medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.09.23285669; this version posted February 11, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

High-intensity exercise paired with motor practice benefits cognitive performance in stroke and older adults

Brian Greeley[1], Beverley C. Larssen[2], Jennifer Ferris[2,3], Negin Motamed Yeganeh[4], Justin W. Andrushko[1], Briana Chau[2], Christina B. Jones[2], Kristin L. Campbell[1,2], Jason L. Neva[5,6], Lara A. Boyd[1,2]

[1]Department of Physical Therapy, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada
[2]Graduate Program in Rehabilitation Sciences, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada
[3]Gerontology Research Centre, Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, Canada
[4]Djavad Mowafaghian Centre for Brain Health, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada
[5]Université de Montréal, École de kinésiologie et des sciences de l'activité physique, Faculté de médecine, Montréal, QC, Canada, H3C3T5
[6]Centre de recherche de l'institut universitaire de gériatrie de Montréal, Montréal, QC, Canada, H3T1P1

Keywords: Chronic stroke, high-intensity interval training, exercise, transfer, cognition, motor practice

Word count: 4,997

List of tables/figures:

Table 1. Demographics of the stroke group.
Figure 1. Overview of study design.
Figure 2. Spatial location of targets and order of repeated sequence in the serial targeting task.
Figure 3. Averaged ratio reaction time as a function across practice and retention tests.
Figure 4. Mean Trails Making Test-A and B.
Figure 5. Mean number of target hits in Object Hit and Avoid.
Figure 6. Mean number of distractors hits in Object Hit and Avoid.

Corresponding author:
Lara Boyd, PT PhD
Department of Physical Therapy
University of British Columbia
Vancouver, Canada V6T 1Z4
lara.boyd@ubc.ca
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2828-4549

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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/10.1101/2023.02.09.23285669; this version posted February 11, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Introduction. Stroke is a leading cause of long-term disability and can result in cognitive and motor impairments. Exercise may improve cognition and motor function after stroke, but past research has typically targeted these impairments in isolation. Here, we investigated whether pairing multiple bouts of exercise with motor practice can positively affect both cognitive and motor function after stroke.

Methods. Thirty-three individuals with chronic stroke and 41 healthy older adults completed 5 separate days of motor task practice using their paretic/non-dominant arm, paired with 23 minutes of either high-intensity interval training exercise or rest. Cognitive and motor function were tested pre- and post-intervention. Processing speed, visuospatial skills, and inhibitory control was tested with the Trail Making Test-A and B (TMT-A, TMT-B) and object hit and avoid. Total completion time from TMT-A and TMT-B, target and distractor hits from object hit and avoid were used as dependent measures for assessing cognitive function. For individuals with stroke, motor impairment and function were tested with the Fugl-Meyer upper extremity arm assessment and Wolf Motor Function Test respectively.

Results. All participants showed evidence of motor learning; exercise did not confer an additional benefit beyond that stimulated by practice for either group. For stroke participants, motor function ($p = .047$), but not motor impairment, improved over time. The stroke group who exercised before motor practice displayed significant reductions in TMT-A completion time ($p = .035$). Both stroke and older adults hit more targets in the post- compared to pre-intervention ($p < .001$), driven by improvements in the affected/non-dominant hand. Importantly, exercise paired with motor practice also led to a reduced number of distractors hit ($p = .026$) in the object hit and avoid task for both individuals with stroke and older adults. These changes were not at the expense of speed.

Discussion. Five days of high-intensity interval training exercise paired with motor practice led to improved processing speed as measured by the TMT-A for individuals with stroke. Both exercise participant groups (stroke and older adults) showed improved visuospatial skills and inhibitory control as

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.09.23285669; this version posted February 11, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

measured by object hit and avoid following our intervention. Our findings suggest that exercise paired with motor task practice leads to improved cognitive-motor function in individuals with stroke and older adults. Together, exercise paired with motor practice appears to be a safe and effective means of enhancing cognitive-motor skills after stroke and in older adults.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.09.23285669; this version posted February 11, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

Stroke is the leading neurological cause of adult physical disability[1], and often causes cognitive and motor impairments. Fifty-two percent of those who have excellent motor recovery continue to show signs of cognitive impairment 3 years after stroke.[2] Identifying effective interventions that optimize recovery of both motor and cognitive functions is critical to improving the quality of life after stroke.

Exercise delivered as a standalone intervention appears not to impact cognition after stroke. For example, a single treadmill walking session at 70% of heart rate reserve resulted in an improvement in upper limb function, but did not benefit cognition in individuals with chronic stroke.[3] Similarly, a multi-session aerobic exercise intervention led to improved paretic hand function without affecting cognition in individuals with chronic stroke.[4] However, cognitive function might be improved by pairing aerobic exercise with practice of a demanding cognitive task. Increased fluid intelligence was noted in individuals with chronic stroke following 10 weeks of pairing aerobic exercise with adaptive cognitive training.[5] While the findings from these studies suggest that exercise may boost the effects of cognitive training, it is unknown whether exercise paired with motor task would transfer to untrained motor tasks that require high cognitive demand (i.e., cognitive-motor tasks).

