

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<sup>1,2</sup>, Cheol E. Han, PhD<sup>3</sup>, Bokkyu Kim, PhD<sup>1,4</sup>, Carolee J. Winstein, PhD<sup>1</sup>, and  
7                   Nicolas Schweighofer, PhD<sup>1\*</sup>

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

11                  <sup>2</sup>Department of Physical Therapy, Jeonju University, Jeonju 55069, Republic of Korea

12                  <sup>3</sup>Department of Electronics and Information Engineering, Korea University, Sejong 30019, Republic of  
13                  Korea

14                  <sup>4</sup>Department 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  $62.83 \pm 13.95$  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  $54.36 \pm 10.58$  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

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

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:  $41.6 \pm 3.3$ , RH:  $44.9 \pm 3.2$ , Mann-Whitney U test,  $p = .453$ ). There was no difference in time  
297 since stroke onset between LH and RH groups (LH:  $3.4 \pm 1.5$  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 ( $61.6 \pm 1.4$  vs  $46.2 \pm 1.4$  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:  $439 \pm 7$  ms and fast time:  $390 \pm 6$  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:  $403 \pm 10$  ms and fast time:  
377  $411 \pm 11$  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 groups<sup>1</sup>;  
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

---

<sup>1</sup> 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



## References

- 493  
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 <sup>†</sup>	61.02±1.8	27.3 ± 1.6 <sup>*†</sup>	72.7 ± 1.6	58.48 ± 1.7	41.5 ± 1.7 <sup>*</sup>
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 <sup>†</sup>	1.12 ± 0.02 <sup>†</sup>	1.06 ± 0.02 <sup>†</sup>	1.06 ± 0.02	1.11 ± 0.02	1.15 ± 0.02 <sup>†</sup>
Success (%)	No-time	100	100	100	100	100	100
	Fast	96.6 ± 0.1	97.5 ± 0.4	46.2 ± 1.4 <sup>†</sup>	100	100	61.6 ± 1.4 <sup>†</sup>

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)	<b>-0.674</b> <b>(0.279)</b>
Side(LH = 1)			-0.210 (0.359)	-0.196 (0.359)	-0.334 (0.230)	-0.404 (0.414)	<b>-0.480</b> <b>(0.414)</b>
Effort	-2.610*** (0.328)		-2.608*** (0.327)	-2.964*** (0.424)		-2.783*** (0.315)	<b>-2.779***</b> <b>(0.315)</b>
Success		0.508*** (0.138)			0.230 (0.159)	0.566 (0.193)	<b>0.110</b> <b>(0.209)</b>
Effort : Side				0.797 (0.622)			
Success : Side					0.608 (0.236)		<b>1.029***</b> <b>(0.309)</b>
Observations	2,936	2,936	2,936	2,936	2,936	2,936	<b>2,936</b>
Log Likelihood	-1,161.413	-1,820.310	-1,161.245	-1,160.467	-1,816.734	-1,066.943	<b>-1,062.568</b>
AIC	2,330.827	3,648.621	2,332.490	2,332.935	3,645.468	2,147.886	<b>2,141.136</b>

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


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

	Arm Choice model			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Constant	<b>1.078***</b> <b>(0.304)</b>	0.187 (0.093)	0.881 (0.313)	0.916 (0.316)
Effort	<b>-4.131***</b> <b>(1.054)</b>		-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	<b>1,420</b>	1,420	1,420	1,420
Log Likelihood	<b>-582.652</b>	-962.156	-578.988	-575.823
Akaike Inf. Crit.	<b>1,173.303</b>	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.