

1 **Title:** Corticospinal Responses Following Gait-Specific Training in Stroke
2 Survivors: A Systematic Review

3 **Author names and affiliations**

4 **Yosra Cherni** ^{a,b,c}

5 ^a Centre Interdisciplinaire de Recherche en Réadaptation et Intégration Sociale, Quebec City, QC, Canada

6 ^b Département de réadaptation, Faculté de médecine, Université Laval, Quebec City, QC, Canada

7 ^c TOPMED, Centre collégial de transfert de technologie en orthèses, prothèses et équipements médicaux,
8 Québec city, QC, Canada

9 email: yosra.cherni@umontreal.ca

10

11 **Alexia Tremblay** ^{a,b}

12 ^a Centre Interdisciplinaire de Recherche en Réadaptation et Intégration Sociale, Quebec City, QC, Canada

13 ^b Département de réadaptation, Faculté de médecine, Université Laval, Quebec City, QC, Canada

14 email: alexia.tremblay.1@ulaval.ca

15

16 **Margaux Simon** ^{a,b}

17 ^a Centre Interdisciplinaire de Recherche en Réadaptation et Intégration Sociale, Quebec City, QC, Canada

18 ^b Département de réadaptation, Faculté de médecine, Université Laval, Quebec City, QC, Canada

19 email: margaux.simon.1@ulaval.ca

20

21 **Floriane Bretheau** ^a

22 ^a Centre Interdisciplinaire de Recherche en Réadaptation et Intégration Sociale, Quebec City, QC, Canada

23 email: floriane-solene.bretheau.1@ulaval.ca

24

25 **Andréanne K. Blanchette** ^{a,b}

26 ^a Centre Interdisciplinaire de Recherche en Réadaptation et Intégration Sociale, Quebec City, QC, Canada

27 ^b Département de réadaptation, Faculté de médecine, Université Laval, Quebec City, QC, Canada

28 email: andreeanne.blanchette@fmed.ulaval.ca

29

30 **Catherine Mercier** ^{a,b} (corresponding author)

31 ^a Centre Interdisciplinaire de Recherche en Réadaptation et Intégration Sociale, Quebec City, QC, Canada

32 ^b Département de réadaptation, Faculté de médecine, Université Laval, Quebec City, QC, Canada

33 email: catherine.mercier@rea.ulaval.ca

34

35

36 **Running title:** Effect of gait-specific training on corticospinal excitability

37

38

39

40

41 **Abstract**

42 **Background:** Corticospinal excitability is subject to alterations after stroke. While the reversal of
43 these alterations has been proposed as an underlying mechanism for improvement walking capacity
44 after gait-specific training, this has not yet been clearly demonstrated. Therefore, the objective of
45 this review is to evaluate the effect of gait-specific training on corticospinal excitability in stroke
46 survivors.

47 **Design:** Systematic review of the literature

48 **Methods:** We conducted an electronic database search in four databases (*i.e.*, Medline, Embase,
49 CINAHL and Web of Science) in June 2022. Two authors independently screened and selected all
50 studies that investigated the effect of gait-specific training in post-stroke individuals on variables
51 such as motor-evoked potential amplitude, motor threshold, map size, latency, and corticospinal
52 silent period.

53 **Results:** Nineteen studies investigating the effect of gait-specific training on corticospinal
54 excitability were included. Some studies showed an increased MEP amplitude (7/16 studies), a
55 decreased latency (5/7 studies), a decreased motor threshold (4/8 studies), an increased map size
56 (2/3 studies) and a decreased cortical silent period (1/2 study) after gait-specific training. No
57 change has been reported in term of short interval intracortical inhibition after training. Five studies
58 did not report any significant effect after gait-specific training on corticospinal excitability.

59 **Conclusion:** The results of this systematic review suggest that gait-specific training modalities can
60 drive neuroplastic adaptation among stroke survivors. However, given the methodological
61 disparity of the included studies, further clinical trials with better methodological quality are
62 needed to draw conclusions. Hence, the findings from this review can serve as a rationale for future
63 studies and continued efforts in investigating the effects of gait-specific training on the central
64 nervous system.

65 **Keywords:** Locomotion, Task-oriented training, Corticospinal tract, Stroke, Neuroplasticity

66

67 **1. Background**

68 Stroke is a leading cause of physical disability in adults [1]. The prevalence is about 16
69 million people worldwide [2]. Stroke causes sensorimotor deficits [3,4] that often lead to walking
70 limitations due to the impaired function of neural circuits including the corticospinal tract (CST)
71 [5]. It is recognized that the CST is the main neural pathway that regulates skilled voluntary
72 movement in humans [6,7]. In this context, studies based on non-invasive brain stimulation
73 techniques, such as transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) have reported alterations in CST
74 excitability in stroke survivors compared to healthy individuals, such as an increased motor evoked
75 response (MEP) latency [8], an increased resting motor threshold (MT) [9], a reduced MEP size
76 [8,9] and a prolonged silent period [10]. These alterations in CST contribute to alterations motor
77 performance, and are known to be related to gait deficits [11–13]. In fact, compared to healthy
78 individuals, post-stroke individuals often exhibit poor motor control ability [14], reduced walking
79 speed [14,15], frequent falls [16], and limited waking endurance [17]. Because gait limitations
80 prevent their independence in daily activities [18,19], a priority for stroke survivors is to optimize
81 gait recovery [20,21].

82 Gait-specific training interventions, such as overground training [22], treadmill training
83 without or with bodyweight support [23,24] or robotic-assisted gait training [25,26], focus on the
84 automaticity of walking by providing repetitive stepping practice. These modalities have shown
85 several benefits leading to improve walking ability. Systematic reviews [23,27,28] reported that
86 gait-specific training interventions are beneficial to improve functional / clinical parameters of gait
87 (*e.g.*, walking speed, walking endurance, and gross motor function) in individuals with
88 neurological disorders. The functional gains resulting from gait-specific training in stroke
89 survivors, like those produced by gait-specific training, may be due to several mechanisms, such
90 as re-establishing control performed by ipsilesional sensorimotor cortex [29,30] and behavioural
91 compensation strategies [31]. In animals and humans, some studies provided evidence of a change
92 in activation patterns in many regions of the damaged brain [32,33]. Changes in corticospinal
93 excitability might reflect a contribution of primary motor cortex reorganization in functional gains
94 [34,35]. However, although several reviews investigated the effect of interventions on walking
95 capacity in stroke survivors, their impact on corticospinal excitability remains to be clearly

96 established. Therefore, the objective of the present literature review was to summarize and evaluate
97 the effect of gait-specific training on corticospinal excitability in post-stroke individuals.

98 **2. Materials and Methods**

99 *2.1. Data Source and Literature Source*

100 A science librarian was consulted for the initial development of the search protocol. Studies were
101 identified by searching 4 databases (*i.e.*, Medline, Embase, CINHALL and Web of Science) from
102 inception to June 2022. The search strategy was based on three main concepts: gait-specific
103 training, corticospinal excitability, and stroke population. More details concerning the search
104 strategy and the keywords used are reported in **Table S1** as supplementary material. The current
105 review follows the guidelines for the preferred reporting items for systematic reviews (PRISMA)
106 [36] and was registered in the PROSPERO register on June 21, 2022 (ID: CRD42022338555).

107 *2.2. Eligibility Criteria*

108 The included studies met the following inclusion criteria: (1) intervention studies, such as
109 randomized controlled trials, pre/post studies, case studies, *etc*; (2) studies targeting people who
110 have had a stroke; (3) studies based on gait-specific training modality that focus on practicing
111 specific task related to gait (*e.g.*, overground gait training, treadmill training, robotic assisted gait
112 training, *etc*); (4) studies reporting at least one variable related to corticospinal excitability
113 measured with TMS (*i.e.*, MEP, motor threshold, map size, latency, and cortical silent period); (5)
114 studies evaluating pre/post effect of the intervention on corticospinal excitability and; (6) studies
115 published in French or English.

