medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.14.22283438; this version posted August 8, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Title:

Fastest may not maximize gait quality: differential and individual-specific immediate effects of gait speed on biomechanical variables post-stroke

Authors:

Michael C. Rosenberg[1], Hannah Christianson[2], Justin Liu[2], Vincent Santucci[2], Payton Sims[2], Alex Schilder[2], Laura Zajac-Cox[2], Taniel S. Winner[1], Lena H. Ting[1], Trisha M. Kesar[2,3]

[1]Department of Biomedical Engineering, Emory University & Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA

[2]Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, Emory University School of Medicine, Atlanta, GA, USA

[3]Center for Physical Therapy and Movement Science, Emory University, Atlanta, GA

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.14.22283438; this version posted August 8, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

ABSTRACT

A common perspective in post-stroke gait training is that walking at the fastest safe speed maximizes the quality of gait biomechanics, but effects on compensatory biomechanics and inter-limb asymmetry have not been widely characterized. It is unclear whether walking at the fastest speed maximizes the quality of (*i.e.*, optimizes) post-stroke biomechanics across variables, individuals, and walking function levels. In low- (n=9) and high-functioning (n=9) stroke survivors walking at six individualized speeds, we determined if walking at the fastest speed optimized 16 biomechanical variables. Across participants, 46% of magnitude and 17% of asymmetry variables were optimized at the fastest speed, but the optimized variables differed across individuals. Some inter-limb asymmetry variables sustained large biomechanical costs, (*i.e.*, biomechanical quality lost by walking at the fastest vs. the optimal speed; difference in Cohen's d=0.1-0.7). In both groups, faster speeds were associated with increased (improved) paretic-leg trailing limb angle, peak ankle moment, and peak hip and ankle power magnitudes (all $p<0.001$), but changes in inter-limb asymmetry were individual-specific. Our findings suggest that treadmill training at the fastest safe speed does not maximize gait quality across individuals or biomechanical variables. More holistic, individual-specific gait quality metrics are needed to guide gait speed optimization during rehabilitation.

KEYWORDS

Biomechanics, gait rehabilitation, walking speed, interindividual variability, motor impairments, stroke, treadmill training

INTRODUCTION

A common perspective in post-stroke gait rehabilitation is that mass stepping practice at the fastest safe speed maximizes training-induced improvements in walking function without compromising gait quality[1-3]. Clinical

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.14.22283438; this version posted August 8, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

practice guidelines support high-intensity treadmill training to improve overground walking function[4]. Treadmill training provides a safe and predictable environment in which physical therapists can modulate gait speed to promote high-quality gait biomechanics[1,2,4]. However, it remains unclear if gait training at faster speeds optimizes the biomechanical quality across all individuals, for all biomechanical variables, and for individuals with different levels of walking function. Because complex and individual-specific gait impairments post-stroke may lead to heterogeneous changes in biomechanics with walking speed, training at the fastest speed may not always maximize biomechanical gait quality[5,6]. Given the importance of gait speed in quantifying post-stroke walking function and community participation, as well as speed being a key training parameter during rehabilitation, refining our understanding of the relationships between speed and biomechanics may inform data-driven strategies to personalize training speeds to optimize (*i.e.*, maximally improve) both gait biomechanics and walking function[7-9].

Prior studies typically compared a small number of gait speeds, limiting our ability to identify sub-maximal speeds that optimize gait biomechanics post-stroke[1,3,10]. Multiple studies have reported that walking faster than the individual's self-selected (SS) gait speed improves post-stroke gait deficits, such as paretic push-off and ankle power, without increasing reliance on compensatory mechanisms or increasing inter-limb asymmetry[1,3,4,10,11]. For example, Lamontagne and Fung (2004) reported improved kinematics and muscle activity and reductions in inter-limb asymmetry for some temporal variables when walking at participants' fastest safe speed compared to the self-selected (SS) speed[1]. Similarly, Jonkers and colleagues (2009) found improvements in hip and knee power when walking at the fastest safe speed compared to the SS speed[10]. However, it is unclear whether intermediate speeds would further improve biomechanics. Tyrell and colleagues (2011) provided greater resolution into the biomechanical impacts of gait speed by evaluating changes in 8 biomechanical variables across four gait speeds in relatively high-functioning stroke survivors (speeds 0.3-1.0 m/s)[3]. However, the proportion of participants for whom the fastest speed was best was not investigated.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.14.22283438; this version posted August 8, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Evaluating a wider range of speeds and determining the proportion of participants whose biomechanics are optimized at the fastest speed will provide a refined perspective on the optimality of training at faster speeds.

An additional challenge to personalizing gait training speeds is that a single speed may optimize only a subset of biomechanical variables while increasing gait compensations and inter-limb asymmetry. The complexity of post-stroke gait dysfunction is not fully captured by singular variables; improving the quality of one variable may not correspond to improvements in the quality of other important biomechanical variables. Key biomechanical deficits such as reduced paretic push-off and reduced ankle moment and power generation during the stance phase of gait are seen in many stroke survivors and have been targeted during rehabilitation[12-14]. Further, swing-phase joint flexion deficits can increase fall risk due to poor ground clearance[15]. These deficits may be compensated for by pelvic hiking or hip circumduction during swing[5,10] or relying on the non-paretic leg to increase propulsion[12]. Different coordination strategies to increase walking speed have been observed in stroke survivors: increasing joint powers in the paretic or non-paretic leg and in either the hip or ankle[3,10,16]. As even small changes in gait biomechanics may impact gait stability, efficiency, and function, quantifying which variables are optimized at the fastest speeds is critical for optimizing post-stroke gait training speeds[17-19].

While prior studies identified a range of biomechanical variables that were optimized at the fastest speed, no study has comprehensively investigated the tradeoffs between multi-joint changes in gait biomechanics, compensations from proximal joints such as the pelvis and hip, and inter-limb asymmetry[1,3,10]. Multiple studies reported the immediate effects of speed on spatiotemporal variables, joint kinematics, moments, powers, and muscle activity in the paretic and non-paretic legs[1,3,10,11,15], but only Tyrell and colleagues (2004) tested the effects of speed on inter-limb step length asymmetry[3]. Increasing speed improved (*i.e.*, decreased) step length asymmetry, though it is unclear if the inter-limb asymmetry of kinematic or kinetic variables also improved. Jonkers and colleagues showed that improvements (*i.e.*, increases) in paretic-limb hip power at faster gait

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.14.22283438; this version posted August 8, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

speeds were accompanied by even greater increases in non-paretic hip power[10]. In this case, inter-limb asymmetry degraded (*i.e.*, increased), despite improvements in paretic hip power. Therefore, gains in the magnitude of some biomechanical variables may come at the cost of degradations in others. In this case, walking at faster speeds would incur a *biomechanical cost*—a benefit lost—compared to walking at a slower, "optimal" speed. Quantifying the biomechanical costs of walking at the fastest speed for different variables will provide a framework for researchers and clinicians to objectively weigh the tradeoffs between changes in different biomechanical variables with speed.

