH and LH** 320 **groups**

321 We then tested whether the following regressors accounted for arm choice in individuals with
322 stroke: 1) between-arm differences in effort, 2) between-arm differences in success, and 3) paretic side. For
323 the stroke participants, Model 1 with effort showed a better fit (AIC = 2,330) than Model 2 with success
324 (AIC = 3,648) and Model 3 with effort and paretic side (AIC = 2,332; all results are in Table 2). Model 4
325 with effort, paretic side, and interaction between effort and paretic side showed non-significant interactions
326 (AIC = 2,332). The model with effort, paretic side, and success had a better model fit than Model 4 (Model
327 6; AIC = 2,147; comparison with Model 4; LRT, $p < .001$). Incorporating the interaction between success
328 and paretic side without effort resulted in a poor model (Model 5). However, including the interaction

329 between success and paretic side, together with effort resulted in the best fit (Model 7 AIC = 2,141; LRT:
330 $p = .003$ between these two models). We thus selected Model 7 as our final model for arm choice in post-
331 stroke.

332 For the control group, we performed a similar analysis and found that the effort term played a
333 crucial role with no effect of condition (Table 3; note that success was not entered in this model because
334 of the near 100% success rate for this group in all conditions, see Table 1).

335 Figure 2 shows overall predictions of the more-affected arm choice for all targets and all stroke
336 participants from the selected Model 7. Comparison of average actual choice (Figure 2A) and average
337 predicted choice (Figure 2B) indicates that the model captures the differences between the LH and RH
338 groups and time constraint conditions, with a notable decrease in the more-affected arm's choice in the fast
339 condition for the LH group, but not for the RH group. Figure 2D, which shows the predicted vs. actual arm
340 choice in the fast condition for the stroke participants, illustrates the excellent prediction of arm choice in
341 the spontaneous choice blocks from data in the forced choice blocks (*Spearman's correlation*, $r = .93$, $p <$
342 $.001$). Accuracy of the model calculated by comparing the actual to predicted arm choice for each target,
343 for the RH, LH, and control groups were $84.9 \pm 4.23\%$, $85.7 \pm 5.6\%$, and $82.8 \pm 11.73\%$, respectively.

344 The fixed-effect coefficient of effort was different from zero ($z = -1.16$, $p < .001$, see Model 7,
345 Table 2) and there was no difference in this coefficient between the LH and RH groups ($z = .88$, $p = .377$)
346 (Figure 2E). Whereas the fixed-effect coefficient of success was not different from zero in the RH group (z
347 $= 0.53$, $p = .600$), it was greater than zero in the LH group ($z = 3.33$, $p < .001$). The importance of including
348 success in the model is illustrated in Figure 2C, in which we compared arm choice in models that do and
349 do not include the success term. Without the success term, predictions of arm choice largely deviate from
350 the data in all time conditions for the LH group (Figure 2A and 2C). Together, these results show that

351 success influences arm choice for the LH group, but not for the RH group.

352 Note that a possible confound in the above analysis is that, in the fast condition, the LH group
353 exhibited a success rate with the more affected arm about 15% lower than that of the RH group. Thus, there
354 was a possibility that higher success rates in RH diminished its influence in arm choice. We addressed this
355 issue with two additional analyses. First, we matched participants in the two groups by success rates – this
356 led to removal of two RH participants with the highest success rates (RH 1 & 6). Results did not change:
357 the best fit model was still Model 7 and expected success still influenced arm choice in the LH but not in
358 the RH groups (AIC for Model 6 = 2,012 and Model 7 = 2,006; LRT: $p = .003$ between these two models).
359 Second, we fitted the models after removing one subject's data from the overall data set, with each subject
360 data removed in turn, leading to $N = 22$ model analyses. We verified that in these $N = 22$ analyses, the best-
361 fit final model (as selected via the smallest AIC) was always Model 7.