116 Articles were excluded if they: (1) were performed in a mixed population without a possibility to
117 isolate results from individuals who have suffered a stroke; (2) were based on multiple training
118 modalities (*e.g.*, including rTMS, transcranial direct-current stimulation, *etc*) among which we
119 cannot distinguish the effects of gait-specific training on corticospinal excitability and (3) were not
120 original research, such as letters to the editor, conference abstracts and commentaries.

121

122

123 2.3. *Studies of screening*

124 Titles and abstracts of the identified papers were screened independently by two of the authors (YC
125 and AT) to identify those that potentially met the inclusion criteria. A full review of those papers
126 was then performed independently by the same authors. Article selection was discussed until
127 consensus was reached. In the case of any unresolvable disagreement related to the studies
128 eligibility, a third author (CM) intervened to make a decision.

129 2.4. *Methodological quality and risk of bias*

130 To assess the methodological quality of included studies, two checklists were used in this study.
131 First, YC and AT independently rated the overall quality of each included article, using the PEDro
132 scale which ranges from 0 to 10 [37]. A PEDro scores of 0-3 were considered ‘poor’, 4-5 ‘fair’, 6-
133 8 ‘good’, and 9-10 ‘excellent’ [38]. This checklist allows to identify trials that are likely to be valid
134 and have sufficient statistical information to guide clinical decision-making. Second, the Chipchase
135 checklist was used to evaluate the methodology and reporting of studies in relation to the use of
136 TMS [39]. In this checklist, 8 items are related to subjects (*e.g.*, age, gender) and 18 to methodology
137 (*e.g.*, coil type, stimulus intensity, *etc.*). For both assessment procedures, a calibration meeting was
138 initially held with five articles, to ensure a clear understanding of each criterion and thus
139 standardization and reliability of assessments. A second meeting was held to discuss the criteria
140 for each included article, until a consensus was reached for a score. In the case of any unresolvable
141 disagreement, a third author (CM) performed the assessment to make a decision. For both general
142 PEDro scale and TMS-specific checklist, items were scored as either present (1) or absent (0).

143 2.5. *Data Extraction*


144 Data including study design, quality assessment, participants characteristics, intervention (and
145 comparison with a control group), outcomes, and results, was extracted by one author (MS) and
146 validated by a second author (YC). Outcomes of interest were measurements of corticospinal
147 excitability such as MEP size, MEP latency, TMS map area, motor threshold, cortical silent period
148 and short interval intracortical inhibition. In studies in which the gait-specific intervention was a
149 control condition (the experimental condition being for example gait training combined with brain
150 stimulation), the data was extracted only for the pre/post effect of this condition. The quality rating

151 was performed based on a pre/post in such case, therefore reflecting the quality of study based on
152 the data extracted in response to the review objective, and not the quality of the original study.

153 3. Results

154 3.1. Search results

155 The search and the screening processes are summarized in **Figure 1**. The initial search identified
156 6174 articles. After removing duplicates, the eligibility of 4008 articles was independently
157 evaluated by two reviewers based on their titles and abstracts. In this process, 82 articles were
158 determined by consensus to qualify for the full-text reading stage. This last stage resulted in the
159 identification of 19 articles as eligible in this review.



160

161

162

Figure 1. Flowchart outlining the protocol adopted in this systematic review.

163 3.2. Risk of bias

164 Study design and quality assessment: **Table 1** summarize the PEDro rating score for each of the 19
165 studies, which included 6 randomized controlled trials (RCT) [35,40–44], 2 crossover studies
166 [45,46], 1 cross-sectional study [34], 8 pre/post study [47–53] and 2 cases studies [54,55]. The
167 methodological quality of the included studies ranged from 1 to 8 out of 10, with a median score
168 of 4. Nine studies were of high quality (PEDro score ≥ 6), 6 studies were of moderate quality
169 (PEDro score = 4-5) and 4 were of poor quality (PEDro score ≤ 3). In 6 studies [47–50,52,53], the
170 gait-specific training was considered a control condition to another modality such as tDCS or
171 rTMS. To meet the objective of this review, data extraction in these studies only concerned the
172 pre/post effect of gait-specific training interventions (see Table 1).

173 TMS methodological quality: The specific details of the included studies, which incorporate the
174 evaluation of the Chipchase checklist, are summarized in **Table 2**. The included studies had scores
175 ranging from 5 to 20 out of 26, with a median score of 14. Regarding participant factors, 1 study
176 reported prescribed subject medication (Item 4) and five studies described participants medical
177 condition (Item 7). Concerning methodological factors, the majority of studies reported coil
178 location and stability (N=14), current direction (N=7) or method for determining MEP size during
179 analysis (N=12). Only 3 studies described stimulation pulse shape (N=3) and no studies controlled
180 the level of relaxation present in the muscles other than those being tested.

181 3.3. Characteristics of the participants

182 The sample size in the included studies ranged from 1 to 50 participants (total of 362 across all
183 studies), and participant demographics varied considerably (see **Table 3**). Sixteen studies focused
184 on participants in the chronic phase of recovery (>3 months post-lesion) after stroke, three studies
185 [41,43,49] included participants in the subacute phase and one study [55] included one participant
186 in the acute phase.


187 3.4. Gait training protocols

188 Training parameters (modalities, frequency, session duration and total number of sessions) are
189 displayed in **Table 3**. The protocols of the included studies were heterogeneous (*e.g.*, duration: 1
190 – 24 weeks; frequency: 1 – 5 sessions/week). Of the 5 studies proposing 1-training session, only

191 two studies showed positive effects following gait-specific training (HIIT [46] or walking with
 192 FES [45]). However, the majority of studies reporting positive effects were based on protocols with
 193 higher training volume (≥ 12 sessions).

194 *3.5. Effect of gait-specific training on corticospinal excitability*

195 The results extracted from the included studies are summarized in **Figure 2** and **Table 3**. The
 196 following sections outline the effect of gait-specific training on corticospinal excitability in terms
 197 of MEP amplitude and latency, motor threshold, map size, cortical silent period, and SICI.



198 **Figure 2.** Synthesis of the pre-post effect of single and multiple gait training sessions on
 199 corticospinal excitability by reporting the number of articles showing a positive effect (green), no
 200 effect (grey) or a negative effect (red).
 201
 202

203 *MEP amplitude:* Sixteen studies have investigated the effect of gait-specific training on MEP
 204 amplitudes. Seven studies showed a significant increase in MEP amplitudes after gait training (*i.e.*,
 205 robotic training [40,42–44], treadmill training [46], overground training [49] and FES combined to
 206 overground training [12]). Five of these studies [40,42–45] presented high methodological quality
 207 and two [46,49] were of moderate quality. However, eight studies did not report significant change
 208 [34,47,48,50,51,53,55,56] and one study showed a decrease in MEP amplitudes after gait-specific

209 training [54]. Six of these seven studies were of moderate to low methodological quality. Only one
210 study (case study, PEDro=2) reported a negative effect of gait training on MEP amplitude [54]. In
211 general, an increase in the amplitude of MEP may result from gait-specific training; however, in
212 order to better assess corticospinal excitability other TMS parameters should also be considered to
213 compensate for the variability that may be present in the MEP results.

214 MEP latency: Seven studies investigated the effect of gait-specific training on MEP latency. Data
215 from the five studies indicated a decrease in response to conventional gait training [49], robotic
216 training [43,44,49,56], treadmill training [34] and BWSTT [44]. Three of these studies were RCTs
217 (PEDro=6-7) and two were pre/post studies (PEDro=2-4). On the other hand, two pre/post studies
218 (PEDro=3-4) did not observe a significant change in MEP latency after training [47,50].