In the current study we paired high-intensity interval training (HIIT) exercise with practice of a motor task in a group of individuals who were in the chronic phase of recovery from stroke, and a group of OA. Participants underwent 5 separate sessions consisting of 23 minutes of either HIIT exercise or rest prior to motor practice. Motor function and performance on cognitively engaging tasks were assessed pre- and post-intervention. We hypothesized that individuals in the exercise group would show enhanced motor learning, similar to previous findings in stroke.[4] We also hypothesized that the exercise group would show transfer, or an improved ability to perform untrained, cognitively engaging motor tasks,[5] relative to the rest group.

Methods

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.09.23285669; this version posted February 11, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Participants

Forty-one participants with stroke, and 44 OA were recruited. Participants were considered eligible if they were between the age of 21-85, left or right hand dominant and showed no signs of cognitive impairment.[6] In addition, individuals in the stroke group were in the chronic phase of recovery (stroke >6 months). Exclusion criteria included: diagnosed with neurological or psychiatric conditions other than stroke, comprehensive aphasia, failure to see targets, or inability to extend and maintain the paretic arm/hand inside a target for 500 ms on a Kinarm end-point robot (Kinarm, Kingston, Ontario).

This study was approved by the University of British Columbia Ethics Committee (Clinical Research Ethics Board #H16-01945) and all participants read and signed a consent form prior to any experimental protocols. Aspects of these data have been previously published;[7-9] however, the questions and analyses and data subset in the present manuscript are novel.

Study design

This study consisted of 11 sessions (Figure 1).[8] A cardiologist supervised maximal stress test cleared individuals for exercise (session 1; see Stress Test in supplemental document). Following the stress test, participants were randomly allocated into either HIIT exercise or rest groups. Across 5-days (sessions 4-8), participants engaged in 23 minutes of either HIIT exercise or watched a nature documentary immediately before practice of a motor task. Upper-extremity impairment and function, and cognitive assessments were conducted pre- (session 2) and post-intervention (session 9 at a 24-hour retention test). Participants returned for a 35-day retention test (session 11) to assess long-term changes in behaviour. Sessions 3, 7 and 10 contained neurophysiological assessments and are not reported here.

Intervention

Exercise and rest

During each practice session, participants in the exercise group completed a 5-minute warm-up, then 3 × 3-minute intervals of high-intensity exercise (75% of their maximum wattage achieved during

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.09.23285669; this version posted February 11, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

the maximal stress test) with a 3-minute active recovery (10 watts) for a total of 23 minutes on a recumbent bike. This method was chosen based on its availability in rehabilitation settings,[10] the success rate in OA,[8] and its safety and feasibility in stroke participants.[11] Participants pedaled between 50-80 RPM throughout each session. Heart Rate (HR) was monitored from the non-paretic wrist with an Alpha 53p heart rate watch (Mio, Portland), blood pressure and Rating of Perceived Exertion were taken in the last 30-60 seconds of each interval. Participants in the rest group watched a nature documentary on a 50-inch screen for 23 minutes. HR was monitored every 3 minutes.

Motor task practice: Serial Targeting Task

All participants practiced the Serial Targeting Task (STT), an implicit motor sequence task performed on a Kinarm End-Point robot.[8] Individuals were seated in a Kinarm chair, adjusted so that the head was positioned in the center of the visual field. Participants used their paretic/non-dominant upper-limb (visually occluded by a bib) to practice 4 blocks of the STT following 23 minutes of exercise or rest during each session, over 5-days (2,220 total movements). Participants were instructed to move their hand to each target as quickly and accurately as possible.

The STT had a total of 9 possible targets. Eight targets formed an equidistant circular array around the 9th target (Figure 2). Targets were displayed on the participant's paretic/non-dominant visual field. Only one target was visible at any given time; to initiate the appearance of the next target, participants were required to hold the cursor within the current target for 500 ms. Participants had 10,000 ms total to reach the visible target. For the pre-test, participants performed 20 target reaches. Motor acquisition was assessed each practice day whereas motor learning was assessed 24-hours and 35-days following the last day of practice.

Unknown to participants (see Explicit Awareness in supplemental document), there was a repeating 6-element sequence (Figure 2) flanked by a random sequence of 7 targets. Random sequences appeared in the same order for all participants but did not follow a pattern or ever repeat. Participants

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.09.23285669; this version posted February 11, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

were exposed to 32 repetitions of the repeating sequence (8 times per block, 4 blocks of practice; 192 trials) and to 36 random sequences within each practice session.