362 **Switch – Stay differences between the RH and LH groups**

363 We then analyzed individual trial data in both conditions across the no-time and fast-time constraint
364 conditions to test whether participants maximized success by switching arms in spontaneous choice blocks
365 when failing in the fast forced-choice condition with the more affected arm for the same targets (see
366 Methods). Whereas the percentage of “stay” was not different between the RH and LH groups ($p > .1$), the
367 percentage of “switch” was higher in the LH group than the RH group ($56 \pm 12\%$ vs $22 \pm 7\%$, $p < .05$;
368 Figure 3A.). This indicates that the LH group switched to the less-affected arm more often when expecting
369 unsuccessful trials in the fast condition than did the RH group. Thus, the LH group exhibited flexible
370 behavior in arm choice to avoid unsuccessful trials, whereas the RH group appeared to be less sensitive to
371 failures.

372 **Reaction Times differences between the RH and LH groups**

373 Figure 3B shows reaction times for groups and conditions. Reaction times of the spontaneous
374 choice block in the LH group decreased from the no-time constraint condition to fast condition (no-time
375 condition: 439 ± 7 ms and fast time: 390 ± 6 ms, $p = .0012$). However, the RH group showed no change in
376 reaction times between the no-time and fast-time constraint condition (no-time: 403 ± 10 ms and fast time:
377 411 ± 11 ms, $p = .598$) (Figure 3B). In addition, the reaction times in the no time condition were larger in
378 the LH group than in the RH group ($p = .04$).

379 **Clinical validation of arm choice with the AAUT**

380 For the RH group, use of the more-affected arm measured by AAUT was significantly correlated
381 with choice of the more-affected arm expressed by the number of targets that participants successfully
382 reached using the more-affected arm under both the no-time and fast-time constraint conditions (*Pearson's*
383 *correlation*, $r = .61$, $p = .023$ for the no- time; $r = .79$, $p < .001$ for the fast-time condition- Figure 4 B,D).
384 However, for the LH group, whereas arm choice of the more-affected arm in the fast condition correlated
385 with AAUT (*Spearman's correlation*, $r = .88$, $p < .001$), choice in the no-time constraint condition did not
386 (*Spearman's correlation*, $r = .004$, $p = .91$)(Figure 4 A,B).

387

388 **Discussion**

389

390 We investigated how side of stroke, as well as effort and success, influence arm choice post-stroke.
391 Our results overall support our hypotheses that in premorbidly right-handed individuals, RH individuals
392 chose their paretic arm habitually, whereas LH individuals chose their paretic arm more optimally.

393 **RH individuals habitually use their more-affected arm, but LH individuals do**
394 **not**

395 Five complementary results from our study support greater habitual choice of the paretic arm in
396 RH individuals than in LH individuals. First, whereas RH individuals showed no change in their overall
397 probability of arm choice between the no-time and the fast-time constraint condition, LH participants
398 showed a large decrease in choice in the fast-time constraint condition (see Table 1). Second, our logistic
399 regression model of choice showed that the RH and LH groups differently responded to expected success:
400 whereas the (fixed effect) parameter of expected success was near zero and non-significant in the RH group,
401 it was significantly positive for the LH group. Removing the expected success term largely worsened the
402 predictive capability of the model of choice for the LH group (Figure 2B and 2C). Third, compared to the
403 LH group, participants in the RH group exhibited a small proportion of “switches” when given the choice
404 of the arm to use in the fast condition, and thus persevered in choosing to perform unsuccessful reaching
405 movements that often occurred after using the more-affected arm in this condition (Figure 3A). Fourth,
406 reaction times of the RH participants did not change in the two time-constraint conditions (see Figure 3B),
407 whereas reaction times of the LH participants largely increased in the no-time constraint condition
408 compared to the fast-time constraint condition. Finally, a covert measure of arm use, the AAUT, correlated
409 with arm choice for both the fast- and no-time constraint conditions in RH individuals (Figure 4). Because
410 time pressure in the fast condition is thought to facilitate habitual choice (de Wit et al. 2018; Kim et al.
411 2018), via a shift from the goal-directed system to the habitual system (Keramati et al. 2011)(Hardwick et
412 al. 2019), these results provide support for greater habitual choice of the paretic arm for RH individuals
413 than for LH individuals.