Changes in post-stroke gait biomechanics with speed likely depend on walking function level, often characterized by individuals' SS speeds[1,10,20]. Lower-functioning individuals are often defined as those who walk slower than speeds required for community ambulation[1,10,20]. Stroke survivors with more severe impairments may use distinct biomechanical strategies to modulate gait speed. For example, high-functioning stroke survivors exhibit changes in hip flexion and ankle plantarflexion power, while low-functioning stroke survivors struggle to modulate joint power generation at faster speeds[10]. This finding highlights the possibility that changes in biomechanics with speed depend on walking function level, and that this relationship may be variable-specific. However, prior studies have not quantified the effects of function level on gait biomechanics across more than 2 speeds[3,10,11]. Quantifying the immediate effects of speed and walking function level on changes in gait biomechanics is needed to guide personalization of speed-based gait rehabilitation.

Here, we tested the hypothesis that different post-stroke biomechanical gait variables are optimized at different gait speeds and vary across individuals and function levels. We build upon prior studies by analyzing post-stroke gait biomechanics (paretic leg kinematics and kinetics, compensations, inter-limb asymmetry) at 6 speeds, ranging from SS to the fastest safe speed, in high- (>0.4 m/s) and low-functioning ($\leq$0.4 m/s) stroke survivors. We identified gait speeds that maximized the quality of (*i.e.*, optimized) 16 biomechanical magnitude, compensatory, and inter-limb asymmetry variables for each individual and variable. To further

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.14.22283438; this version posted August 8, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

quantify the potential importance of optimizing gait speed, we characterized the biomechanical cost (*i.e.*, the potential loss of gait quality) of training at the fastest rather than the optimal gait speed for each variable. Finally, we characterized the immediate effect of speed and walking function level on changes in each of the 16 biomechanical variables. We predicted that not all paretic-leg biomechanical magnitude and inter-limb asymmetry variables' quality would be maximized at the fastest speed across individuals and function levels.

METHODS

Eighteen post-stroke individuals (6 females; 60 ± 10 years; 47 ± 52 months post-stroke; Table 1) participated in one session of treadmill-based gait analysis. Study procedures were approved by the Emory University Institutional Review Board and all participants provided written informed consent. Inclusion criteria included >6 months post-stroke, the ability to walk on a treadmill without an orthotic device for 1-minute, and the ability to communicate with investigators. Exclusion criteria included neurologic diagnosis other than stroke, hemi-neglect, orthopedic conditions limiting walking, and cerebellar dysfunction. Before gait analysis, a clinical evaluation comprising standard measures of lower limb sensorimotor impairment and function (*e.g.*, Fugl-Meyer score, Berg Balance score) was conducted by a clinician (Table 1). Study procedures were approved by and performed in accordance with guidelines set forth by the Emory University Institutional Review Board and all participants provided written informed consent.

Table 1: Participant demographics.

	Sex	Age (yrs)	Mo. Post-stroke	Paretic side	Lower-extremity Fugl-Meyer	Self-Selected speed (m/s)	Fastest speed (m/s)
ST01	M	70-80	14	R	26	0.22	0.32
ST02	M	50-60	7	L	15	0.25	0.45
ST03	F	50-60	213	R	30	0.26	0.39
ST04	M	40-50	78	R	17	0.30	0.60
ST05	M	70-80	106	R	22	0.35	0.55
ST06	F	50-60	64	L	18	0.35	0.50

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.14.22283438; this version posted August 8, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

ST07	M	50-60	46	L	23	0.37	0.47
ST08	M	50-60	75	L	14	0.38	0.53
ST09	M	70-80	8	L	22	0.40	0.70
ST10	M	60-70	14	R	32	0.42	0.60
ST11	F	50-60	32	L	27	0.43	0.52
ST12	F	70-80	24	L	26	0.45	0.70
ST13	M	30-40	35	R	20	0.45	0.80
ST14	M	50-60	15	R	23	0.55	0.80
ST15	F	60-70	65	L	20	0.60	0.85
ST16	M	50-60	27	R	27	0.70	1.15
ST17	F	60-70	19	L	25	0.75	0.95
ST18	M	50-60	6	L	26	0.90	1.20
Low-functioning*	2F	61 ± 10	68 ± 65	5L	21 ± 5	0.32 ± 0.06	0.50 ± 0.11
High-functioning*	4F	59 ± 11	26 ± 27	5L	25 ± 4	0.58 ± 0.17	0.84 ± 0.23
Overall*	6F	60 ± 10	47 ± 52	10L	23 ± 5	0.45 ± 0.18	0.67 ± 0.25

*Summary statistics show the average and standard deviation across groups and across all participants. Low- and high-functioning stroke survivors were stratified based on self-selected (SS) speed, with the low-functioning group having SS speed ≤ 0.40 m/s.

Experimental setup

Participants walked on a split-belt instrumented treadmill (Bertec Corp., Ohio, USA) to enable collection of ground reaction force (GRF) data independently for each limb. Reflective markers were attached to the trunk, pelvis, and bilateral thigh, shank, and foot segments as described by Kesar and colleagues (2010)[21]. Marker trajectories were recorded using a 7-camera motion capture system (Vicon Inc., Oxford, UK). During all walking trials, for safety, participants held onto a front handrail and wore an overhead safety harness without body-weight support. Participants were instructed to maintain a light and consistent handrail grip for all walking trials; if investigators suspected a change in handrail grip or excessive reliance on the handrail, the participant was given feedback and, if needed, the trial was restarted.

Determination of walking speeds

After a 30-60 second trial to acclimatize to the treadmill, each participant's self-selected (SS) walking speed was determined by slowly increasing the belt speed until the participant reported their comfortable walking speed. Next, the fastest safe walking speed was determined by gradually increasing the treadmill speed above their SS speed until either the participant reported the fastest speed that they could safely walk for 30 seconds,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.14.22283438; this version posted August 8, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

or the investigators deemed it unsafe to increase the speed further. Next, four intermediate speeds were computed at equal increments between the SS and fastest walking speeds, resulting in a total of six evenly distributed speeds spanning each participant's walking capacity. Data were collected during 15-second treadmill walking trials at each of the six speeds, in increasing order from the SS speed to the fastest speed. Brief 1-2 minute standing rest breaks were provided between walking trials as needed, to prevent fatigue. Based on SS speed, participants were stratified into low- (SS speed $\leq$ 0.4 m/s) and high-functioning (SS speed > 0.4 m/s) groups, similar to prior studies[1,10].