Reaction time (RT) was used to characterize change in motor behaviour; RT was averaged for each individual sequence trial, then calculated as a ratio relative to the averaged pre-test for the corresponding trial sequence type (e.g., averaged pre-test random trial / averaged first random trial in practice). This process also accounted for differences in initial RTs across individuals and groups. Ratios were calculated for each practice day. Higher ratios indicated faster RT relative to the pre-test. Change in ratios for the random sequences indicates alterations in motor performance while changes in the ratio for repeated sequences illustrates implicit motor learning.

Assessments

Kinarm standard test battery

In the pre- and post-intervention sessions the Kinarm was used to assess Trail Making A and B, and Object Hit and Avoid for all participants. These are a part of the Kinarm Standard Tests™ battery.

Trail Making Test-A and B

The Trail Making Test A and B (TMT-A, TMT-B) were used to assess processing speed and task switching, respectively.[12] To complete the task, participants grasped and held one of the robotic arms with their non-paretic/dominant hand. Hand position was represented by a small, solid white dot. Participants were asked to connect 25 numbered (TMT-A), or 13 numbered and 12 lettered circles (TMT-B) in ascending order. If participants made an error by moving to an incorrect target, the last correct target turned red; participants were required to return to the red target to resume the task. All stimuli were presented on the non-paretic/dominant side of the Kinarm workspace. TMT-A was always completed before TMT-B. Total completion time (i.e., the time in seconds from task onset to when participants touched the last target) was the main dependent variable.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.09.23285669; this version posted February 11, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Object Hit and Avoid

Object Hit and Avoid (OHA) is a visuomotor task that assesses rapid bimanual motor decisions, attention, and inhibitory control.[13] Participants first observed two red targets (e.g., circle, rectangle). Participants were instructed to use two visually displayed 5 cm wide green paddles as their hands to hit away as many of these targets as possible. Paddle movement corresponded to hand movement. During the task, distractor targets were also present (i.e., oval, square) and participants were instructed to avoid hitting them. The speed and number of moving stimuli increased as the task progressed such that a single, slow (~10 cm/s) stimulus was visible at the beginning and a maximum of 16 fast (~50 cm/s) stimuli were present at the end. A total of 300 stimuli (200 targets, 100 distractors) were randomly presented in 2 minutes. The number of target hits and distractor hits were calculated separately for each hand and used as the dependent variables.

Upper-extremity motor function and impairment in stroke

Trained clinical assessors administered and scored the Wolf Motor Function Test (WMFT) and the Fugl-Meyer Assessment (FMA) pre- and post-intervention. The WMFT indexes arm motor function and contains 15 timed movement tasks. If no repetitions were completed within 120 seconds for a task, a zero score was assigned. Each task was characterized via calculation of rate (repetitions/60 second); higher rates show faster movements and better motor function.[14] The upper extremity portion of the FMA (/66) illustrates paretic arm impairment with higher scores reflecting less impairment.[15]

Statistical Analysis

All statistical analyses were carried out using SPSS software (SPSS 27.0; IBM Corporation, Armonk, NY). Data were tested for normality with the Shapiro-Wilk test with $\alpha = .001$.[16] When skewed or kurtotic, we log-transformed data and performed the analysis on the transformed data, however, non-transformed data are presented in the figures.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.09.23285669; this version posted February 11, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Independent samples *t*-tests were used to compare baseline demographic data between exercise and rest subgroups within stroke (see Demographics in supplemental document). We performed mixed repeated measures analysis of variance (RM-ANOVA) for all outcome measures. For RT data from the STT, we ran a 5 (Practice Day: 1,2,3,4,5) × 2 (Sequence: repeated, random) × 2 (Intervention Group: rest, exercise) × 2 (Participant Group: stroke, OA) RM-ANOVA to test motor acquisition. We also performed a 2 (Retention Day: 24-hour, 35-day) × 2 (Sequence: repeated, random) × 2 (Intervention Group: rest, exercise) × 2 (Participant Group: stroke, OA) RM-ANOVA test on the RT data from the STT to assess motor learning. For OHA, a 2 (Hand: paretic, non-paretic) × 2 (Session: pre-, post-intervention) × 2 (Intervention Group: rest, exercise) × 2 (Participant Group: stroke, control) RM-ANOVA was run. To ensure changes in number of targets or distractor targets were not due to a speed-accuracy trade-off, we also completed a separate RM-ANOVA on hand speed in the object hit and avoid task (see supplemental analyses). Multiple one-way RM-ANOVA tests were used on all single hand outcome measures (WMFT, and TMT-A, TMT-B). Each participant's physical fitness (blood pressure: diastolic and systolic at rest, resting HR, Godin, and max watts achieved during the stress test) was calculated as a composite z-score and used as a covariate in all analyses.[8] We employed Šídák corrections for multiple comparisons ($\alpha < .05$), and partial eta squared (η_p^2) effect sizes are reported.