219 Motor threshold: MT was reported in 7 studies. Four studies reported a decrease in MT after gait-
220 specific training (*i.e.*, overground gait training [55], BWSTT [35,41] and robotic gait training [44]),
221 while 3 studies [50–52] did not report any significant changes after training. Three of the four
222 studies showing a positive effect of gait-specific training on MT are RCT (PEDro <7), while those
223 indicating a lack of change are pre/post studies (PEDro=3-4). In general, a significant decrease in
224 MT has been observed after robotic training [44] or BWSTT [35,41,44]. Moreover, Yang et al.
225 [41] observed a decrease in the MT in subacute group but not in the chronic group after BWSTT.

226 Map size: Three studies used the TMS mapping technique to estimate the effect of gait-specific
227 training on the size of the corticomotor representation [35,41,56]. Two RCT studies (PEDro=7-8)
228 reported an increase in map size after BWSTT training [35,41]. Furthermore, in their pre/post study
229 (PEDro=2), Poydasheva et al. [56] did not observe a significant change in this same parameter.
230 Yang et al. [41] found that this increase in map size after gait training was greater in subacute
231 patients compared to chronic patients. Although the results of the two RCTs appear promising in
232 terms of increase in the size of the map, the sample size of these studies remains limited (≤ 7
233 participant per group) which limits the conclusions on this variable.

234 Cortical silent period duration: Two studies examined the effect of gait-specific training on the
235 cortical silent period. One study (PEDro=1) showed a decrease in the cortical silent period after
236 overground training in one participant [55] while the other (PEDro=3) did not observe any change
237 in a group of 12 participants [51]. Although the study reporting a lack of effect had a larger sample

238 size, it is important to bear in mind that it looked at the effect of a single training session. Therefore,
239 the available data are too limited to reach a conclusion on this variable.

240 *Short interval intracortical inhibition:* Two studies [46,51] explored the effect of 1-session gait
241 training on SICI in 12-13 stroke survivors. No significant changes were observed after training.

242

Table 1. Study design and quality assessment (PEDro score) of the included studies.

Authors	Design	Item 1	Item 2	Item 3	Item 4	Item 5	Item 6	Item 7	Item 8	Item 9	Item 10	Item 11	Total /10
Calabrò [40]	RCT	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	8
Yang [41]	RCT	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	8
Jayaraman [42]	RCT	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	7
Li [43]	RCT	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	7
Shahine [44]	RCT	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	7
Yen [35]	RCT	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	7
Forrester [34]	Cross sectional	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	6
Palmer [45]	Crossover study	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	6
Li [46]	Crossover study	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	5
Wang [47]*	Pre/Post study*	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	4
Chang [49]*	Pre/Post study*	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3
Seo [50]*	Pre/Post study*	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3
Wang [48]*	Pre/Post study*	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3
Wong [51]	Pre/Post study*	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3
Koganemaru [52]*	Pre/Post study*	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3
Madhavan [53]*	Pre/Post study*	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3
Poydasheva [56]	Pre/Post study	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Krishnan [54]	Case study	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
Peurala [55]	Case study	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1

NOTE. RCT: Randomized Controlled Trial. The PEDro scale consists of 11 items: Item 1. eligibility criteria were specified. Item 2. subjects were randomly allocated to groups. Item 3. allocation was concealed. Item 4. The groups were similar at baseline regarding the most important prognostic indicators. Items 5–7. There was blinding of all subjects, therapists, and assessors. Item 8. Measures of at least one key outcome were obtained from more than 85% of the subjects initially assigned to groups. Item 9. All subjects for whom outcome measures were available received the treatment or control condition assigned or, where this was not the case, data for at least one key outcome were analyzed by “intention-to-treat”. Item 10. The results of between-group statistical comparisons are reported for at least one key outcome. Item 11. The study provides both point measures and measures of variability for at least one key outcome. Each item is scored as a “yes” or “no”, worth 1 or 0 points, respectively. The total score expressed on a 10-point scale. The first item is not included in the sum on the total score of the PEDro scale. A PEDro scores of 0-3 were considered ‘poor’, 4-5 ‘fair’, 6-8 ‘good’, and 9-10 ‘excellent’ [38] * These studies were RCT [48–51,51] or crossover studies [52,53] but were considered as Pre/Post studies as only data from the control group was extracted in relation to the objective of the present reviews. Items were rated accordingly, and therefore the score do not reflect the overall quality of the original study.

Table 2. TMS-specific components of methodological quality using the Chipchase checklist.

Studies	Participant factors								Methodological factors																Total		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24		25	26
Calabrò [40]	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	13
Yang [41]	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	14
Jayaraman [42]	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	20
Li [43]	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	19
Shahine [44]	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	13
Yen [35]	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	13
Forrester [34]	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	17
Palmer [45]	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	17
Li [46]	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	14
Chang [49]	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	16
Seo [50]	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	11
Wang [47]	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	16
Wang [48]	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	13
Wong [51]	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	15
Koganemaru [52]	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	14
Madhavan [53]	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	17
Poydasheva [56]	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	5
Krishnan [54]	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	13
Peurala [55]	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	15

NOTE: **Item1:** Age of subjects; **Item2:** Gender of subjects; **Item3:** Handedness of subjects; **Item4:** Subjects prescribed medication; **Item5:** Use of CNS active drugs (e.g., anti-convulsants); **Item6:** Presence of neurological/psychiatric disorders; **Item7:** Any medical conditions; **Item8:** History of specific repetitive motor activity. **Item9:** Position and contact of EMG electrodes; **Item10:** Amount of contraction of target muscles; **Item11:** Prior motor activity of the muscle to be tested; **Item12:** Relaxation of muscles other than those tested; **Item13:** Coil type (size and geometry); **Item14:** Coil orientation; **Item15:** Direction of induced current in the brain; **Item16:** Coil location and stability; **Item17:** Type of stimulator used (e.g. brand); **Item18:** Stimulation intensity; **Item19:** Pulse shape (monophasic or biphasic); **Item20:** Determination of optimal hotspot; **Item21:** The time between MEP trials; **Item22:** Time between days of testing; **Item23:** Subject attention (level of arousal) during testing; **Item24:** Method for determining threshold (active/resting); **Item25:** Number of MEP measures made; **Item26:** Method for determining MEP size during analysis.

Table 3: Summary of studies: populations, interventions, outcomes and results.