Data processing

All GRFs, joint kinematics, and joint moments and powers were processed in Visual 3D (C-Motion Inc., Maryland, USA). Before computing joint moments and powers, GRFs and joint kinematics were low-pass filtered at 30 and 6 Hz, respectively using a 4th-order Butterworth filter. At each gait speed, dependent variable magnitudes were computed for the paretic and non-paretic limbs. For each variable, the average value across all gait cycles during each trial was used for each speed.

Dependent variables

To conduct a comprehensive analysis of the immediate effects of speed on post-stroke gait biomechanics, a total of 16 dependent variables included the magnitude of paretic-leg kinematics, kinetics and gait compensations, and inter-limb asymmetries. Paretic leg magnitude variables included: Peak paretic propulsion was normalized to body mass and was calculated as the peak value of the anteriorly-directed GRF during the terminal double-support phase of the limb[22,23]. Trailing limb angle (TLA) was calculated as the maximum angle between the vertical axis of the laboratory and a line joining the greater trochanter and fifth metatarsal head marker[7,24,25]. Peak ankle moment and peak ankle power were calculated during the stance phase of gait. Peak hip power was defined as the peak hip flexor power generation power during the pre-swing and initial swing phase of gait. Peak moments and powers were normalized to body mass[10,22]. Additionally, ankle angle at initial contact (IC)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.14.22283438; this version posted August 8, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

was calculated. We included two gait compensation variables: hip circumduction and pelvic hiking of the paretic leg. Paretic leg circumduction was calculated as the maximum frontal plane deviation of the bottom heel marker during stance phase versus the subsequent swing phase. Pelvic hiking was calculated as the maximum frontal plane angle between the pelvis during a static standing calibration trial and during the swing phase of the paretic leg[3]. Inter-limb asymmetry variables included the inter-limb asymmetry of each magnitude and compensatory variable, calculated as the difference between the non-paretic and paretic limb magnitudes[26]. The dataset containing participant demographics and dependent variables used in this study can be found in *Additional file 1*.

Statistical analyses

Characterizing the immediate effects of speed on post-stroke gait biomechanics

To confirm that treadmill speed had significant effects on post-stroke gait biomechanics, we conducted repeated-measures Analyses of Variance (RM-ANOVAs; $\alpha = 0.05$) to test for immediate effects of treadmill speed on each dependent variable separately for the low- and high-functioning groups. This approach is consistent with prior literature and served as a preliminary characterization and replication of the immediate effects of speed on gait biomechanics[1,3]. For each variable, we report percent changes between the SS and fastest speeds, as well as the number of participants who exhibited changes in the same direction between the SS and fastest speeds.

Determining if faster speeds result in improved gait biomechanics across individuals

We defined the optimal speed for each biomechanical variable within each individual. Specifically, optimal speeds were defined as the speeds that either maximized a paretic-leg magnitude variable, minimized the magnitude of a paretic-leg compensation variable, or minimized a variable's inter-limb asymmetry. To determine the extent to which the fastest speeds optimized each gait variable, we computed the percentage of variables that were optimized at each speed for each individual. Percentages were computed separately for the 8

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.14.22283438; this version posted August 8, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

magnitude variables (including compensations) and 8 inter-limb asymmetry variables. If faster speeds are better for maximizing overall gait quality, then the fastest speed should optimize 100% of variables for all participants. We computed the average change in each biomechanical variable at the fastest speed relative to the SS speed as $\Delta_{fast-SS}$.

Characterizing the biomechanical cost of walking at sub-optimal speeds

For each of the dependent variables, we computed an individual-specific *biomechanical cost* (Δd) of training at the fastest rather than the optimal speed as the difference in the immediate effect (d = Cohen's d vs. the SS speed) of walking at the fastest versus the optimal speed, identified for that participant and variable[27]. If walking at the fastest speed resulted in worse biomechanical quality of a variable (*e.g.*, reduced paretic leg propulsion, increased propulsive asymmetry) compared to that at the optimal speed, then the fastest speed was considered to incur a biomechanical cost. If the optimal speed was the fastest speed for a variable and individual, the biomechanical cost would be zero. If the fastest speed maximized a variable's biomechanical quality, then the fastest and optimal speeds would be identical for that variable. We used Wilcoxon signed-rank tests to test for differences in biomechanical costs separately for magnitude and asymmetry variables.

Identifying gait biomechanics variables associated with modulation of absolute walking speed

Based on significant effects of relative speed on biomechanics in the RM-ANOVA, we used multivariate regression to characterize the effects of changes in absolute trial walking speed (*i.e.*, absolute speed for each trial relative to SS speed; henceforth *"trial speed")*, SS speed, and their interaction on changes in each biomechanical variable compared to walking at the SS speed. Our premise for this analysis is that changes in gait biomechanics depend on both absolute trial speed during each trial and baseline walking function[10,16]. The regression equation is shown in Equation (1): change in a biomechanical variable (ΔY) at each speed is estimated as a function of change in trial speed ($\Delta Speed$), SS speed ($Speed_{SS}$), their interaction ($Speed_{SS} \times \Delta Speed$), and an error term ($\epsilon$). Coefficients $\alpha, \beta,$ and γ that are significantly different from zero

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.14.22283438; this version posted August 8, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

according to Wald Tests, suggest that changes in the biomechanical variable are associated with changes in speed, SS speed, or their interaction, respectively. Because SS speed is not categorical, we report regression results using an adjusted speed as a weighted combination of trial speed, SS speed, and their interaction. We report significant effects of changes in trial speed, SS speed, and their interaction.

$$\Delta Y = \alpha \Delta Speed + \beta Speed_{SS} + \gamma (Speed_{SS} \times \Delta Speed) + \epsilon \qquad (1)$$
$$\Delta Speed = Speed - Speed_{SS}$$

When trial speed was identified as a significant predictor variable during regression, we used independent-samples t-tests to identify differences in speed-induced changes in gait biomechanics at the SS speed versus the fastest speed between the low- and high-functioning groups. When either SS speed or the interaction term was identified as a significant predictor of speed-induced changes in a biomechanical variable, we used univariate linear regression to estimate the immediate effects of walking speed on changes in the variable (vs. SS speed) separately in the low- (SS speed $\leq$ 0.4 m/s) and high-functioning groups, with 7 participants in each group[10]. All tests were conducted using MATLAB 2021b (Mathworks Ltd, Natick, USA) with an unadjusted significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$. For RM-ANOVA, paired t-test, and univariate regression analyses, we adjusted the significance level (α_{Sidak}) for multiple comparisons using Holm-Sidak stepdown corrections[28].