414 Previous research on arm choice in both non-disabled young adults (Stoloff et al. 2011;
415 Schweighofer et al. 2015) and in post-stroke individuals (Ballester et al. 2015, 2016) have shown that a

416 competition between arms that results in decision to choose one arm is modulated by previous history of
417 success. Such competition is thought to occur via neural populations in bilateral parietal cortices that encode
418 actions in hand-specific terms and compete for action selection across and within hemispheres (Fitzpatrick
419 et al. 2019). This competition has also been shown to be modulated by choices in the immediately preceding
420 trials, leading to sub-optimal choices (Habagishi et al. 2014; Schweighofer et al. 2015; Valyear et al. 2019).
421 Here, our results suggest that the long-term history of hand preference also modulates the competition
422 between actions. Our results are consistent with the view that a long-lasting habitual bias, e.g. handedness
423 or hand preference, modifies the competition between the two possible actions. Because habitual choices
424 result in sub-optimal choices in RH participants, with fewer successes than could be achieved by choosing
425 the less affected arm, why these long-lasting changes do not remap following negative experience? We
426 can envision three possible non-exclusive possibilities that would counteract this remapping: First, the
427 computational and time savings due to habitual actions in RH individuals could offset the advantages of
428 otherwise more optimal decisions (Shadmehr and Krakauer 2008). Second, because the unsuccessful
429 movement of the more-affected arm is often compensated with the less-affected arm in a bimanual manner
430 in RH individuals (Haaland et al. 2012), remapping to avoid failures in daily activities might not be
431 necessary. Third, repeated habitual choice in RH individuals can lead to (rewarding) improved function,
432 in a form of self-training (Han et al. 2008; Hidaka et al. 2012), as suggested by the somewhat larger
433 success rates in RH individuals compared to LH individuals despite overall similar impairment levels.

434 In contrast to the differential effect of expected success, the effect of the expected effort in arm
435 choice was similar in RH and LH participants. Our results confirm, and extend to stroke survivors, the
436 results of previous studies showing that nondisabled participants prefer to select targets, or the arm
437 associated with lower biomechanical effort (Cos et al. 2011; Schweighofer et al. 2015; Wang et al. 2016;

438 Bakker et al. 2017). Here, the effort parameter was the largest of all fixed parameters in all groups¹;
439 however, the parameter for effort was reduced in the post-stroke participants compared to the control
440 participants. It is possible that, post-stroke, the computation of the expected effort, which requires a forward
441 internal model of the dynamics, is not as accurate as in the healthy brain, leading to a relatively smaller
442 contribution of effort to arm choice.

443 **Limitations and future work**

444 The present study has several limitations and leaves several open questions that need to be
445 addressed in future works. First, we estimated effort using a planar two-link arm (shoulder and elbow),
446 although participants in our experiments could abduct their arm and rotate their shoulders internally or
447 externally. In addition, our estimates of biomechanical effort do not take into account abnormal muscle co-
448 contractions commonly shown in stroke survivors (Dewald et al. 1995; Ellis et al. 2005). Second, our
449 experimental task may limit the generalization of our findings. In particular, both the use of the restraining
450 belt to minimize compensatory trunk movements and the reaching movements that do not require finger
451 movements or object manipulation may influence spontaneous choice. Third, it may be argued that our
452 number of participants post-stroke (N=22) was too small to select the best model of arm choice and to test
453 for the significance of three different regressors and two interaction terms. However, we believe that our
454 results are valid because: 1) the stroke group was relatively homogenous, with strict entry criteria for the
455 DOSE trial, 2) the models were pre-planned based on hypotheses derived from previous research, 3) the
456 contributions, and relative sizes of the coefficients for the effort vs the success terms matched those of our
457 previous study in non-disabled participants (Schweighofer et al. 2015), 4) we used a strict $p = 0.005$ for

¹ As a reminder all variables were z-transformed so direct comparison of parameter values is meaningful.