Authors	N	Age (years) (mean ±SD)	Mean time poststroke (mean ±SD)	Intervention		Key outcomes	Results
				Experimental	Control		
Calabrò [40]	EG= 20 CG= 20	EG=69±4 CG=67±6	EG=10±3 mths CG=11±3 mths	Exoskeleton (Ekso) training	Conventional overground gait training	MEP amplitudes in HA in both sides. Stim intensity: N/S	In both groups: ↑ MEP amplitude on the paretic side. Greater change in EG . ↓ MEP amplitude in non-paretic side in EG .
				40 sessions: 8wks - 5x/wk/			
Chang [49]	EG= 12	EG=59.9±10.2	EG=16.0±6.2 days	Overground gait training including postural control, motor function, and movement patterns.	None	MEP amplitudes and latency in TA in affected side at rest. Stim intensity: 100% MSO	↑ MEP amplitude and ↓ MEP latency after training.
				10 sessions: 2wks - 5x/wk			
Forrester [34]	EG= 3 CG= 8	EG=65.3±6.3 CG=62.2±1.7	EG=31.2±20.4 mths CG=31.2±20.4 mths	A group previously trained with treadmill received a submaximal effort (60% heart rate reserve) treadmill training.	A non trained treadmill group received a submaximal effort (60% heart rate reserve) treadmill training.	MEP amplitudes, threshold and latency in VM on both sides at rest. Stim intensity: 110% RMT	In CG: ↓ MEP latencies in the paretic and non-paretic side. No significant change in the EG . No significant difference between groups.
				72 sessions: 24 wks - 3x/wk,			
Jayaraman [42]	EG=25 CG=25	EG=59.5±9.7 CG=61.6±12.6	EG=85.2±74.4 mths CG=64.8±36.0 mths	Exoskeleton (Honda Stride Management Assist) training	Treadmill gait training + patients' goals-oriented tasks	MEP amplitudes in RF, MH and TA in both sides. Stim intensity: Recruitment curves for each muscle were obtained by collecting MEPs for a range of stimulus intensities from 80% to 140% of AMT, in increments of 10%, resulting in 7 total intensities.	In both groups: ↑ MEP amplitude of paretic RF. Greater change in EG for RF vs in CG . In CG: ↑ MEP amplitude in MH and TA.
				18 sessions: 6-8wks; 3x/wks			
Koganemaru [52]	N=11	65.7±3.6	74.4±32.3 mths	Gait training on a treadmill and FES to assist paretic ankle.	None	AMT in TA and gastrocnemius muscles in both sides. Stim intensity: N/S	No significant differences.
				12 sessions: 4wks - 3x/wk			
Krishnan [54]	N=1	52	7.0 mths	RAGT (Lokomat)	None	MEP amplitudes during gait in GM, RF, VM, MG, SOL (during stance) MH, LH, TA (during swing). Stim intensity: N/S	↓ MEP amplitude of the VM, MH and GM muscles after training.
				1 session			
Li [46]	N=13	65.8±7.2	39.5±33.7 mths	Crossover design: Phase 1 [high-intensity exercise priming (i.e., fast treadmill walking)]; Phase 2: rest	None	MEP amplitudes in extensor carpi radialis and SIC1 in both sides. Stim intensity: 120% RMT	↑ MEP post-exercise in paretic side compared to rest in paretic side.
				1 session			
Li [43]	EG=12 CG=13	EG=51.2±7.8 CG=49.6±8.4	N/A	Exoskeleton (BCI-LLRR) + routine rehabilitation	Routine rehabilitation interventions (pulsed electrical therapy, partial hemiplegia comprehensive training)	MEP amplitudes and latency in TA in both sides. Stim intensity: 90% TA muscle AMT.	In both groups: ↓ MEP latencies and ↑ MEP amplitude. Greater change in EG .
				30 sessions: around 4 wks			
Madhavan [53]	N=11	58±2.7	108.0±21.6 mths	HIIT: High intensity interval treadmill training.	None	MEP amplitudes in TA in both sides. Stim intensity: N/S	No significant differences.
				1 session			

Palmer [45]	N=20	59.5±12.0	42.0±2.05 mths	Crossover design: Phase 1 Walking with FES; Phase 2: Walking without FES.	None	MEPs amplitudes in TA and SOL in both sides. Stim intensity: N/S	↑ MEP amplitudes in the paretic SOL following gait training with FES.
				1 session/intervention - 1 wk apart			
Peurala [55]	N=1	76.0	Acute phase	Conventional gait training (standing and overground exercises)	None	RMT, MEP amplitudes and silent period in TA in both sides. Stim intensity: N/S	↓ RMT and silent period in the non-paretic side.
				15 sessions: 3wks - 5x/wk			
Poydasheva [56]	N=14	53.0 yrs [49;6];	14.2 [7;2] mths	Standard rehabilitation + rehabilitation exercises with 'Regent' soft exoskeleton complex	None	MEP amplitudes and latency in TA and map size in both sides. Stim intensity: N/S	↓ MEP latency in the affected side.
				10 sessions: 2wks - 5x/wk			
Seo [50]	N=10	62.9±8.9	152.5±122.8 mths	RAGT on a treadmill (Walkbot_S) + sham tDCS (in AH)	None	RMT, MEP amplitudes and latency in HA in both sides. Stim intensity: N/S	No significant differences.
				10 sessions: 2wks - 5x/wk			
Shahine [44]	EG=25 CG=25	EG=58.3±8.6 CG=59.7±7.4	EG=30.3±21.8 mths CG=28.4±19.8 mths	Electromechanical gait training (GT): movements of lower limb are assisted.	BWSTT: weight support with free movements of lower limb.	RMT, MEP amplitudes and latency in RF, TA, MG. Stim intensity: N/S	In both groups: ↓ RMT in RF, TA, MG; ↑ MEP amplitude in RF, TA, MG; ↓ MEP latency in RF, TA, MG. No significant differences between groups.
				48 sessions: 8wks - 6x/wk			
Wang [47]	N=12	62.9±10.9	24.0±14.0 mths	Sham rTMS (in RF of AH and UH), followed by functional task-oriented training (standing and walking)	None	MEP amplitudes and latency in RF sides at rest. Stim intensity: 110% of RMT	No significant differences.
				10 sessions: 2wks - 5x/wk			
Wang [48]	N=6	54.7±12.2	31.8±24 mths	Regular physical therapy + Sham rTMS (in TA of AH and UH), followed by treadmill training	None	MEP amplitudes in TA in both sides at rest. Stim intensity: 120% of RMT	No significant differences.
				9 sessions: 3wks - 3x/wk			
Wong [51]	N=12	57.3 [46.1, 62.8]	54.0 [24.0, 93.4] mths	Walking under 3 conditions: cognitive dual task walking, motor dual task walking, and single walking.	None	RMT, MEP amplitudes, cortical silent period duration, and SICI in the paretic TA during contraction. Stim intensity: 120% RMT	No significant differences.
				1 session of 20 min each exercise			
Yang [41]	EG _{Chro} =5 EG _{Sub} =5 CG _{Chro} =4 CG _{Sub} =4	EG _{Chro} =57.5±6.1 EG _{Sub} =56.8±1.3 CG _{Chro} =48.1±3.7 CG _{Sub} =61.8±3.8	EG _{Chro} =25.2±3.6 mths EG _{Sub} =3.0±1.0 mths CG _{Chro} =34.8±6.0 mths CG _{Sub} =3.0±1.0 mths	BWSTT + General exercise program (stretching, strengthening, endurance, overground walking training)	General exercise program (stretching, strengthening, endurance, overground walking training)	RMT and map size of HA at rest. Stim intensity: 110% of RMT	In EG: ↓ RMT in subacute patients. ↑ map size in subacute and chronic patients.
				12 sessions: 4wks - 3x/wk			
Yen [35]	EG=7 CG=7	EG=57.3±16.4 CG=56.0±12.7	EG=22.8±7.32 mths CG=22.8±7.32 mths	BWSTT + General exercise program (stretching, strengthening, endurance, overground walking training)	General exercise program (stretching, strengthening, endurance, overground walking training)	RMT, map size of TA and HA in both sides at rest. Stim intensity: 110% of RMT	In EG: ↓ RMT for TA in the non-paretic side. ↑ map size for TA in both sides. ↑ map size of AH in the paretic side.
				12 sessions: 3x/wk of BWSTT; 2 to 5x/wk of general exercise.			

Abbreviations: mths: months; EG: Experimental group; CG: Control group; RAGT: Robot-assisted gait training; BCI-LLRR: brain-computer interface-operated lower limb rehabilitation robot; BWSTT: Body weight-supported treadmill training; FES: Functional Electrical Stimulation; HA: hallux abductor; VM: vastus medialis, RF: rectus femoris, MH: medial hamstrings, LH: lateral hamstrings, TA: anterior tibialis, MG: medial gastrocnemius, SOL: soleus, GM: gluteus medius; MEP: Motor evoked potential; RMT: resting motor threshold; PS: paretic side; NPS: non-paretic side.

243 **Discussion**

244 This review is a first step towards summarize how responses to a single or multiple sessions of
245 gait-specific training can modulate corticospinal excitability in stroke survivors. In general, gait-
246 specific training may enhance corticospinal excitability in stroke survivors. However, given the
247 moderate number of RCT and crossover studies and the overall methodological disparity of
248 included studies (PEDro=1-8), further clinical trials should aim for higher quality designs to better
249 understand the corticospinal responses to gait-specific training.