RESULTS

Speed altered biomechanics differentially in low- and high-functioning groups

Across the high- and low-functioning stroke groups, walking speed modulated 75% of the biomechanical magnitude and compensatory variables and 38% of the asymmetry variables across participants (Figure 1A; the direction of improvements in each biomechanical variable is denoted by a green arrow, yellow stars denote variables that were modulated by speed, see Table 2 for statistical outcomes). Paretic-limb AGRF magnitude

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.14.22283438; this version posted August 8, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

increased by 51 ± 440% (average across participants) between the SS and fastest speeds only in the high-functioning group (RM-ANOVA, $p < 0.001$; $\alpha_{sidak} = 0.006$; Table 2). Peak TLA, ankle moment, hip power, and ankle power increased by 23-174% with speed in both groups (all $p < 0.003$; $\alpha_{sidak} < 0.006$). Conversely, compensatory circumduction increased at faster speeds, indicating a detrimental effect of speed in only the high-functioning (107 ± 173%; $p < 0.002$; $\alpha_{sidak} = 0.006$; Figure 1A & B; blue bars and lines) group after correction for multiple comparisons. Pelvic hiking trended toward increases (*i.e.*, degradations) with speed in the low-functioning (-92 ± 365%; $p = 0.024$; $\alpha_{Sidak} = 0.005$) but not high-functioning group (10 ± 33%; $p = 0.536$ $\alpha_{sidak} = 0.006$). Changes in circumduction and pelvic hiking, however, were highly variable between participants.

Walking at faster speeds modulated inter-limb asymmetry differentially between groups. For example, only the low-functioning group trended towards increased peak AGRF asymmetry (125 ± 224%; $p = 0.012$; $\alpha_{Sidak} = 0.005$) with speed (Figure 1A). Speed effects on joint moment asymmetry also differed between the groups: ankle moment asymmetry increased (*i.e.*, worsened) only in the high-functioning group (50 ± 86%; $p = 0.003$; $\alpha_{sidak} = 0.006$). Ankle power asymmetry trended towards significance in both the low- (-86 ± 119%; $p = 0.006$; $\alpha_{sidak} = 0.005$) but not high-functioning ($p = 0.027$; $\alpha_{sidak} = 0.006$) groups.

However, there was substantial inter-individual variability in each group for inter-limb asymmetry variables; not all individuals followed group trends (Figure 1A & C). For example, compared to the SS speed, the fastest speed increased peak hip power asymmetry in 6 of 9 low-functioning participants and 3 of 9 high-functioning participants (Figure 1C). This contrasts with magnitude variables, in which all participants in both groups increased TLA, hip and ankle power, and ankle moments at the fast speed compared to the SS speed. Similarly, within individuals, not all asymmetry variables changed in the same direction: 49 ± 17% of each participant's asymmetry variables increased between the SS and fastest speeds. For comparison, 80 ± 12% of magnitude variables changed in the same direction.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.14.22283438; this version posted August 8, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Figure 1: Changes in biomechanical variables with speed in low- and high-functioning stroke survivors. A) Average (thick lines) and individual participants (thin lines) magnitudes (top) and inter-limb asymmetries (bottom) for biomechanical variables across the six gait speeds, ranging from the SS to fastest (Fast) speeds. Averages for low- (black) and high- (blue; SS speed > 0.4 m/s) functioning groups of participants, are shown to highlight potential group differences in changes in biomechanics with speed. Green arrows along the vertical axis denote the direction of improved biomechanical quality for each gait variable. Stars denote variables and groups that exhibited significant effects of speed according to the RM-ANOVA after correction for multiple comparisons. B) Average (standard error of the mean; SEM) percent change in each biomechanical magnitude (top) and asymmetry (bottom) variable at the fast speed relative to the SS speed, grouped by function level. The SEM is shown for clarity and was computed with n = 9 for each group. C) The number of participants in each group (9 per group) that exhibited an increase in each variable between the SS and fastest speeds. If all participants changed a variable in the same direction, the corresponding bar would have a value of 9.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.14.22283438; this version posted August 8, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Table 2: RM-ANOVA results demonstrating within-group immediate effects of trial speed on biomechanical variables.

		Low-functioning		High-functioning	
		F	p	F	p
Magnitude variables	AGRF	3.4	0.012	19.4	<0.001*
	TLA	19.6	<0.001*	36.8	<0.001*
	Hip power	13.1	<0.001*	10.6	<0.001*
	Ankle power	19.9	<0.001*	33.7	<0.001*
	Ankle moment	28.5	<0.001*	33.9	<0.001*
	Ankle angle at IC	3.0	0.021	1.7	0.161
	Circumduction	2.5	0.043	4.6	0.002*
	Pelvic hiking	2.9	0.024	0.8	0.536
Asymmetry variables	AGRF	4.4	0.003*	1.1	0.389
	TLA	1.6	0.176	1.3	0.273
	Hip power	2.7	0.033	0.3	0.926
	Ankle power	3.9	0.006	2.9	0.027
	Ankle moment	0.1	0.989	4.5	0.003*
	Ankle angle at IC	0.6	0.718	4.2	0.004*
	Circumduction	2.4	0.056	1.7	0.155
	Pelvic hiking	2.3	0.064	1.4	0.234

AGRF = anterior ground reaction force; IC = initial contact; TLA = trailing limb angle
*Significant after Holm-Sidak stepdown correction.

The fastest walking speed did not optimize all biomechanical variables across participants

Across all participants, not all gait variables were optimized at the fastest speed. When looking at all magnitude variables, only 46% were maximized (*i.e.*, optimized) at the fastest speed, with 15% of variables maximized at the SS speed (Figure 2A, brown bars). Conversely, only 17% of inter-limb asymmetry variables were optimized at the fastest speed, whereas 31% were optimized at the SS speed (Figure 2A, cyan bars). Magnitude variables were optimized at the fastest speed in more participants than were inter-limb asymmetry variables (Figure 2B). For example, at the fastest speed, paretic-limb AGRF magnitude (*change vs. SS speed* = $\Delta_{Fast-SS}$= 0.2 ± 0.2 N/kg) was optimized in 67% of participants but AGRF asymmetry ($\Delta_{Fast-SS}$ = -0.2 ± 0.3 N/kg) was optimized in only 22% of participants. Compensatory circumduction and pelvic hiking magnitudes and asymmetries were optimized at the fastest speed for less than 28% of participants.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.14.22283438; this version posted August 8, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Figure 2: The effects of walking at the fastest speed compared to the sub-maximal speeds. A) The percentage of participants whose biomechanics were optimized across the eight magnitude (orange) and eight asymmetry (cyan) variables. If training at the fastest speed was best for all variables (gray), the percent optimized at the fastest speed would be 100%. B) The percent of participants for whom each magnitude and asymmetry variable was optimized at the fastest speed. If the fastest speed always optimized a variable, it would have a value of 100%. C) Effect sizes (Cohen's *d*) of each variable across participants for magnitude and asymmetry variables at the fastest (Fast) and optimal (Opt) speeds. Boxplots show the distribution of effect sizes across the eight biomechanical variables. Each gray dot corresponds to one variable (8 per box). Bars displaying p-values denote the probability of differences in immediate effects of training at the fastest rather than the optimal speed (Wilcoxon Signed-Rank test). The immediate effects on magnitude variables were not significant (n.s.). Effect sizes are oriented such that positive effects imply improved biomechanical quality.