458 model selection and parameter significance, and 5) the stroke models were developed with multiple data
459 points from all stroke participants with a maximum 140 arm choices per participants, which, accounting for
460 missing data, yielded a totals of 2936 points. Fourth, because of the relatively small number of subjects, we
461 could not link specific brain lesion characteristics to arm choice, nor could we include additional covariates
462 in the models, such as impairment levels, pain, or the integrity of visuo-spatial memory, e.g., (Schweighofer
463 et al. 2011). In future work with larger datasets, such covariates could be included to improve predictions
464 of arm choice to a larger and more diverse population of stroke survivors.

465 **Implications of our findings for neurorehabilitation**

466 Our findings, if confirmed with additional studies including reaching and grasping movements,
467 suggest new rehabilitation strategies that are differently targeted to individuals with RH and LH.
468 Spontaneous use of the more-affected arm in individuals post-stroke is a crucial indicator of both recovery
469 and effectiveness of rehabilitation (Barker and Brauer 2005; Chen et al. 2012). Because stroke often leads
470 to hemiparesis, individuals post-stroke often choose to perform motor actions with the less-affected arm.
471 These individuals often exhibit at least some degree of non-use, that is, a decrease in use of the more-
472 affected arm despite a residual capacity to use it (Andrews and Steward 1979; Taub et al. 1994; Hidaka et
473 al. 2012; Han et al. 2013). Results from our arm choice model shows that for both RH and LH individuals,
474 effort is a large (negative) predictor of arm choice. Thus, for all participants, treatment strategy should aim
475 to increase spontaneous use by decreasing the more-affected arm's effort through training which
476 emphasizes fast movement and re-educates muscle co-activation patterns of shoulder and elbow to reduce
477 abnormal elbow/shoulder joint torque coupling (Ellis et al. 2005, 2016). In addition, because success largely
478 influence choice in the LH individuals, additional treatment regimens will be needed for these individuals
479 to increase the use of their more-affected arm and to de-sensitize task failure in low-risk conditions (such
480 as in this study) when the more-affected arm is used. Thus, for LH individuals, task oriented-repetitive

481 movements with accompanying patient education, or virtual reality set-ups that encourage choice of the
482 more-affected arm (Ballester et al. 2015, 2016), can be helpful to increase use in the natural environment
483 (Winstein et al. 2016). In both cases, increased arm use may in turn further increase arm function via “self-
484 training” (Hidaka et al. 2012); then the patient can enter a virtuous circle in which spontaneous arm use and
485 motor performance reinforce each other (Han et al. 2008; Schweighofer et al. 2009).

486

487

488

489 **Acknowledgements:** We thank members of the CNRL labs, Rebecca Lewthwaite, John
490 Monterosso, and Jim Gordon for comments on this work. We thank Shannon Massimo and Nicolo Betoni
491 for help with data collection and Hyeshin Park for help with BART programming.

492

493 **References**

494

495 **Andrews K, Steward J.** Stroke recovery: He can but does he? *Rheumatology* 18: 43–48, 1979.

496 **Bailey RR, Birkenmeier RL, Lang CE.** Real-world affected upper limb activity in chronic
497 stroke: an examination of potential modifying factors. *Top Stroke Rehabil* 22: 26–33, 2015.

498 **Bakker RS, Weijer RHA, Van Beers RJ, Selen LPJ, Medendorp WP.** Decisions in motion:
499 Passive body acceleration modulates hand choice. *J Neurophysiol* 117: 2250–2261, 2017.

500 **Ballester BR, Maier M, San Segundo Mozo RM, Castada V, Duff A, Verschure PFMJ.**
501 Counteracting learned non-use in chronic stroke patients with reinforcement-induced movement therapy.
502 *J Neuroeng Rehabil* 13: 74, 2016.

503 **Ballester BR, Nirme J, Duarte E, Cuxart A, Rodriguez S, Verschure P, Duff A.** The visual
504 amplification of goal-oriented movements counteracts acquired non-use in hemiparetic stroke patients. *J*
505 *Neuroeng Rehabil* 12: 50, 2015.

506 **Barker RN, Brauer SG.** Upper limb recovery after stroke: The stroke survivors' perspective.
507 *Disabil Rehabil* 27: 1213–1223, 2005.