Results

A total of 33 individuals with stroke (n = 15 exercise; n = 18 rest) and 41 OA (n = 19 exercise; n = 22 rest) completed the study and were included in the final analyses (see Results section in the supplemental document for a complete description of participant dropout). There were no adverse events associated with exercise testing or training.

Stroke baseline demographics

There was a group difference in the maximum HR during the stress test with those in the exercise group displaying a greater HR relative to the rest group ($p = .012$). However, 6 participants in the rest

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.09.23285669; this version posted February 11, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

group were on beta-blockers as opposed to 2 in the exercise group. There were no other differences in baseline demographics across groups (all *p*-values > .332) (Table 1).

Post-intervention motor impairment and function

Arm motor function improved for participants with stroke as shown by significantly faster rates of WMFT completion at the 24-hour retention test (main effect of Time $F(1,27) = 4.312$, $p = .047$, $\eta_p^2 = .14$). There were no changes in arm impairment as measured by the FMA.

Serial Targeting Task: Motor acquisition

Motor practice led to improved performance on the STT for both participant groups (Sequence × Practice Day interaction: $F(4,276) = 5.284$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .07$); attributable to faster RT's for both random (*p*'s < .044) and repeated sequences (*p*'s < .001). We also found a Sequence × Practice Day × Participant Group interaction ($F(4,276) = 3.688$, $p = .006$, $\eta_p^2 = .05$). Post-hoc testing revealed this was driven by a Sequence × Practice Day interaction for the older adult group ($p < .001$) but not the stroke group ($p = .745$) (Figure 3).

Serial Targeting Task: Retention tests

Across both retention tests, we noted a Sequence × Intervention Group ($F(1,64) = 5.650$, $p = .020$, $\eta_p^2 = .08$) interaction. Specifically, the rest ($p < .001$) but not exercise group ($p = .054$) showed a difference between the repeated and random sequences (Figure 3). The rest group also showed greater change in motor learning (main effect of Intervention Group $F(1,64) = 5.959$, $p = .017$, $\eta_p^2 = .09$) as compared to the exercise group. Faster RTs were noted at the 24-hour compared to the 35-day retention test (main effect of Retention Day $F(1,64) = 31.587$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .33$). Finally, a main effect of Sequence ($F(1,64) = 34.271$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .35$) revealed a greater change in repeated relative to the random sequences.

Trail Making Test A

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.09.23285669; this version posted February 11, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

A significant Participant Group × Intervention Group × Time interaction was observed ($F(1, 67) = 5.760$, $p = .019$, $\eta_p^2 = .08$). The stroke group took longer to complete the TMT-A as compared to OA (main effect of Participant Group $F(1, 67) = 7.385$, $p = .008$, $\eta_p^2 = .10$), but the three-way interaction showed differences in how the participant groups responded to exercise. All OA completed the TMT-A faster during post-intervention, however, the stroke exercise group completed the TMT-A faster than the rest group at the post-intervention session (Figure 4). See Figure 1 in Supplementary file for individual differences.

Trail Making Test B

There was a significant Intervention Group × Time interaction ($F(1,67) = 4.002$, $p = .050$, $\eta_p^2 = .06$) reflecting that TMT-B completion times improved with the rest but not the exercise group. A main effect of Participant Group was observed ($F(1,67) = 17.162$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .20$), indicating stroke participants took longer to complete the TMT-B compared to OA (Figure 4). See Figure 1 in Supplementary file for individual differences.

Object Hit and Avoid: Target Hits

OA hit more targets than stroke participants as evidenced by a main effect of Participant Group ($F(1, 67) = 33.055$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .33$; Figure 5). Participants in both groups hit more targets in the post- compared to pre-intervention, as evidenced by a significant main effect of Time ($F(1, 67) = 12.232$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .15$), driven by improvements in the affected/non-dominant hand rather than the less-affected/dominant hand whose performance did not change (Hand × Time interaction: $F(1, 67) = 4.696$, $p = .034$, $\eta_p^2 = .07$). These changes were not at the expense of speed (see supplemental analyses). A significant Participant Group × Hand interaction ($F(1, 67) = 30.955$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .32$) and main effect of Hand ($F(1, 67) = 92.455$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .58$) demonstrates that the affected/non-dominant hand hit fewer targets than the less-affected/dominant hand, however this was driven by the stroke group as evidenced by the interaction. See Figure 2,3 in Supplementary file for individual differences.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.09.23285669; this version posted February 11, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Object Hit and Avoid: Distractor Hits

A significant Intervention Group × Time interaction ($F(1,67) = 4.801$, $p = .032$, $\eta_p^2 = .07$; Figure 6) revealed that the number of distractors hit decreased over time for both individuals with stroke and OA exercise groups. There was also a significant Fitness z-score × Time interaction ($F(1, 67) = 4.044$, $p = .048$, $\eta_p^2 = .057$). A follow-up Spearman's correlation revealed that those with higher baseline physical fitness showed greater gains (i.e., greater reduction in distractor target hits) from pre- to post-intervention, (ρ_s (72) = -.259, $p = .028$). See Figure 4,5 in Supplementary file for individual differences.