When the fastest speed is not best, it can incur substantial biomechanical costs

Compared to walking at the SS speed, the fastest and optimal speeds had similar desirable immediate effects (Cohen's *d* across individuals) on magnitude variables, but the fastest speed had detrimental immediate effects on inter-limb asymmetry variables (Figure 2C; positive values indicate a desirable immediate effect). Magnitude variables were typically maximized, and thus optimal, at the fastest speed (Figure 2A), such that the median immediate effect sizes were similar at both the optimal (d = 0.7) and fastest speeds (d = 0.6; Figure 2C). Consequently, the biomechanical cost of walking at the fastest speed, rather than the optimal speed, was not significant for magnitude variables.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.14.22283438; this version posted August 8, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Across inter-limb asymmetry variables, there was a small positive (*i.e.*, desirable; decreased asymmetry) immediate effect of walking at the optimal speed versus the SS speed (median d = 0.2; Figure 2C). Conversely, when walking at the fastest speed compared to the SS speed, inter-limb asymmetry increased, resulting in a small negative effect (median d = 0.2). This difference in immediate effects of walking at the fastest, rather than the optimal, speed corresponded to a small-to-moderate median biomechanical cost for inter-limb asymmetry across variables (median Δd = 0.3, p = 0.008). The biomechanical cost of inter-limb asymmetry variables was largest in AGRF (Δd = 0.7; $\Delta_{fast-opt}$ = 0.2 N/kg), hip power (Δd = 0.6; $\Delta_{fast-opt}$ = 0.1 W/kg), and ankle power (Δd = 0.6; $\Delta_{fast-opt}$ = 0.4 W/kg; Figure 2C).

Only changes in the magnitude variables were explained by changes in trial speed and SS speed

Across all participants, changes in magnitude, but not compensatory or inter-limb asymmetry variables were explained by a linear combination of changes in trial speed (vs. the SS speed) and SS speed. For magnitude variables, changes in trial speed, SS speed, and their interaction explained 44-82% of the variance in changes in AGRF, TLA, ankle moment, hip power, and ankle power (Figure 3A, C & E). Changes in trial speed were positively associated with changes in TLA ($p < 0.001$, $r^2 = 0.60$), ankle power ($p < 0.001$, $r^2 = 0.82$), and ankle moment magnitudes ($p < 0.001$, $r^2 = 0.77$). Only peak ankle angle at IC exhibited a weak negative association with changes in speed ($p < 0.001$, $r^2 = 0.27$; $\alpha_{Sidak} = 0.005$). SS speed was not associated with changes in magnitude variables (all $p > 0.030$; $\alpha_{Sidak} = 0.003$). However, the interaction between changes in trial speed and SS speed was significant for changes in all magnitude variables (all $p < 0.001$; $\alpha_{Sidak} = 0.005$; Table 3). Neither compensatory circumduction nor pelvic hiking magnitudes was explained by changes in trial speed and SS speed ($r^2 < 0.05$; Figure 3E).

Changes in inter-limb asymmetry variables were not strongly associated with changes in trial speed and SS speed ($r^2 < 0.20$; Figure 3E). Our linear model failed to capture individual differences in the direction of changes in inter-limb asymmetry across participants (Figure 3B & D). For example, some participants' peak

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.14.22283438; this version posted August 8, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

AGRF asymmetry increased while others decreased at faster speeds (Figure 3B). While change in trial speed was a predictor of changes in AGRF ($p < 0.001$, $r^2 = 0.09$; $\alpha_{Sidak} = 0.005$) and ankle power ($p < 0.001$, $r^2 = 0.04$) asymmetry, the models explained less than 20% of the variance in the data (Table 3; Figure 3E).



Figure 3: Biomechanical variables regressed against a combination of SS speed, trial speed, and their interaction. A-D) Multivariate regression results showing the estimate (solid line) and 95% confidence interval (dashed lines) of each fit. Samples (gray dots) correspond to a participant and speed. The horizontal axis (*Adjusted speed*) corresponds to a weighted combination of trial speed, SS speed, and their interaction used in the multivariate regression analysis. A) AGRF magnitude. B) TLA magnitude. C) Peak hip power magnitude. D) Ankle moment asymmetry. E) Coefficient of determination (R^2) values for magnitude (orange) and asymmetry (cyan) biomechanical variables.

Table 3: Results of within-group regression and independent-samples t-tests.

		Within-group effects of trial speed on *speed-induced changes*				**Between-group effects of function level** *(Fastest – SS speed)*	
		Low-functioning		High-functioning			
		slope	p	slope	P	*d*	p
Magnitude variables	AGRF ‡	0.5 N·s/kg·m	<0.001	1.1 N·s/kg·m	<0.001	-	-
	TLA*‡	21.0 deg·sm	<0.001	16.5 deg·s.m	<0.001	0.4	0.435
	Hip power‡	0.9 J/kg·m	<0.001	1.3 J/kg·m	<0.001	-	-
	Ankle power*‡	1.9 J/kg·m	<0.001	2.4 J/kg·m	<0.001	1.0	0.042
	Ankle moment*‡	1.1 N·s/kg	<0.001	0.8 Ns/kg	<0.001	0.1	0.764
	Ankle angle at IC*‡	-8.0 deg·s/m	0.235	1.5 deg·s.m	<0.001	0.9	0.074
	Circumduction	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Pelvic hiking	-	-	-	-	-	-
A	AGRF*‡	-1.0 N·s/kg·m	<0.001	-0.5 N·s/kg·m	<0.001	2.0	0.536

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.14.22283438; this version posted August 8, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

TLA	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hip power	-	-	-		-	-
Ankle power*	-	-	-	-	0.3	0.523
Ankle moment	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ankle angle at IC	-	-	-	-	-	-
Circumduction	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pelvic hiking	-	-	-	-	-	-

Within-group effects of trial speed: Univariate linear regression slopes quantify immediate effects of changes in trial speed on changes in biomechanical variables.
Between-group effects of function level: Independent-samples t-tests test for between-group differences in changes in biomechanical variables between the SS and fastest speeds. Between-group effect sizes (*d*; Cohen's *d*) are reported.
Dashes denote variables that did not meet criteria for within- or between-group analyses following multivariate regression.
*Significant effect of trial speed on change in variable vs. SS speed (α_{Sidak} = 0.005).
†Significant effect of SS speed on change in variable vs. SS speed (α_{Sidak} = 0.003).
‡Significant effect of trial speed×SS speed on change in variable vs. SS speed (α_{Sidak} = 0.005).