250 *Effect of gait-specific training on corticospinal excitability*

251 An effective rehabilitation intervention can modulate the way the brain controls movement [57].
252 Previous studies showed a remapping of movement representations in M1 in animals after effective
253 rehabilitative training of hand movement after a brain injury [58,59]. Reorganization of
254 corticospinal actions by gait-specific training in individuals with neurologic diseases has been
255 shown in previous studies [58,60]. In this systematic review, we focused on the effect of gait-
256 specific training on corticospinal excitability in stroke survivors on TMS-related outcomes. Most
257 of the included studies (16/19) targeted MEP amplitude, which is an indicator of corticospinal
258 excitation [6]. Among these studies, seven studies showed a significant increase in MEP amplitudes
259 after different modalities of gait-specific training (*i.e.*, robotic training [40,42–44], treadmill
260 training [46], overground training [49] and FES combined to overground training [12]).
261 Furthermore, the MEP increases after training have been observed in RF [42,44], TA [43,44,46],
262 SOL [45], MG [44], HA [40] and extensor carpi radialis [46] muscles. However, it is important to
263 mention that eight studies did not report significant change [34,47,48,50,51,53,55,56] and one
264 study [54] showed a decrease in MEP amplitudes after gait-specific training. These studies were
265 mostly of low and moderate methodological quality and performed in participants at the chronic
266 stage. Finally, changes in MEP amplitude have been often investigated as it is relatively easy to
267 quantify. However, other TMS variables might offer a better reliability, such as MT and latency
268 [61].

269 Lower MTs are associated with increased M1 excitability [62]. Interventions such as motor skill
270 training has been shown to reduce MT in humans [63]. In the present review, several clinical trials
271 reported a reduced MT after gait-specific training (*e.g.*, robotic training [44] or BWSTT [35,41,44])

272 in stroke survivors. An important finding was also the reduction in MEP latency after task-specific
273 gait training [34,43,44,49,56]. This variable appears to be an indicator of lower limb impairment
274 and walking limitations [64]. In two RCTs, the authors reported an increase in map size after
275 BWSTT [35,41]. This allows us to conclude that BWSTT may enlarge the cortical motor
276 representation of TA and HA muscles. Furthermore, a case study [55] showed a decrease in the
277 cortical silent period after 12-session of overground training, while the other [51] did not observe
278 any change after 1-training session in a group of 12 participants. Given the sample size and
279 methodological quality of these studies, it is difficult to draw conclusions on this variable. In
280 conclusion, results derived from several studies on the effect of gait-specific training suggest a
281 positive effect on corticospinal excitability in stroke survivors. However, the lack of consistency
282 in the results, the methodological disparity of included studies (*e.g.*, differences assessed muscles,
283 intervention durations, *etc*) and methodological shortcomings in the TMS use should be considered.

284 It is important to emphasize that some studies included in this review [47,48,50–52,54] did not
285 show a significant increase in corticospinal excitability after gait-specific training in stroke
286 survivors. The methodological shortcomings in the use of TMS could explain the disparity in the
287 results of corticospinal excitability [65]. For example, the hot spot is not always well defined and
288 is sometimes optimized for one muscle while the study evaluates several muscles. The lack of
289 significant post-training change may also be due to the protocols of these studies which are based
290 on a low training volume (*e.g.*, 1-12 sessions) [66]. It is possible that an initial increase in
291 corticospinal excitability may still increase with several days and weeks of training but will
292 eventually stagnate and decrease as training progresses without additional challenge [67].
293 Evidences suggested that the efficacy of post-stroke motor rehabilitation is related to the degree to
294 which the neuromuscular system is challenged by repetitive voluntary movement [68,69]. A single
295 gait-specific training session performed was not sufficient to induce short-term effects on
296 corticospinal excitability parameters [51,53,54] in stroke survivors, except for MEP amplitudes
297 [45,46]. One important methodological factor to consider is that in these studies, measurements
298 were taken right after the training session, while they were typically taken on a different day in
299 studies with multiple sessions. Results of studies using a single session might therefore be impacted
300 by factors such as muscle pre-activation or muscle fatigue. Overall, training parameters (*e.g.*,
301 intensity, session duration, frequency) need to be decided in an objective manner [70].

302 *Clinical recommendations*

303 Despite the methodological disparity of the included studies, some clinical recommendations can
304 be derived from this review. Mostly, studies showed changes in corticospinal excitability after high
305 training volume (≥ 12 sessions) of gait-specific training in stroke survivors. This observation is
306 consistent with the previous recommendations [66,71] that higher training intensities and durations
307 may promote brain plasticity. However, the heterogeneity of samples and the variability of training
308 modalities, frequencies, durations, and intensity complicates the generation of clear
309 recommendation for optimal gait training parameters that enhance corticospinal excitability after
310 stroke. Furthermore, only one study [41] with a small sample size investigated the effect of gait-
311 specific training on corticospinal excitability in relation to stroke duration, the authors observed a
312 greater increase in corticospinal excitability in subacute group than the chronic group after
313 BWSTT. In the other hand, the studies [47,48,50–53] that did not report significant changes were
314 those targeting individuals in chronic phase. This observation supports the recommendations to
315 start rehabilitation as soon as possible after a stroke [72].

316 Finally, TMS is a valid tool to evaluate the corticospinal excitability, but it is a technique that
317 presents intra-subject variability and there are few studies on the lower limbs and even less during
318 walking, it is therefore important to be more rigorous in its use, in particular by using TMS-specific
319 components checklist [39]. In our review, we found that the results of the PEDro evaluation did
320 not match the Chipchase checklist. Thus, studies with a high PEDro rating score are not necessarily
321 of good quality from TMS methodology perspective. In conclusion, clinical trials with better
322 methodological quality are needed to better understand the corticospinal responses to gait-specific
323 training.

324 *Limitations*

325 Some limitations in this review must be acknowledged. First, we reported only TMS outcomes to
326 understand the effect of gait-specific training on corticospinal excitability, while other variables
327 such as EMG-EMG or EEG-EMG coherence might also offer some relevant insight [73]. This
328 choice was made to limit the heterogeneity of the results and allow methodological comparisons
329 across studies. Second, the included studies were diverse regarding the population of patients with
330 stroke, especially regarding the wide variation in time since stroke. Third, another limitation of this

331 review concerns restrictions of publication language and type of publication; therefore, a
332 publication bias might be present.

333 **Conclusion**

334 This review is a first step towards understanding how M1 and corticospinal pathway respond to a
335 single or multiple sessions of gait-specific training. Overall, the results suggest that multiple gait-
336 specific training modalities can drive neuroplastic adaptation among individuals' post-stroke even
337 in a chronic phase of recovery. Future studies should aim for higher-quality designs and better TMS
338 methodology so that clear recommendations can emerge and be applied in stroke rehabilitation.

339 **Authors' contributions**

340 **YC** developed the search strategy and methodology for this review, which have been validated by
341 a science librarian and **CM**. **YC** and **AT** screened the search hits for eligibility and rated the quality
342 of the included studies. **YC** and **MS** extracted and synthesized the relevant data. **YC** wrote the first
343 draft of the manuscript. **CM**, **AKB** and **FB** performed a major revision of the manuscript. All
344 authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

345 **Acknowledgments**

346 Y.C. receives a fellowship from Fonds de recherche du Québec—Santé (FRQS). M.S. and A.T. are
347 scholars from Centre interdisciplinaire de recherche en réadaptation et intégration sociale (Cirris).
348 C.M. is Emerita Research Scholar of FRQS and the Laval University Cerebral Palsy Research
349 Chair. The authors thank Martine Gagnon (a science librarian at Laval University) for her guidance
350 and advice during the implementation of the research strategy.

351 **Conflicts of Interest**

352 The authors declare that they have no competing interests and there are no competing financial
353 interests to declare in relation to this manuscript.