Discussion

After a 5-day HIIT exercise and motor practice intervention, all groups showed evidence of motor acquisition and learning. There was no advantage of exercise for motor learning of the STT in either individuals with stroke or OA, however exercise appeared to confer a benefit for unpracticed motor tasks that contained a cognitive component. Specifically, the stroke exercise group showed greater changes in processing speed on the TMT-A following the intervention. Participation in HIIT exercise paired with motor practice also led to improved visuospatial skills and inhibitory control during the OHA task for both stroke and OA. Together, our findings suggest that exercise paired with motor task practice may be a safe and effective means of enhancing cognitive-motor skills after stroke and in OA.

Our findings suggest that multicomponent interventions that pair exercise with a behavioural task may improve motor tasks involving a high level of cognitive demand in individuals with stroke. For example, past work employing a single bout of high-intensity treadmill walking[3] or an 8-week exercise program[4] improved upper-limb motor function, but had no effect on cognition. In hindsight, the selective improvement of motor function may be expected given that the intervention contained no cognitive engagement but was limited to exercise. In contrast, adaptive cognitive training improved cognition in individuals with chronic stroke when paired with either a 10-week aerobic exercise program or low activity range of motion exercises; however, the greatest cognitive gains were seen in the aerobic exercise

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.09.23285669; this version posted February 11, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

group.[5] Importantly, cognition did not improve with non-adaptive cognitive engagement, when paired with either aerobic exercise or low-demand physical activity.[5] These data imply that cognitive training may confer the greatest benefits when paired with exercise in individuals with chronic stroke.

Adopting a multimodal approach, we paired exercise with practice of a motor task. Interestingly, we found that exercise did not enhance motor learning of the STT beyond that induced by practice for participants in either the stroke or OA groups but instead transferred to improve performance on motor tasks that require certain cognitive capacities. Specifically, we observed enhanced processing speed (TMT-A) for stroke participants in the exercise group and enhanced visuomotor spatial skills and inhibitory control (OHA) in both individuals with stroke and OA who exercised before motor practice. These results are particularly noteworthy because participants did not explicitly undergo any cognitive training during the 5-day intervention, but instead practiced an implicit motor sequence task following exercise or rest. These results suggest that exercise effects can transfer to unpracticed motor tasks. Future studies testing the impact of pairing exercise with motor practice should also include cognitive assessments to understand whether this combination affects other cognitive functions.

Skill acquisition can play an instrumental role in enhancing cognitive function.[17] This idea stems from theories that posit that the early stages of motor learning place increased demands on cognition.[18] In addition, there is ample data showing links between exercise and improved cognitive function in OA.[19] Here, we discovered that while both stroke and OA groups demonstrated motor learning, it was only the exercise groups that showed enhanced ability in motor tasks that were guided by a cognitive rule. The impact of exercise plus motor learning transferred to improve processing speed, visuomotor skills, and inhibitory control required by the TMT-A and OHA tasks. To perform these tasks well, participants had to make small, distinct movements quickly and accurately while inhibiting anticipatory movements and following a rule.

Processing and visuomotor speed, and visuoperceptual abilities are cognitive domains that are predictors of functional outcomes after stroke. In a large sample of stroke participants (n = 419),

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.09.23285669; this version posted February 11, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

visuomotor speed but not attention, language, visuoconstruction, verbal or visual memory predicted post-stroke functional status.[20] Similarly, only processing speed and visuoperceptual abilities predicted functional outcomes 5 years following a stroke (n = 307) whereas memory, executive function, and language did not.[21] These results are of particular interest in the current study as we observed cognitive gains limited to processing speed (TMT-A) and visuomotor speed (OHA), but not executive function (TMT-B). Our results suggest that exercise paired with 5-days of motor practice selectively improve processing speed and visuoperceptual abilities, two of the most important cognitive measures in stroke.

Surprisingly, there was no motor learning advantage for the exercise group. This is in contrast with at least one other study which found that stroke participants who first completed a single bout of HIIT exercise before motor practice displayed enhanced explicit motor learning when assessed the following day compared to a rest group.[22] Here, we implemented an implicit motor sequence task.[8] It is possible that exercise differentially affects implicit and explicit memory systems. Consistent with this hypothesis and our current findings, two studies using the same, implicit motor learning task also found no effect of exercise on skill acquisition in young adults.[23,24]. In contrast, young adults who exercised before practicing an explicit isometric pinch force sequencing task demonstrated better learning compared to those in the rest group.[25] Similarly, participants who exercised before practicing a pursuit-rotor task,[26] repeatedly tracing a curve by flexion/extension arm movements,[27] or simple ballistic thumb acceleration movements[28] also displayed superior learning compared to participants who rested. Collectively, exercise may preferentially affect explicit motor learning tasks where a cognitive rule is followed during learning. Future studies should directly test this hypothesis.