Low- and high-functioning stroke survivors exhibited different changes in biomechanics with trial speed

Changes in trial speed and function level independently impacted changes in different biomechanical variables in the low- and high-functioning groups. For variables that exhibited a significant effect of change in trial speed (asterisks in Table 3), only changes in ankle power magnitude between the fastest and SS speeds approached a significant difference between the low- and high-functioning groups before correction for multiple comparisons (Cohen's *d*: $d_{\text{high-low}}$ = 1.0, p = 0.042; α_{Sidak} = 0.003; Table 3).

For variables with significant interaction effects between trial speed and SS speed (double daggers in Table 3), both groups exhibited positive associations between trial speed and most magnitude variables: AGRF, TLA, hip power, ankle power, ankle moment magnitudes (all p < 0.001; α_{Sidak} = 0.025; Table 3). However, changes in some variables per unit change in trial speed differed between groups. For example, the low-functioning group exhibited smaller changes in AGRF magnitude (slope = 0.5 N·s/kg·m) and larger changes in TLA with speed (slope = 21.0 deg·s/m) than did the high-functioning group (slopes = 1.1 N·s/kg·m and 16.5 deg·s/m, respectively; Figure 4C).

Group differences extended to only AGRF asymmetry, which appeared to decrease more with trial speed in the low- (slope = -1.0 N·s/kg·m, p < 0.001; $\alpha_{Sidak} = 0.050$) than the high-functioning (slope = -0.5 N·s/kg·m, p <

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.14.22283438; this version posted August 8, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

0.001; $\alpha_{Sidak} = 0.050$) group (Figure 4B). The other asymmetry variables did not meet the criteria to test the effects of trial speed, but appeared to exhibit subject-specific effects of trial speed that were not captured in group-level analyses (e.g., ankle power asymmetry; Figure 4D).



Figure 4: Changes in biomechanical variables regressed against changes in trial speed for each group. Subplots show changes in biomechanical variables for which a significant effect of SS speed was identified during multivariate regression analysis. The low- (black) and high-functioning (blue) groups were analyzed separately. Solid lines denote the regression estimate and dashed lines denote the 95% confidence interval of the estimate. A) Peak AGRF magnitude, B) Peak AGRF asymmetry, C) TLA magnitude, and D) Ankle power asymmetry.

DISCUSSION

Our results refine the perspective that post-stroke gait training at faster speeds improves biomechanical quality, instead suggesting that selecting optimal gait training speeds may require balancing tradeoffs between attaining faster speeds and maximizing the quality of multiple biomechanical variables. Our results show that walking at

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.14.22283438; this version posted August 8, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

speeds *faster* than SS can improve the quality of gait biomechanics, but the *fastest* safe speed does not maximize biomechanical quality for all variables and all participants. As speed increases, there is a tradeoff between improvements in the magnitude of biomechanical variables and increases in inter-limb asymmetry, including peak paretic-limb propulsion asymmetry and peak ankle power asymmetry. However, changes in asymmetry with speed are heterogeneous and are not well described by SS walking speed. Considering inter-limb asymmetry variables during gait speed selection is critical because walking at the fastest, rather than the optimal speed incurred substantial biomechanical costs in these variables. Accounting for tradeoffs between gait speed, and the magnitude of biomechanical output, compensations, and inter-limb asymmetry may improve our ability to select personalized post-stroke gait training speeds that maximize gait quality across biomechanical variables.

Evaluating biomechanical quality across more speeds than prior studies revealed intermediate speeds that maximized biomechanical gait quality. Here we tested 6 speeds, compared to only 2 or 4 speeds in previous studies[1,3,10]. Our average speed increment was 0.05 m/s, compared to 0.13 m/s in a study with 4 speeds[3] and 0.34-0.55 m/s in studies with 2 speeds[1,10]. These small increments maximized our ability to precisely detect changes in biomechanics with speed: changes in some biomechanical variables (e.g., TLA and AGRF) were smaller than the minimum detectable changes during treadmill walking[15].

Although walking faster than an individual's SS speed generally improves biomechanical magnitude variables, the fastest safe speed is unlikely to maximize the quality of all magnitude variables. Improvements in magnitude variables at faster speeds are consistent with prior studies that showed increases in TLA, hip power, and ankle power at speeds faster than SS[1,3,10]. Approximately linear changes in magnitude variables with speed support that faster speeds, if safe, could further improve these variables for some individuals. Increases in magnitude variables are unsurprising, as faster speeds are often achieved by increasing peak propulsion and joint powers[16,25]. However, no magnitude variables were optimized at the fastest speed for all individuals. This

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.14.22283438; this version posted August 8, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

is consistent with the observation that multiple biomechanical strategies, such as increasing hip or ankle power, can be used to achieve the same walking speed in able-bodied adults and stroke survivors[6,10,16,29,30]. Near the fastest safe speed, changes in biomechanical strategies may result in some magnitude variables plateauing or even degrading as speed increases.

Despite improvements in magnitude variables, faster speeds often had detrimental, though variable, effects on the quality of compensatory and inter-limb asymmetry variables. Our RM-ANOVA results support that faster speeds may increase circumduction and ankle moment asymmetry in high-functioning stroke survivors, and increase AGRF asymmetry in low-functioning stroke survivors. This finding contrasts with Tyrell and Colleagues (2011), who did not find speed effects on circumduction in a predominantly high-functioning cohort (18 of 20 participants had SS speed > 0.4 m/s)[3]. This discrepancy may stem from speed effects on circumduction being individual-specific and, therefore, sensitive to both studies' limited sample sizes. Weak associations between walking speed and changes in circumduction and asymmetry variables support that stratification by walking function level may mask effects of speed on gait compensations and asymmetry.

Changes in inter-limb asymmetry with speed differ more between individuals than do magnitude variables. Unlike most magnitude variables evaluated here, asymmetry variables do not appear to change linearly with gait speed, with inter-limb asymmetry for some variables minimized (*i.e.*, optimized) at intermediate speeds. One recent study found similar nonlinear within-individuals changes in circumduction with speed[6]. Further, while an individual's asymmetry can change with speed, individuals do not necessarily change asymmetry in the same direction for a single variable. Even within-individuals, predicting which direction asymmetry variables will change is challenging. On average, half of the asymmetry variables for a participant would favor the non-paretic leg at faster speeds, while the other half would favor the paretic leg. Both nonlinear speed-asymmetry relationships within- and between-individuals may explain poor regression performance for asymmetry variables, and may explain why prior studies did not identify effects of speed on inter-limb asymmetry[1,3].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.14.22283438; this version posted August 8, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Changes in asymmetry with speed may be influenced by heterogeneous neural and biomechanical impairments post-stroke that limit individuals' abilities to achieve faster speeds symmetrically[5,31,32]. Individual-specific nonlinear analyses may be needed to better characterize the relationships between speed and inter-limb asymmetry.