354

355 REFERENCES

- 356 [1] V.L. Feigin, M. Brainin, B. Norrving, S. Martins, R.L. Sacco, W. Hacke, M. Fisher, J. Pandian, P.
357 Lindsay, World Stroke Organization (WSO): Global Stroke Fact Sheet 2022, *Int. J. Stroke Off. J.*
358 *Int. Stroke Soc.* 17 (2022) 18–29. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17474930211065917>.
- 359 [2] K. Strong, C. Mathers, R. Bonita, Preventing stroke: saving lives around the world, *Lancet Neurol.* 6
360 (2007) 182–187. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422\(07\)70031-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422(07)70031-5).
- 361 [3] Y. Miyawaki, T. Otani, S. Morioka, Agency judgments in post-stroke patients with sensorimotor
362 deficits, *PLOS ONE.* 15 (2020) e0230603. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0230603>.
- 363 [4] S.S. Kessner, E. Schlemm, B. Cheng, U. Bingel, J. Fiehler, C. Gerloff, G. Thomalla, Somatosensory
364 Deficits After Ischemic Stroke, *Stroke.* 50 (2019) 1116–1123.
365 <https://doi.org/10.1161/STROKEAHA.118.023750>.
- 366 [5] S. Li, G.E. Francisco, P. Zhou, Post-stroke Hemiplegic Gait: New Perspective and Insights, *Front.*
367 *Physiol.* 9 (2018) 1021. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fphys.2018.01021>.
- 368 [6] D. Barthélemy, H. Knudsen, M. Willerslev-Olsen, H. Lundell, J.B. Nielsen, F. Biering-Sørensen,
369 Functional implications of corticospinal tract impairment on gait after spinal cord injury, *Spinal*
370 *Cord.* 51 (2013) 852–856. <https://doi.org/10.1038/sc.2013.84>.
- 371 [7] D. Barthélemy, M.J. Grey, J.B. Nielsen, L. Bouyer, Involvement of the corticospinal tract in the
372 control of human gait, *Prog. Brain Res.* 192 (2011) 181–197. [https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-444-](https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-444-53355-5.00012-9)
373 [53355-5.00012-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-444-53355-5.00012-9).
- 374 [8] B.T. Cleland, E. Sisel, S. Madhavan, Motor evoked potential latency and duration from tibialis
375 anterior in individuals with chronic stroke, *Exp. Brain Res.* 239 (2021) 2251–2260.
376 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-021-06144-2>.
- 377 [9] J. Veldema, D.A. Nowak, A. Gharabaghi, Resting motor threshold in the course of hand motor
378 recovery after stroke: a systematic review, *J. NeuroEngineering Rehabil.* 18 (2021) 158.
379 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12984-021-00947-8>.
- 380 [10] J.P. Ahonen, M. Jehkonen, P. Dastidar, G. Molnár, V. Häkkinen, Cortical silent period evoked by
381 transcranial magnetic stimulation in ischemic stroke, *Electroencephalogr. Clin. Neurophysiol.* 109
382 (1998) 224–229. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0924-980x\(98\)00014-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0924-980x(98)00014-9).
- 383 [11] P.W. Duncan, Stroke disability, *Phys. Ther.* 74 (1994) 399–407.
384 <https://doi.org/10.1093/ptj/74.5.399>.
- 385 [12] J.A. Palmer, A.R. Needle, R.T. Pohlig, S.A. Binder-Macleod, Atypical cortical drive during
386 activation of the paretic and nonparetic tibialis anterior is related to gait deficits in chronic stroke,
387 *Clin. Neurophysiol. Off. J. Int. Fed. Clin. Neurophysiol.* 127 (2016) 716–723.
388 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2015.06.013>.
- 389 [13] Y. Cherni, L. Bouyer, F. Bretheau, C. Mercier, Effect of a complex walking task on corticospinal
390 excitability and muscle activity in individuals with cerebral palsy: A multiple-case study, *Gait*
391 *Posture.* 97 (2022) S324–S325. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2022.07.192>.
- 392 [14] R. Meijer, M. Plotnik, E.G. Zwaafink, R.C. van Lummel, E. Ainsworth, J.D. Martina, J.M.
393 Hausdorff, Markedly impaired bilateral coordination of gait in post-stroke patients: Is this deficit
394 distinct from asymmetry? A cohort study, *J. NeuroEngineering Rehabil.* 8 (2011) 23.
395 <https://doi.org/10.1186/1743-0003-8-23>.
- 396 [15] I. Jonkers, S. Delp, C. Patten, Capacity to increase walking speed is limited by impaired hip and
397 ankle power generation in lower functioning persons post-stroke, *Gait Posture.* 29 (2009) 129–137.
398 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2008.07.010>.
- 399 [16] W.E. Wei, D.A. De Silva, H.M. Chang, J. Yao, D.B. Matchar, S.H.Y. Young, S.J. See, G.H. Lim,
400 T.H. Wong, N. Venketasubramanian, Post-stroke patients with moderate function have the greatest
401 risk of falls: a National Cohort Study, *BMC Geriatr.* 19 (2019) 373. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-019-1377-7)
402 [019-1377-7](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-019-1377-7).

- 403 [17] P.S. Pohl, P.W. Duncan, S. Perera, W. Liu, S.M. Lai, S. Studenski, J. Long, Influence of stroke-
404 related impairments on performance in 6-minute walk test, *J. Rehabil. Res. Dev.* 39 (2002) 439–444.
- 405 [18] K.M. Michael, J.K. Allen, R.F. Macko, Reduced ambulatory activity after stroke: the role of
406 balance, gait, and cardiovascular fitness, *Arch. Phys. Med. Rehabil.* 86 (2005) 1552–1556.
407 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2004.12.026>.
- 408 [19] J.C. Wall, A. Ashburn, Assessment of gait disability in hemiplegics. *Hemiplegic gait*, *Scand. J.*
409 *Rehabil. Med.* 11 (1979) 95–103.
- 410 [20] R.W. Bohannon, K. Kloter, J. Cooper, Recovery and outcome of patients with stroke treated in an
411 acute care hospital, *J. Stroke Cerebrovasc. Dis.* 1 (1991) 190–195. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1052-3057\(10\)80016-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1052-3057(10)80016-3).
- 412 [21] R.W. Bohannon, M.G. Horton, J.B. Wikholm, Importance of four variables of walking to patients
413 with stroke, *Int. J. Rehabil. Res. Int. Z. Rehabil. Rev. Int. Rech. Readaptation.* 14 (1991) 246–250.
414 <https://doi.org/10.1097/00004356-199109000-00010>.
- 415 [22] I. Park, Y. Lee, B. Moon, S. Sim, A Comparison of the Effects of Overground Gait Training and
416 Treadmill Gait Training According to Stroke Patients' Gait Velocity, *J. Phys. Ther. Sci.* 25 (2013)
417 379–382. <https://doi.org/10.1589/jpts.25.379>.
- 418 [23] J.C. Polese, L. Ada, C.M. Dean, L.R. Nascimento, L.F. Teixeira-Salmela, Treadmill training is
419 effective for ambulatory adults with stroke: a systematic review, *J. Physiother.* 59 (2013) 73–80.
420 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1836-9553\(13\)70159-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1836-9553(13)70159-0).
- 421 [24] Y. Cherni, L. Gagné-Pelletier, L. Bouyer, C. Mercier, Lower-Body Positive Pressure Treadmill
422 Training for Pediatric Gait Disorders: A Scoping Review, *Appl. Sci.* 12 (2022) 323.
423 <https://doi.org/10.3390/app12010323>.
- 424 [25] Y. Cherni, L. Ballaz, J. Lemaire, F. Dal Maso, M. Begon, Effect of Low Dose Robotic-Gait Training
425 on Walking Capacity in Children and Adolescents with Cerebral Palsy, *Neurophysiol Clin Clin*
426 *Neurophysiol.* (2020).
- 427 [26] Y. Cherni, C. Ziane, A Narrative Review on Robotic-Assisted Gait Training in Children and
428 Adolescents with Cerebral Palsy: Training Parameters, Choice of Settings, and Perspectives,
429 *Disabilities.* 2 (2022) 293–303. <https://doi.org/10.3390/disabilities2020021>.
- 430 [27] K.Y. Nam, H.J. Kim, B.S. Kwon, J.-W. Park, H.J. Lee, A. Yoo, Robot-assisted gait training
431 (Lokomat) improves walking function and activity in people with spinal cord injury: a systematic
432 review, *J. Neuroengineering Rehabil.* 14 (2017) 24. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12984-017-0232-3>.
- 433 [28] N.G. Moreau, A.W. Bodkin, K. Bjornson, A. Hobbs, M. Soileau, K. Lahasky, Effectiveness of
434 Rehabilitation Interventions to Improve Gait Speed in Children With Cerebral Palsy: Systematic
435 Review and Meta-analysis, *Phys. Ther.* (2016). <https://doi.org/10.2522/ptj.20150401>.
- 436 [29] C. Enzinger, H. Dawes, H. Johansen-Berg, D. Wade, M. Bogdanovic, J. Collett, C. Guy, U. Kischka,
437 S. Ropele, F. Fazekas, P.M. Matthews, Brain activity changes associated with treadmill training after
438 stroke, *Stroke.* 40 (2009) 2460–2467. <https://doi.org/10.1161/STROKEAHA.109.550053>.
- 439 [30] A.R. Luft, R.F. Macko, L.W. Forrester, F. Villagra, F. Ivey, J.D. Sorkin, J. Whitall, S. McCombe-
440 Waller, L. Katznel, A.P. Goldberg, D.F. Hanley, Treadmill exercise activates subcortical neural
441 networks and improves walking after stroke: a randomized controlled trial, *Stroke.* 39 (2008) 3341–
442 3350. <https://doi.org/10.1161/STROKEAHA.108.527531>.
- 443 [31] T.A. Jones, Motor compensation and its effects on neural reorganization after stroke, *Nat. Rev.*
444 *Neurosci.* 18 (2017) 267–280. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn.2017.26>.
- 445 [32] R.J. Nudo, Postinfarct cortical plasticity and behavioral recovery, *Stroke.* 38 (2007) 840–845.
446 <https://doi.org/10.1161/01.STR.0000247943.12887.d2>.
- 447 [33] J.A. Kleim, T.M. Hogg, P.M. VandenBerg, N.R. Cooper, R. Bruneau, M. Remple, Cortical
448 synaptogenesis and motor map reorganization occur during late, but not early, phase of motor skill
449 learning, *J. Neurosci. Off. J. Soc. Neurosci.* 24 (2004) 628–633.
450 <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3440-03.2004>.
- 451