Limitations

A limitation of the current study is the type of exercise intervention. Only HIIT exercise was tested. It is possible that other volumes, intensities, or frequencies of exercise would have a different effect. Also, we did not include a battery of cognitive assessments pre- and post-intervention. It is unknown if our findings are specific to motor tasks that require a type of cognitive control or if cognition

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.09.23285669; this version posted February 11, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

in general was altered. Further, HIIT exercise may come with increased risks, especially for sedentary individuals with unknown underlying health conditions. However, all participants who were cleared for exercise in the current study were able to complete the HIIT exercise intervention without any adverse effects despite a wide range of physical fitness. With screening we found that our exercise protocol was feasible and can likely be generalized to other clinical populations.

Conclusions

Five days of HIIT exercise paired with motor practice led to improved processing speed for individuals with stroke. Additionally, both exercise participant groups showed improved visuospatial skills and inhibitory control following our intervention. Together, exercise paired with motor practice appears to be a safe and effective means of enhancing cognitive-motor skills after stroke and in OA.

Funding

This work was funded by the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (PI L.A.B., PJT-148535). JWA, JF, BC and BL are funded by a Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) fellowships. JN and JWA were also funded by the Michael Smith Foundation for Health Research.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The authors have no conflicts to declare.

Data availability

All data will be available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.09.23285669; this version posted February 11, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

	ID	Gender	TSS	Endinburgh	Affected Arm	Pre FM	24-h FM	Pre WOLF	24-h WOLF	HR	Max HR	Max Watts	Godin	MOCA	Beta-Blocker Use
Rest	1	M	54	50	R	64	61	73	64	71	157	120	97	27	N
	2	M	84	60	L	55	61	43	50	78	104	60	60	^	N
	3	M	110	70	R	63	62	73	47	84	108	50	14	27	Y
	4	M	51	0	R	57	44	30	30	58	84	35	31	22	Y
	5	F	45	79	R	60	59	39	37	75	157	40	65	28	N
	6	M	16	70	L	63	60	49	54	45	113	115	15	25	N
	7	F	228	^	R	28	27	15	15	65	102	25	15	^	N
	8	F	143	90	L	62	63	48	52	54	100	65	24	29	Y
	9	M	57	90	L	49	52	30	36	72	143	90	15	26	N
	10	M	58	100	L	64	61	55	59	63	97	95	55	25	N
	11	M	159	90	L	44	46	24	26	61	84	35	0	27	N
	12	M	49	100	L	36	43	11	15	67	133	50	9	24	N
	13	M	36	100	R	62	63	42	75	51	112	80	21	25	Y
	14	M	29	100	L	61	63	44	49	52	91	50	59	20	Y
	15	M	164	50	R	61	60	42	37	53	125	95	70	¥	N
	16	M	48	-70	R	50	48	25	36	99	154	100	76	26	N
	17	M	23	-50	R	44	#	19	#	78	^	^	57	28	N
	18	M	69	100	R	49	52	36	37	66	105	35	56	24	Y
Mean		**3 F / 15 M**	**79.1 (58.3)**	**60.5 (52.5)**	**8 L / 10 R**	**54.0 (10.6)**	**54.4 (10.0)**	**38.8 (17.4)**	**42.2 (16.3)**	**66.2 (13.5)**	**115.8 (24.7)**	**67.1 (30.6)**	**41.1 (28.1)**	**25.5 (2.4)**	**6 Y / 12 N**
Exercise	1	M	141	60	L	63	63	100	95	^	116	60	21	26	N
	2	M	138	100	L	57	56	43	44	57	113	90	27	27	Y
	3	M	83	60	R	53	61	39	55	95	134	60	21	28	N
	4	M	10	50	L	63	66	96	^	78	145	110	47	26	N
	5	M	32	70	L	62	64	47	58	53	112	80	74	26	N
	6	F	99	100	L	39	43	28	22	65	131	45	16	27	N
	7	F	52	100	L	63	61	64	54	87	142	40	29	25	N
	8	M	143	60	R	66	^	54	68	66	166	115	45	24	Y
	9	F	104	58	R	57	58	54	57	56	123	55	36	26	N
	10	F	95	-75	R	23	19	14	21	58	134	70	63	^	N
	11	F	114	100	L	62	59	43	42	97	126	35	56	27	N
	12	M	51	80	L	65	64	55	54	65	139	145	107	26	N
	13	M	29	60	L	62	64	^	81	90	151	135	24	23	N
	14	M	80	100	L	25	30	15	24	61	146	95	82	30	N
	15	M	102	^	L	23	#	26	^	69	205	40	40	^	N
Mean (SD)		**5 F / 10 M**	**84.9 (42.2)**	**65.9 (45.0)**	**11 L / 4 R**	**52.2 (16.2)**	**54.5 (14.7)**	**48.4 (25.9)**	**51.8 (22.0)**	**71.2 (15.3)**	**138.9 (23.6)**	**78.3 (35.5)**	**45.9 (26.2)**	**26.2 (1.7)**	**2 Y / 13 N**