508 **Van Beers RJ, Haggard P, Wolpert DM, Beers RJ.** The Role of Execution Noise in Movement
509 Variability. *J Neuro-physiol* 91: 1050–1063, 2004.

510 **Chen S, Wolf SL, Zhang Q, Thompson PA, Winstein CJ.** Minimal Detectable Change of the
511 Actual Amount of Use Test and the Motor Activity Log: The EXCITE Trial. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*
512 (2012). doi: 10.1177/1545968311425048.

513 **Coelho CJ, Przybyla A, Yadav V, Sainburg RL.** Hemispheric differences in the control of limb
514 dynamics: a link between arm performance asymmetries and arm selection patterns. *J Neurophysiol* 109:
515 825–38, 2013.

516 **Cos I, Bélanger N, Cisek P.** The influence of predicted arm biomechanics on decision making. *J*
517 *Neurophysiol* 105: 3022–33, 2011.

518 **Daw ND, Gershman SJ, Seymour B, Dayan P, Dolan RJ.** Model-based influences on humans’
519 choices and striatal prediction errors. *Neuron* 69: 1204–1215, 2011.

520 **Daw ND, Niv Y, Dayan P.** Uncertainty-based competition between prefrontal and dorsolateral
521 striatal systems for behavioral control. *Nat Neurosci* 8: 1704–1711, 2005.

522 **Dewald JP, Pope PS, Given JD, Buchanan TS, Rymer WZ.** Abnormal muscle coactivation
523 patterns during isometric torque generation at the elbow and shoulder in hemiparetic subjects. *Brain* 118 (
524 Pt 2: 495–510, 1995.

525 **Ellis MD, Holubar BG, Acosta AM, Beer RF, Dewald JPA.** Modifiability of abnormal
526 isometric elbow and shoulder joint torque coupling after stroke. *Muscle and Nerve* 32: 170–178, 2005.

527 **Ellis MD, Lan Y, Yao J, Dewald JPA.** Robotic quantification of upper extremity loss of
528 independent joint control or flexion synergy in individuals with hemiparetic stroke: a review of paradigms
529 addressing the effects of shoulder abduction loading. *J Neuroeng Rehabil* 13: 1–11, 2016.

530 **Fitzpatrick AM, Dundon NM, Valyear KF.** The neural basis of hand choice: An fMRI
531 investigation of the Posterior Parietal Interhemispheric Competition model. *Neuroimage* 185: 208–221,
532 2019.

533 **Gläscher J, Daw N, Dayan P, O’Doherty JP.** States versus rewards: Dissociable neural
534 prediction error signals underlying model-based and model-free reinforcement learning. *Neuron* 66: 585–
535 595, 2010.

536 **Haaland KY, Mutha PK, Rinehart JK, Daniels M, Cushnyr B, Adair JC.** Relationship
537 between arm usage and instrumental activities of daily living after unilateral stroke. *Arch Phys Med*
538 *Rehabil* 93: 1957–62, 2012.

539 **Habagishi C, Kasuga S, Otaka Y, Liu M, Ushiba J.** Different strategy of hand choice after
540 learning of constant and incremental dynamical perturbation in arm reaching. *Front Hum Neurosci* 8,
541 2014.

542 **Han CE, Arbib MA, Schweighofer N.** Stroke rehabilitation reaches a threshold. *PLoS Comput*
543 *Biol* 4: e1000133, 2008.

544 **Han CE, Kim S, Chen S, Lai Y-H, Lee J-Y, Osu R, Winstein CJ, Schweighofer N.**
545 Quantifying Arm Nonuse in Individuals Poststroke. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair* 27: 439–447, 2013.

546 **Hardwick RM, Forrence AD, Krakauer JW, Haith AM.** Time-dependent competition between
547 goal-directed and habitual response preparation. *Nat Hum Behav* 3: 1252–1262, 2019.

548 **Hidaka Y, Han CE, Wolf SL, Winstein CJ, Schweighofer N.** Use it and improve it or lose it:
549 Interactions between arm function and use in humans post-stroke. *PLoS Comput Biol* 8, 2012.