Only changes in biomechanical magnitude variables with speed are well-described by low/high function level grouping. Low- and high-functioning stroke survivors experience similar directional effects of speed on biomechanical magnitude variables, but with different effect magnitudes. For example, ankle power increased more with speed in the high- than the low-functioning group, consistent with one prior study[10]. Similar to inter-limb asymmetry variables, individuals' abilities to modulate specific magnitude variables (e.g., joint powers) at faster speeds may be sensitive to group-specific motor or biomechanical deficits[5,16,31,32]. Identifying group-level motor or musculoskeletal factors driving gait compensations would enhance our ability to prescribe rehabilitation protocols based on walking function level.

Our results suggest that walking at faster speeds incurs substantial biomechanical costs for inter-limb asymmetry variables. Biomechanical cost is analogous to an "opportunity cost" in economics[33]. In the context of gait rehabilitation, biomechanical costs quantify the potential benefit missed or additional worsening of biomechanical quality by selecting non-optimal training parameters, like walking speed. We calculated biomechanical cost as the difference in immediate effect sizes of training at the individual-specific optimal versus fastest speeds. Our analysis of speed-related biomechanical costs refines prior studies by showing that changes in some inter-limb asymmetry variables at the fastest speed, relative to the SS speed, were substantially worse than what could be achieved if speed was optimized to minimize asymmetry[1,3]. Variables with large biomechanical costs may be important to consider when optimizing gait training speeds to improve overall gait quality. For example, moderate-to-large biomechanical costs of joint power and AGRF asymmetry suggest that maximizing gait training speeds may miss potential improvements in the quality of these variables, even when

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.14.22283438; this version posted August 8, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

they are not direct therapeutic targets[21]. However, we did not determine if the identified biomechanical costs correspond to clinically meaningful differences in a variable's quality.

Limitations

Our findings' generalizability is constrained by the amount of data collected, our experimental protocol, and the variables analyzed. First, our sample size was limited, though comparable to prior studies[1,10]. However, our primary goal was to determine whether biomechanical variables were optimized at the fastest safe speeds. While a larger sample size may alter estimated effects of speed on different variables, more data would only further emphasize the heterogeneous changes in biomechanics with speed and the need for new approaches when quantifying post-stroke gait quality. Second, participants walked for only 15 seconds per speed. Short trial durations reduced fatigue risk, but longer walking bouts would enable more precise estimates of biomechanical variables. Third, participants walked on a treadmill, limiting comparisons to overground studies[1]. Observed changes in some variables with speed may be conservative compared to changes in overground walking, such as peak GRFs and joint moments[34,35]. However, participants were also instructed to hold a handrail, which was necessary to ensure safe walking at fast speeds. While this approach is consistent with one prior study, handrail use may alter kinematic and kinetic gait variables and thus limits the generalizability of our findings to gait without handrail support[3,36]. Quantifying how forces generated on the handrails affect changes in post-stroke biomechanics with speed may explain conflicting results between studies and between individuals in the same study.

Implications for treadmill training and future research

In the context of treadmill-based gait rehabilitation, our results suggest that training at the fastest safe speed is not always best *if the goal is to improve the quality of gait biomechanics*. Rather, speed should be optimized to maximize the quality of specific biomechanical variables of interest. However, improving gait speed is another important functional goal of post-stroke gait rehabilitation[4,7]. For some stroke survivors, gait training speed

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.14.22283438; this version posted August 8, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

selection should consider the tradeoff between the benefits of training at the fastest safe speed on community ambulation ability and its impact on biomechanical quality[37]. Importantly, our findings are constrained to the *immediate* effects of speed on biomechanical quality. Future studies on the effects of longer-duration walking at a range of speeds (e.g., a dose-response clinical trial evaluating effects of training speed) may reveal new and important insights about how gait speed, gait quality, and training benefits interact. Finally, differential changes in some biomechanical variables with speed highlight the need for holistic metrics of overall gait quality. Holistic data-driven metrics that are sensitive to tradeoffs between biomechanical magnitude, compensations, and inter-limb asymmetry may facilitate patient-specific optimization of gait training speeds.

CONCLUSIONS

This study refines a current perspective in post-stroke gait training—that training at the fastest safe speed maximizes biomechanical quality—by showing that walking at the fastest safe speed does not maximize biomechanical quality for all individuals and all variables. When using treadmill training to elicit mass stepping practice of high-quality biomechanics, our findings suggest that walking speed should be optimized, not necessarily maximized, for an individual and biomechanical variable. Challenges with predicting changes in compensatory and inter-limb asymmetry variables with speed highlights the need for innovative data-driven personalized and holistic metrics quantifying biomechanical quality during gait training.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.14.22283438; this version posted August 8, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AGRF: Anterior ground reaction force

IC: Initial contact

Fast: Fastest safe speed

Opt: Optimal speed

SS: Self-selected speed

TLA: Trailing limb angle

DECLARATIONS

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Data availability

All data generated and analyzed during this study is included in the file *SupplementalData.xlsx*.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding

Research reported in this manuscript was supported by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development under award number F32HD108927 to MR, and R01HD095975 and K01HD079584 to TK. This work was also supported by the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship Program under Grant No. 1937971 to TW. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.14.22283438; this version posted August 8, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Authors' contributions

M.R. and J.L. drafted the original manuscript. M.R. performed analyses and created all figures. J.L., V.S., P.S., A.S., L.Z., and T.K. collected the data. J.L., H.C., V.S., A.S., P.S., T.W., and T.K. processed the data and performed preliminary analyses. M.R., T.K., J.L., H.C., L.Z., and L.T. interpreted the data. T.K. was involved with all aspects of the study, including design, data-collection, data-processing, analysis, interpretation, and manuscript-preparation. All co-authors contributed to critical review and revisions of the manuscript.

Acknowledgements

Not applicable

REFERENCES

1 Lamontagne, A. & Fung, J. Faster is better: implications for speed-intensive gait training after stroke. *Stroke* **35**, 2543-2548 (2004).

2 Dobkin, B. H. Strategies for stroke rehabilitation. *The Lancet Neurology* **3**, 528-536 (2004).

3 Tyrell, C. M., Roos, M. A., Rudolph, K. S. & Reisman, D. S. Influence of systematic increases in treadmill walking speed on gait kinematics after stroke. *Physical therapy* **91**, 392-403 (2011).

4 Hornby, T. G. *et al.* Clinical Practice Guideline to Improve Locomotor Function Following Chronic Stroke, Incomplete Spinal Cord Injury, and Brain Injury. *J Neurol Phys Ther* **44**, 49-100, doi:10.1097/NPT.0000000000000303 (2020).

5 Clark, D. J., Ting, L. H., Zajac, F. E., Neptune, R. R. & Kautz, S. A. Merging of Healthy Motor Modules Predicts Reduced Locomotor Performance and Muscle Coordination Complexity Post-Stroke. *Journal of Neurophysiology* **103**, 844-857, doi:10.1152/jn.00825.2009 (2010).