Table 1. Demographics of the stroke group. BB = Beta-blocker; FM = Fugl-Meyer; HR = heart rate; TSS = time since stroke (months); WMFT = Wolf Motor Function Test. ¥ = participant has expressive aphasia; # = did not return; ^ = missing.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.09.23285669; this version posted February 11, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 1. Study design. On day 1, participants underwent a stress test. On day 2 and 8, all participants underwent an MRI and completed the Kinarm standard test battery, whereas only stroke participants also completed Fugl-Meyer and the Wolf Motor Function Test. On day 4-8, participants to completed 23 minutes of exercise or rest followed by 4 blocks of paretic/non-dominant upper-limb motor practice on the Kinarm. On day 9, 24 hours after day 8, participants completed 1 block of the serial targeting task (STT). On day 11, 35-days after the last practice day, participants completed 1 block of the STT.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.09.23285669; this version posted February 11, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 2. Spatial location and order of repeated targets in the motor task. A & B) Displays the spatial location of all possible targets. Note, targets were *not* numbered during the task. C) Order of the repeated sequence.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.09.23285669; this version posted February 11, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 3. Averaged ratio RT as a function of practice day for stroke and healthy older adults for exercise (orange) and rest (purple). Values are averaged ratios relative to pre-test. Higher values indicate better motor performance (practice day 1-5) or motor learning (24-hour and 35-day retention).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.09.23285669; this version posted February 11, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 4. Mean Trails Making Test-A (TMT-A) (left) and TMT-B (right) disaggregated by exercise (solid line), rest (dashed lines), stroke (blue) and healthy older adults (blue) participants.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.09.23285669; this version posted February 11, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 5. Mean number of target hits in object hit and avoid in healthy older adults (left) and stroke (right), disaggregated by exercise (solid lines), rest (dashed lines), and hand (orange: affected/non-dominant; purple: less affected/dominant).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.09.23285669; this version posted February 11, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 6. Mean number of distractor target hits in object hit and avoid for healthy older adults (left) and stroke (right) participants, disaggregated by exercise (solid lines), rest (dashed lines), and hand (orange: affected/non-dominant; purple: less affected/dominant).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.09.23285669; this version posted February 11, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

References

1. Cieza A, Causey K, Kamenov K, Hanson SW, Chatterji S, Vos T. Global estimates of the need for rehabilitation based on the Global Burden of Disease study 2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. The Lancet. 2020 Dec;396(10267):2006–17.

2. Kapoor A, Lanctôt KL, Bayley M, Kiss A, Herrmann N, Murray BJ, et al. "Good Outcome" Isn't Good Enough: Cognitive Impairment, Depressive Symptoms, and Social Restrictions in Physically Recovered Stroke Patients. Stroke. 2017 Jun;48(6):1688–90.

3. Ploughman M, McCarthy J, Bossé M, Sullivan HJ, Corbett D. Does Treadmill Exercise Improve Performance of Cognitive or Upper-Extremity Tasks in People With Chronic Stroke? A Randomized Cross-Over Trial. Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 2008 Nov;89(11):2041–7.

4. Quaney BM, Boyd LA, McDowd JM, Zahner LH, Jianghua He, Mayo MS, et al. Aerobic exercise improves cognition and motor function poststroke. Neurorehabil Neural Repair. 2009;

5. Ploughman M, Eskes GA, Kelly LP, Kirkland MC, Devasahayam AJ, Wallack EM, et al. Synergistic Benefits of Combined Aerobic and Cognitive Training on Fluid Intelligence and the Role of IGF-1 in Chronic Stroke. Neurorehabil Neural Repair. 2019 Mar;33(3):199–212.

6. Milani SA, Marsiske M, Cottler LB, Chen X, Striley CW. Optimal cutoffs for the Montreal Cognitive Assessment vary by race and ethnicity. Alzheimers Dement Diagn Assess Dis Monit. 2018 Jan;10(1):773–81.

7. Neva JL, Greeley B, Chau B, Ferris JK, Jones CB, Denyer R, et al. Acute High-Intensity Interval Exercise Modulates Corticospinal Excitability in OA. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2022 Apr;54(4):673–82.