- 452 [34] L.W. Forrester, D.F. Hanley, R.F. Macko, Effects of treadmill exercise on transcranial magnetic
453 stimulation-induced excitability to quadriceps after stroke, *Arch. Phys. Med. Rehabil.* 87 (2006)
454 229–234. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2005.10.016>.
- 455 [35] C.-L. Yen, R.-Y. Wang, K.-K. Liao, C.-C. Huang, Y.-R. Yang, Gait training induced change in
456 corticomotor excitability in patients with chronic stroke, *Neurorehabil. Neural Repair.* 22 (2008) 22–
457 30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1545968307301875>.
- 458 [36] D. Moher, A. Liberati, J. Tetzlaff, D.G. Altman, Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews
459 and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement, *BMJ.* 339 (2009) b2535.
460 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.b2535>.
- 461 [37] C.G. Maher, C. Sherrington, R.D. Herbert, A.M. Moseley, M. Elkins, Reliability of the PEDro scale
462 for rating quality of randomized controlled trials, *Phys. Ther.* 83 (2003) 713–721.
- 463 [38] A.G. Cashin, J.H. McAuley, Clinimetrics: Physiotherapy Evidence Database (PEDro) Scale, *J.*
464 *Physiother.* 66 (2020) 59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jphys.2019.08.005>.
- 465 [39] L. Chipchase, S. Schabrun, L. Cohen, P. Hodges, M. Ridding, J. Rothwell, J. Taylor, U. Ziemann, A
466 checklist for assessing the methodological quality of studies using transcranial magnetic stimulation
467 to study the motor system: an international consensus study, *Clin. Neurophysiol. Off. J. Int. Fed.*
468 *Clin. Neurophysiol.* 123 (2012) 1698–1704. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2012.05.003>.
- 469 [40] R.S. Calabrò, A. Naro, M. Russo, P. Bramanti, L. Carioti, T. Balletta, A. Buda, A. Manuli, S. Filoni,
470 A. Bramanti, Shaping neuroplasticity by using powered exoskeletons in patients with stroke: a
471 randomized clinical trial, *J. NeuroEngineering Rehabil.* 15 (2018) 35.
472 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12984-018-0377-8>.
- 473 [41] Y.-R. Yang, I.-H. Chen, K.-K. Liao, C.-C. Huang, R.-Y. Wang, Cortical reorganization induced by
474 body weight-supported treadmill training in patients with hemiparesis of different stroke durations,
475 *Arch. Phys. Med. Rehabil.* 91 (2010) 513–518. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2009.11.021>.
- 476 [42] A. Jayaraman, M.K. O'Brien, S. Madhavan, C.K. Mummidisetty, H.R. Roth, K. Hohl, A. Tapp, K.
477 Brennan, M. Kocherginsky, K.J. Williams, H. Takahashi, W.Z. Rymer, Stride management assist
478 exoskeleton vs functional gait training in stroke: A randomized trial, *Neurology.* 92 (2019) e263–
479 e273. <https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0000000000006782>.
- 480 [43] C. Li, J. Wei, X. Huang, Q. Duan, T. Zhang, Effects of a Brain-Computer Interface-Operated Lower
481 Limb Rehabilitation Robot on Motor Function Recovery in Patients with Stroke, *J. Healthc. Eng.*
482 2021 (2021) 4710044. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/4710044>.
- 483 [44] E.M. Shahine, T.S. Shafshak, Central neuroplasticity and lower limbs functional outcome following
484 repetitive locomotor training in stroke patients, *Egypt. Rheumatol. Rehabil.* 41 (2014) 85–91.
485 <https://doi.org/10.4103/1110-161X.140520>.
- 486 [45] J.A. Palmer, H. Hsiao, T. Wright, S.A. Binder-Macleod, Single Session of Functional Electrical
487 Stimulation-Assisted Walking Produces Corticomotor Symmetry Changes Related to Changes in
488 Poststroke Walking Mechanics, *Phys. Ther.* 97 (2017) 550–560. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ptj/pzx008>.
- 489 [46] X. Li, C.C. Charalambous, D.S. Reisman, S.M. Morton, A short bout of high-intensity exercise
490 alters ipsilesional motor cortical excitability post-stroke, *Top. Stroke Rehabil.* 26 (2019) 405–411.
491 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10749357.2019.1623458>.
- 492 [47] R.-Y. Wang, H.-Y. Tseng, K.-K. Liao, C.-J. Wang, K.-L. Lai, Y.-R. Yang, rTMS combined with
493 task-oriented training to improve symmetry of interhemispheric corticomotor excitability and gait
494 performance after stroke: a randomized trial, *Neurorehabil. Neural Repair.* 26 (2012) 222–230.
495 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1545968311423265>.
- 496 [48] R.-Y. Wang, F.-Y. Wang, S.-F. Huang, Y.-R. Yang, High-frequency repetitive transcranial magnetic
497 stimulation enhanced treadmill training effects on gait performance in individuals with chronic
498 stroke: A double-blinded randomized controlled pilot trial, *Gait Posture.* 68 (2019) 382–387.
499 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2018.12.023>.
- 500 [49] M.C. Chang, D.Y. Kim, D.H. Park, Enhancement of Cortical Excitability and Lower Limb Motor
501 Function in Patients With Stroke by Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation, *Brain Stimulat.* 8
502 (2015) 561–566. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2015.01.411>.