6 Kettlety, S. A., Finley, J. M., Reisman, D. S., Schweighofer, N. & Leech, K. A. Speed-dependent biomechanical changes vary across individual gait metrics post-stroke relative to neurotypical adults. *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation* **20**, 1-13 (2023).

7 Bowden, M. G., Balasubramanian, C. K., Behrman, A. L. & Kautz, S. A. Validation of a speed-based classification system using quantitative measures of walking performance poststroke. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair* **22**, 672-675, doi:10.1177/1545968308318837 (2008).

8 Perry, J., Garrett, M., Gronley, J. K. & Mulroy, S. J. Classification of walking handicap in the stroke population. *Stroke* **26**, 982-989 (1995).

9 Schmid, A. *et al.* Improvements in speed-based gait classifications are meaningful. *Stroke* **38**, 2096-2100, doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.106.475921 (2007).

10 Jonkers, I., Delp, S. & Patten, C. Capacity to increase walking speed is limited by impaired hip and ankle power generation in lower functioning persons post-stroke. *Gait & posture* **29**, 129-137 (2009).

11 Little, V. L., McGuirk, T. E., Perry, L. A. & Patten, C. Pelvic excursion during walking post-stroke: A novel classification system. *Gait Posture* **62**, 395-404, doi:10.1016/j.gaitpost.2018.03.052 (2018).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.14.22283438; this version posted August 8, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

12 Farris, D. J., Hampton, A., Lewek, M. D. & Sawicki, G. S. Revisiting the mechanics and energetics of walking in individuals with chronic hemiparesis following stroke: from individual limbs to lower limb joints. *Journal of neuroengineering and rehabilitation* **12**, 1-12 (2015).

13 Awad, L. N., Binder-Macleod, S. A., Pohlig, R. T. & Reisman, D. S. Paretic Propulsion and Trailing Limb Angle Are Key Determinants of Long-Distance Walking Function After Stroke. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair* **29**, 499-508, doi:10.1177/1545968314554625 (2015).

14 Awad, L. N., Lewek, M. D., Kesar, T. M., Franz, J. R. & Bowden, M. G. These legs were made for propulsion: advancing the diagnosis and treatment of post-stroke propulsion deficits. *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation* **17**, 1-16 (2020).

15 Kesar, T. M., Reisman, D. S., Higginson, J. S., Awad, L. N. & Binder-Macleod, S. A. Changes in Post-Stroke Gait Biomechanics Induced by One Session of Gait Training. *Phys Med Rehabil Int* **2** (2015).

16 Farris, D. J. & Sawicki, G. S. The mechanics and energetics of human walking and running: a joint level perspective. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface* **9**, 110-118 (2012).

17 Bauby, C. E. & Kuo, A. D. Active control of lateral balance in human walking. *Journal of biomechanics* **33**, 1433-1440 (2000).

18 Awad, L. N., Palmer, J. A., Pohlig, R. T., Binder-Macleod, S. A. & Reisman, D. S. Walking speed and step length asymmetry modify the energy cost of walking after stroke. *Neurorehabilitation and neural repair* **29**, 416-423 (2015).

19 Ellis, R. G., Howard, K. C. & Kram, R. The metabolic and mechanical costs of step time asymmetry in walking. *Proc Biol Sci* **280**, 20122784, doi:10.1098/rspb.2012.2784 (2013).

20 van de Port, I. G., Kwakkel, G. & Lindeman, E. Community ambulation in patients with chronic stroke: how is it related to gait speed? *Journal of rehabilitation medicine* **40**, 23-27 (2008).

21 Kesar, T. M., Binder-Macleod, S. A., Hicks, G. E. & Reisman, D. S. Minimal detectable change for gait variables collected during treadmill walking in individuals post-stroke. *Gait & posture* **33**, 314-317 (2011).

22 Genthe, K. *et al.* Effects of real-time gait biofeedback on paretic propulsion and gait biomechanics in individuals post-stroke. *Topics in stroke rehabilitation* **25**, 186-193 (2018).

23 Kesar, T., Reisman, D., Higginson, J., Awad, L. & Binder-Macleod, S. Changes in post-stroke gait biomechanics induced by one session of gait training. *Physical medicine and rehabilitation international* **2** (2015).

24 Reisman, D. S., Rudolph, K. S. & Farquhar, W. B. Influence of Speed on Walking Economy Poststroke. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair* (2009).

25 Bowden, M. G., Balasubramanian, C. K., Neptune, R. R. & Kautz, S. A. Anterior-posterior ground reaction forces as a measure of paretic leg contribution in hemiparetic walking. *Stroke* **37**, 872-876 (2006).

26 Chen, G., Patten, C., Kothari, D. H. & Zajac, F. E. Gait differences between individuals with post-stroke hemiparesis and non-disabled controls at matched speeds. *Gait Posture* **22**, 51-56 (2005a).

27 Cohen, J. A power primer. *Psychological bulletin* **112**, 155 (1992).

28 Glantz, S. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2012).

29 Jonsdottir, J. *et al.* Functional resources to increase gait speed in people with stroke: strategies adopted compared to healthy controls. *Gait Posture* **29**, 355-359, doi:10.1016/j.gaitpost.2009.01.008 (2009).

30 Finley, J. M., Long, A., Bastian, A. J. & Torres-Oviedo, G. Spatial and temporal control contribute to step length asymmetry during split-belt adaptation and hemiparetic gait. *Neurorehabilitation and neural repair* **29**, 786-795 (2015).

31 Allen, J. L., Kautz, S. A. & Neptune, R. R. The influence of merged muscle excitation modules on post-stroke hemiparetic walking performance. *Clinical Biomechanics* **28**, 697-704 (2013).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.14.22283438; this version posted August 8, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

32 Johnson, R. T., Bianco, N. A. & Finley, J. M. Patterns of asymmetry and energy cost generated from predictive simulations of hemiparetic gait. *PLOS Computational Biology* **18**, e1010466, doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1010466 (2022).

33 Palmer, S. & Raftery, J. Opportunity cost. *Bmj* **318**, 1551-1552 (1999).

34 Brouwer, B., Parvataneni, K. & Olney, S. J. A comparison of gait biomechanics and metabolic requirements of overground and treadmill walking in people with stroke. *Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon)* **24**, 729-734 (2009).

35 Riley, P. O., Paolini, G., Della Croce, U., Paylo, K. W. & Kerrigan, D. C. A kinematic and kinetic comparison of overground and treadmill walking in healthy subjects. *Gait Posture* **26**, 17-24 (2007).

36 Chen, G., Patten, C., Kothari, D. H. & Zajac, F. E. Gait deviations associated with post-stroke hemiparesis: improvement during treadmill walking using weight support, speed, support stiffness, and handrail hold. *Gait Posture* **22**, 57-62 (2005b).

37 Dickstein, R. Rehabilitation of gait speed after stroke: a critical review of intervention approaches. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair* **22**, 649-660 (2008).