550 **Kable JW, Glimcher PW.** The Neurobiology of Decision: Consensus and Controversy. *Neuron*
551 63: 733–745, 2009.

552 **Keramati M, Dezfouli A, Piray P.** Speed/accuracy trade-off between the habitual and the goal-
553 directed processes. *PLoS Comput Biol* 7, 2011.

554 **Kim S, Park H, Han CE, Winstein CJ, Schweighofer N.** Measuring habitual arm use post-
555 stroke with a bilateral time-constrained reaching task. *Front Neurol* 9, 2018.

556 **Mani S, Mutha PK, Przybyla A, Haaland KY, Good DC, Sainburg RL.** Contralesional motor
557 deficits after unilateral stroke reflect hemisphere-specific control mechanisms. *Brain* 136: 1288–1303,
558 2013.

559 **Mani S, Przybyla A, Good DC, Haaland KY, Sainburg RL.** Contralesional Arm Preference
560 Depends on Hemisphere of Damage and Target Location in Unilateral Stroke Patients. *Neurorehabil*
561 *Neural Repair* 28: 584–593, 2014.

562 **Michielsen ME, Selles RW, Stam HJ, Ribbers GM, Bussmann JB.** Quantifying nonuse in
563 chronic stroke patients: A study into paretic, nonparetic, and bimanual upper-limb use in daily life. *Arch*
564 *Phys Med Rehabil* 93: 1975–1981, 2012.

565 **Park H, Kim S, Winstein CJ, Gordon J, Schweighofer N.** Short-Duration and Intensive
566 Training Improves Long-Term Reaching Performance in Individuals With Chronic Stroke. *Neurorehabil.*
567 *Neural Repair* (2015). doi: 10.1177/1545968315606990.

568 **R Core Team.** A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. *R A Lang. Environ. Stat.*
569 *Comput.* 1R Foundation for Statistical Computing: <https://www.R-project.org>, 2012.

570 **Sainburg RL, Schaefer SY.** Interlimb differences in control of movement extent. *J Neurophysiol*
571 92: 1374–83, 2004.

572 **Schweighofer N, Han CE, Wolf SL, Arbib MA, Winstein CJ.** A functional threshold for long-
573 term use of hand and arm function can be determined: predictions from a computational model and
574 supporting data from the Extremity Constraint-Induced Therapy Evaluation (EXCITE) Trial. *Phys Ther*
575 89: 1327–1336, 2009.

576 **Schweighofer N, Lee J-Y, Goh H-T, Choi Y, Kim SS, Stewart JC, Lewthwaite R, Winstein**
577 **CJ.** Mechanisms of the contextual interference effect in individuals poststroke. *J Neurophysiol* 106:
578 2632–41, 2011.

579 **Schweighofer N, Xiao Y, Kim S, Yoshioka T, Gordon J, Osu R.** Effort, success, and nonuse
580 determine arm choice. *J Neurophysiol* 114: 551–559, 2015.

581 **Shadmehr R, Huang HJ, Ahmed AA.** A Representation of Effort in Decision-Making and
582 Motor Control. *Curr Biol* 26: 1929–1934, 2016.

583 **Shadmehr R, Krakauer JW.** A computational neuroanatomy for motor control. *Exp Brain Res*
584 185: 359–381, 2008.

585 **Stoloff RH, Taylor J a, Xu J, Ridderikhoff A, Ivry RB.** Effect of reinforcement history on
586 hand choice in an unconstrained reaching task. *Front Neurosci* 5: 41, 2011.

587 **Taub E, Crago JE, Burgio LD, Groomes TE, Cook EW, DeLuca SC, Miller NE.** An operant
588 approach to rehabilitation medicine: overcoming learned nonuse by shaping. *J Exp Anal Behav* 61: 281–
589 93, 1994.

590 **Taub E, Crago JE, Uswatte G.** Constraint-induced movement therapy: a new approach to
591 treatment in physical rehabilitation. *Rehabil Psychol* 43: 152–170, 1998.

592 **Valyear KF, Fitzpatrick AM, Dundon NM.** Now and then: Hand choice is influenced by recent
593 action history. *Psychon Bull Rev* 26: 305–314, 2019.