- 503 [50] H.G. Seo, W.H. Lee, S.H. Lee, Y. Yi, K.D. Kim, B.-M. Oh, Robotic-assisted gait training combined
504 with transcranial direct current stimulation in chronic stroke patients: A pilot double-blind,
505 randomized controlled trial, *Restor. Neurol. Neurosci.* 35 (2017) 527–536.
506 <https://doi.org/10.3233/RNN-170745>.
- 507 [51] P.-L. Wong, Y.-R. Yang, S.-C. Tang, S.-F. Huang, R.-Y. Wang, Comparing different montages of
508 transcranial direct current stimulation on dual-task walking and cortical activity in chronic stroke:
509 double-blinded randomized controlled trial, *BMC Neurol.* 22 (2022) 119.
510 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12883-022-02644-y>.
- 511 [52] S. Koganemaru, R. Kitatani, A. Fukushima-Maeda, Y. Mikami, Y. Okita, M. Matsubashi, K. Ohata,
512 K. Kansaku, T. Mima, Gait-Synchronized Rhythmic Brain Stimulation Improves Poststroke Gait
513 Disturbance: A Pilot Study, *Stroke.* 50 (2019) 3205–3212.
514 <https://doi.org/10.1161/STROKEAHA.119.025354>.
- 515 [53] S. Madhavan, J.W. Stinear, N. Kanekar, Effects of a Single Session of High Intensity Interval
516 Treadmill Training on Corticomotor Excitability following Stroke: Implications for Therapy, *Neural
517 Plast.* 2016 (2016) 1686414. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2016/1686414>.
- 518 [54] C. Krishnan, R. Ranganathan, S.S. Kantak, Y.Y. Dhaher, W.Z. Rymer, Active robotic training
519 improves locomotor function in a stroke survivor, *J. NeuroEngineering Rehabil.* 9 (2012) 57.
520 <https://doi.org/10.1186/1743-0003-9-57>.
- 521 [55] S.H. Peurala, I.M. Tarkka, M. Juhakoski, M. Könönen, J. Karhu, P. Jäkälä, R. Vanninen, J. Sivenius,
522 Restoration of normal cortical excitability and gait ability in acute stroke after intensive
523 rehabilitation, *Cerebrovasc. Dis. Basel Switz.* 26 (2008) 208–209.
524 <https://doi.org/10.1159/000145330>.
- 525 [56] A.G. Poydasheva, I.A. Saenko, A.V. Chervyakov, E.A. Zmeykina, R.H. Lukmanov, L.A.
526 Chernikova, N.A. Suponeva, M.A. Piradov, I.B. Kozlovskaya, [Evaluation of changes in the cortical
527 gait control in post-stroke patients induced by the use of the “Regent” soft exoskeleton complex
528 (SEC) by navigated transcranial magnetic stimulation], *Fiziol. Cheloveka.* 42 (2016) 25–31.
- 529 [57] A. Keci, K. Tani, J. Xhema, Role of Rehabilitation in Neural Plasticity, *Open Access Maced. J.
530 Med. Sci.* 7 (2019) 1540–1547. <https://doi.org/10.3889/oamjms.2019.295>.
- 531 [58] R.J. Nudo, B.M. Wise, F. SiFuentes, G.W. Milliken, Neural substrates for the effects of
532 rehabilitative training on motor recovery after ischemic infarct, *Science.* 272 (1996) 1791–1794.
533 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.272.5269.1791>.
- 534 [59] R.J. Nudo, G.W. Milliken, Reorganization of movement representations in primary motor cortex
535 following focal ischemic infarcts in adult squirrel monkeys, *J. Neurophysiol.* 75 (1996) 2144–2149.
536 <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.1996.75.5.2144>.
- 537 [60] B. Landsmann, D. Pinter, E. Pirker, G. Pichler, W. Schippinger, E.M. Weiss, G. Mathie, T.
538 Gattringer, F. Fazekas, C. Enzinger, An exploratory intervention study suggests clinical benefits of
539 training in chronic stroke to be paralleled by changes in brain activity using repeated fMRI, *Clin.
540 Interv. Aging.* 11 (2016) 97–103. <https://doi.org/10.2147/CIA.S95632>.
- 541 [61] B. Su, Y. Jia, L. Zhang, D. Li, Q. Shen, C. Wang, Y. Chen, F. Gao, J. Wei, G. Huang, H. Liu, L.
542 Wang, Reliability of TMS measurements using conventional hand-hold method with different
543 numbers of stimuli for tibialis anterior muscle in healthy adults, *Front. Neural Circuits.* 16 (2022).
544 <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fncir.2022.986669> (accessed October 21, 2022).
- 545 [62] P.M. Rossini, A.T. Barker, A. Berardelli, M.D. Caramia, G. Caruso, R.Q. Cracco, M.R. Dimitrijević,
546 M. Hallett, Y. Katayama, C.H. Lüking, Non-invasive electrical and magnetic stimulation of the
547 brain, spinal cord and roots: basic principles and procedures for routine clinical application. Report
548 of an IFCN committee, *Electroencephalogr. Clin. Neurophysiol.* 91 (1994) 79–92.
549 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0013-4694\(94\)90029-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0013-4694(94)90029-9).
- 550 [63] A. Pascual-Leone, D. Nguyet, L.G. Cohen, J.P. Brasil-Neto, A. Cammarota, M. Hallett, Modulation
551 of muscle responses evoked by transcranial magnetic stimulation during the acquisition of new fine
552 motor skills, *J. Neurophysiol.* 74 (1995) 1037–1045. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.1995.74.3.1037>.

- 553 [64] H.T. Peters, K. Dunning, S. Belagaje, B.M. Kissela, J. Ying, J. Laine, S.J. Page, Navigated
554 Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation: A Biologically Based Assay of Lower Extremity Impairment
555 and Gait Velocity, *Neural Plast.* 2017 (2017) 6971206. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2017/6971206>.
556 [65] T.M. Kesar, J.W. Stinear, S.L. Wolf, The use of transcranial magnetic stimulation to evaluate
557 cortical excitability of lower limb musculature: Challenges and opportunities, *Restor. Neurol.*
558 *Neurosci.* 36 (2018) 333–348. <https://doi.org/10.3233/RNN-170801>.
559 [66] J.A. Kleim, T.A. Jones, Principles of experience-dependent neural plasticity: implications for
560 rehabilitation after brain damage, *J. Speech Lang. Hear. Res. JSLHR.* 51 (2008) S225-239.
561 [https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388\(2008/018\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2008/018)).
562 [67] J.L. Jensen, P.C.D. Marstrand, J.B. Nielsen, Motor skill training and strength training are associated
563 with different plastic changes in the central nervous system, *J. Appl. Physiol.* 99 (2005) 1558–1568.
564 <https://doi.org/10.1152/jappphysiol.01408.2004>.
565 [68] H. Woldag, H. Hummelsheim, Evidence-based physiotherapeutic concepts for improving arm and
566 hand function in stroke patients: a review, *J. Neurol.* 249 (2002) 518–528.
567 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s004150200058>.
568 [69] S. Barreca, S.L. Wolf, S. Fasoli, R. Bohannon, Treatment interventions for the paretic upper limb of
569 stroke survivors: a critical review, *Neurorehabil. Neural Repair.* 17 (2003) 220–226.
570 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0888439003259415>.
571 [70] G. Kwakkel, Impact of intensity of practice after stroke: issues for consideration, *Disabil. Rehabil.*
572 28 (2006) 823–830. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09638280500534861>.
573 [71] K.R. Lohse, C.E. Lang, L.A. Boyd, Is more better? Using metadata to explore dose-response
574 relationships in stroke rehabilitation, *Stroke.* 45 (2014) 2053–2058.
575 <https://doi.org/10.1161/STROKEAHA.114.004695>.
576 [72] J. Bernhardt, B. Indredavik, P. Langhorne, When Should Rehabilitation Begin after Stroke?, *Int. J.*
577 *Stroke.* 8 (2013) 5–7. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijvs.12020>.
578 [73] J. Liu, Y. Sheng, H. Liu, Corticomuscular Coherence and Its Applications: A Review, *Front. Hum.*
579 *Neurosci.* 13 (2019). <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fnhum.2019.00100> (accessed
580 October 21, 2022).

581

582