8. Greeley B, Chau B, Jones CB, Neva JL, Kraeutner SN, Campbell KL, et al. Multiple bouts of high-intensity interval exercise reverse age-related functional connectivity disruptions without affecting motor learning in OA. Sci Rep. 2021;

9. Andrushko JW, Rinat S, Greeley B, Larssen BC, Jones CB, Rubino C, Denyer R, Ferris J, Campbell KL, Neva JL & Boyd LA (2023). Improved cognitive-motor processing speed and decreased functional connectivity after high intensity aerobic exercise in individuals with chronic stroke. *bioRxiv* 2023.01.15.523513.

10. Charalambous CC, Helm EE, Lau KA, Morton SM, Reisman DS. The feasibility of an acute high-intensity exercise bout to promote locomotor learning after stroke. Top Stroke Rehabil. 2018;

11. Sun Y, Ledwell NMH, Boyd LA, Zehr EP. Unilateral wrist extension training after stroke improves strength and neural plasticity in both arms. Exp Brain Res. 2018;

12. Vasquez BP, Zakzanis KK. The neuropsychological profile of vascular cognitive impairment not demented: A meta-analysis. J Neuropsychol. 2015 Mar;9(1):109–36.

13. Bourke TC, Lowrey CR, Dukelow SP, Bagg SD, Norman KE, Scott SH. A robot-based behavioural task to quantify impairments in rapid motor decisions and actions after stroke. J NeuroEngineering Rehabil. 2016 Dec;13(1):91.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.09.23285669; this version posted February 11, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

14. Hodics TM, Nakatsuka K, Upreti B, Alex A, Smith PS, Pezzullo JC. Wolf motor function test for characterizing moderate to severe hemiparesis in stroke patients. Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 2012 Nov;93(11):1963–7.

15. Lin JH, Hsueh IP, Sheu CF, Hsieh CL. Psychometric properties of the sensory scale of the Fugl-Meyer Assessment in stroke patients. Clin Rehabil. 2004 Jun;18(4):391–7.

16. Gamst G, Meyers LS, Guarino AJ, Gamst G, Meyers LS, Guarino AJ. ANOVA ASSUMPTIONS. In: Analysis of Variance Designs. 2012.

17. Diamond A, Ling DS. Conclusions about interventions, programs, and approaches for improving executive functions that appear justified and those that, despite much hype, do not. Dev Cogn Neurosci. 2016 Apr;18:34–48.

18. Fitts P, Posner M. Human performance. 1967.

19. Erickson KI, Prakash RS, Voss MW, Chaddock L, Hu L, Morris KS, et al. Aerobic fitness is associated with hippocampal volume in elderly humans. Hippocampus. 2009 Oct;19(10):1030–9.

20. Narasimhalu K, Ang S, De Silva DA, Wong MC, Chang HM, Chia KS, et al. The Prognostic Effects of Poststroke Cognitive Impairment No Dementia and Domain-Specific Cognitive Impairments in Nondisabled Ischemic Stroke Patients. Stroke. 2011 Apr;42(4):883–8.

21. Barker-Collo S, Feigin VL, Parag V, Lawes CMM, Senior H. Auckland Stroke Outcomes Study: Part 2: Cognition and functional outcomes 5 years poststroke. Neurology. 2010 Nov 2;75(18):1608–16.

22. Nepveu JF, Thiel A, Tang A, Fung J, Lundbye-Jensen J, Boyd LA, et al. A Single Bout of High-Intensity Interval Training Improves Motor Skill Retention in Individuals with Stroke. Neurorehabil Neural Repair. 2017;

23. Baird JF, Gaughan ME, Saffer HM, Sarzynski MA, Herter TM, Fritz SL, et al. The effect of energy-matched exercise intensity on brain-derived neurotrophic factor and motor learning. Neurobiol Learn Mem. 2018;

24. Mang CS, Snow NJ, Wadden KP, Campbell KL, Boyd LA. High-Intensity Aerobic Exercise Enhances Motor Memory Retrieval. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2016;

25. Statton MA, Encarnacion M, Celnik P, Bastian AJ. A single bout of moderate aerobic exercise improves motor skill acquisition. PLoS ONE. 2015;

26. Tomporowski PD, Pendleton DM. Effects of the timing of acute exercise and movement complexity on young adults' psychomotor learning. J Sport Exerc Psychol. 2018;

27. Thomas R, Johnsen LK, Geertsen SS, Christiansen L, Ritz C, Roig M, et al. Acute exercise and motor memory consolidation: The role of exercise intensity. PLoS ONE. 2016;

28. Opie GM, Semmler JG. Acute Exercise at Different Intensities Influences Corticomotor Excitability and Performance of a Ballistic Thumb Training Task. Neuroscience. 2019;