594 **Vega-González A, Granat MH.** Continuous monitoring of upper limb activity in a free-living
595 environment. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 86: 541–548, 2005.

596 **Wang C, Xiao Y, Burdet E, Gordon J, Schweighofer N.** The duration of reaching movement is
597 longer than predicted by minimum variance. *J Neurophysiol* 116: 2342–2345, 2016.

598 **Winstein C, Kim B, Kim S, Martinez C, Schweighofer N.** Dosage Matters. *Stroke* 50: 1831–
599 1837, 2019.

600 **Winstein CJ, Wolf SL, Dromerick AW, Lane CJ, Nelsen MA, Lewthwaite R, Cen SY, Azen**
601 **SP.** Effect of a Task-Oriented Rehabilitation Program on Upper Extremity Recovery Following Motor
602 Stroke. *Jama* 315: 571, 2016.

603 **de Wit S, Kindt M, Knot SL, Verhoeven AAC, Robbins TW, Gasull-Camos J, Evans M,**
604 **Mirza H, Gillan CM.** Shifting the balance between goals and habits: Five failures in experimental habit
605 induction. *J Exp Psychol Gen* 147: 1043–1065, 2018.

606

607

608

609 Table 1. Choice, Effort, and Success for the right and the left arms across conditions in the RH, the
610 LH, and the Control groups

Variables	Condition	Control		LH		RH	
		Left	Right	Left (more-affected)	Right (less-affected)	Left (less-affected)	Right (more-affected)
Choice (%)	No-time	45.4±1.9	54.63 ±1.9	45.9 ± 1.8	54.1 ±1.8	58.40 ± 1.7	41.6 ± 1.7
	Fast	39.0±1.8 [†]	61.02±1.8	27.3 ± 1.6 ^{*†}	72.7 ± 1.6	58.48 ± 1.7	41.5 ± 1.7 [*]
Effort (a.u)	No-time	1.06 ± 0.02	1.06 ± 0.02	1.01 ± 0.02	1.00 ± 0.02	1.02 ± 0.02	1.07 ± 0.02
	Fast	1.12 ± 0.02 [†]	1.12 ± 0.02 [†]	1.06 ± 0.02 [†]	1.06 ± 0.02	1.11 ± 0.02	1.15 ± 0.02 [†]
Success (%)	No-time	100	100	100	100	100	100
	Fast	96.6 ± 0.1	97.5 ± 0.4	46.2 ± 1.4 [†]	100	100	61.6 ± 1.4 [†]

611 * difference between right more-affected vs left more-affected; † difference between no-time and fast-time
612 constraint conditions. RH, participants with right hemiparesis; LH, participants with left hemiparesis,
613 Control, nondisabled participants. All the values are shown in the format of mean ± standard error. a.u.:
614 arbitrary units.

615

616

617

Table 2. Mixed effect logistic regression models for stroke participants.

Arm Choice Models							
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Constant(RH)	-0.789*** (0.181)	-0.539*** (0.119)	-0.692 (0.244)	-0.697 (0.244)	-0.389 (0.154)	-0.698 (0.280)	-0.674 (0.279)
Side(LH = 1)			-0.210 (0.359)	-0.196 (0.359)	-0.334 (0.230)	-0.404 (0.414)	-0.480 (0.414)
Effort	-2.610*** (0.328)		-2.608*** (0.327)	-2.964*** (0.424)		-2.783*** (0.315)	-2.779*** (0.315)
Success		0.508*** (0.138)			0.230 (0.159)	0.566 (0.193)	0.110 (0.209)
Effort : Side				0.797 (0.622)			
Success : Side					0.608 (0.236)		1.029*** (0.309)
Observations	2,936	2,936	2,936	2,936	2,936	2,936	2,936
Log Likelihood	-1,161.413	-1,820.310	-1,161.245	-1,160.467	-1,816.734	-1,066.943	-1,062.568
AIC	2,330.827	3,648.621	2,332.490	2,332.935	3,645.468	2,147.886	2,141.136

AIC, Akaike Information Criterion; RH, participants with right hemiparesis; LH, participants with left hemiparesis. *** p < .005. The best-fit model is represented by bold.


618

Table 3. Mixed effect logistic regression models for the control participants.


	Arm Choice model			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Constant	1.078*** (0.304)	0.187 (0.093)	0.881 (0.313)	0.916 (0.316)
Effort	-4.131*** (1.054)		-4.155*** (1.063)	-4.427*** (1.069)
Condition		0.263 (0.108)	0.401 (0.148)	0.334 (0.151)
Effort:Condition				0.498
Observations	1,420	1,420	1,420	1,420
Log Likelihood	-582.652	-962.156	-578.988	-575.823
Akaike Inf. Crit.	1,173.303	1,930.313	1,167.976	1,163.646

AIC, Akaike Information Criterion; ***p < .005. The best-fit model is represented by bold.


(A) Participant set-up




(B) Target locations




(C) Experimental schedule



(D) Velocity



(E) Angle



(F) Torque




Figure 1. Bilateral Arm Reaching Test (BART) set up, target locations, and protocol. A. Set-up: The green circle and the white circle show the home position and a target, respectively. At each trial, participants were instructed to reach to the target using either right or left index finger (depending on conditions) as quickly and accurately as possible. Magnetic sensors were attached to the index finger tips of both arms to record choice of hand and kinematics. B. The 35 targets displayed in the BART workspace (plus the home target, shown surrounded by a square). Gray shading shows the time constraint for each target in the fast condition. C. Experimental protocol common for the stroke group. In Day1, the forced choice blocks (LA and MA) were presented before the spontaneous choice blocks (SC) for the familiarization purpose. In Days 2 and 3, reminder conditions were presented before the spontaneous choice blocks, followed by the forced choice blocks (MA) for the medium and fast conditions (see Methods). The no-time and fast time constraint conditions were used for the analysis and were shaded by gray color. D. Examples of velocity profile of a single reaching movements for one subject post-stroke illustrating the computation of movement time. E. Example of estimated joint angle. An inverse kinematics model was used to estimate shoulder and elbow joint angles from hand trajectories. F. Example of shoulder and elbow joint toques estimated by an inverse dynamics model of the arm in 2 dimensions. No-time, no-time constraint condition; Medium, medium time constraint condition; Fast, fast time constraint condition; MA, more-affected arm only block; LA, less-affected arm only block; SC, spontaneous choice block; R, reminder block.




Figure 2. More-affected arm choices from actual experiment and results from best-fitted model. A. Actual choice for the RH (dark gray) and the LH (white) groups. B. The best-fit model predicts the more-affected arm choice accurately in both time conditions. C. A model without the success term predicts the more-affected arm choice less accurately for the LH group. The significant difference between the conditions in the LH group is indicated by $^*(p<.05)$ D. Average arm choice predicted by the model vs. actual choice in the fast condition for all participants post-stroke. E. Fixed-effect coefficients. The fixed-effect coefficient for success in the LH group is significantly lower than in the RH group, as noted by ** ($p < .01$). Fixed-effect coefficients significantly different from zero are indicated by * ($p < .001$).




Figure 3. Stay and Switch and reaction times for the RH and the LH groups. A. Stay is defined as the percentage of trials in spontaneous choice block in fast time constraint condition in which subject keep on using their more-affected arm following failures in forced choice block in fast time constraint condition, and switch as the percentage of trials in which the subjects switched to the less-affected arm.. B. Reaction times measured in spontaneous choice block for both groups in no-time and fast time constraint conditions. The reaction times decreased from the no-time to the time constraint condition in the LH group, but not the RH group. RH, participants with right hemiparesis; LH, participants with left hemiparesis.* $p < .05$




Figure 4. Correlations between AAUT and arm choice for RH and LH groups in no-time and fast time constraint conditions. Top row: correlations in no-time constraint condition for both RH and LH groups, Bottom row: correlations in fast time constraint conditions for both groups. The RH group shows good to moderate to good correlations between the AAUT score and arm choice under both conditions, while the LH group shows good correlation only in the fast constraint condition, but not in the no-time constraint condition.