Trial of high-intensity gait training and step monitoring for stroke

Elizabeth D. Thompson, PT, PhD, NCS[1]; Ryan T. Pohlig, PhD[2]; T. George Hornby, PT, PhD, FAPTA[3,4]; Scott E. Kasner, MD[5]; Jonathan Raser-Schramm, MD[6]; Kiersten M. McCartney, PT[1,7]; Allison E. Miller, PT, PhD, NCS[8]; Christopher E. Henderson, PT, PhD, NCS[3,4]; Henry Wright, PT[1]; Tamara Wright, PT[1]; Darcy S. Reisman, PT, PhD, FAPTA[1,7]

[1]University of Delaware, Department of Physical Therapy, Newark, DE, USA
[2]University of Delaware, Biostatistics Core, Newark, DE, USA
[3]Indiana University, Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Indianapolis, IN, USA
[4]Rehabilitation Hospital of Indiana, Indianapolis, IN, USA
[5]University of Pennsylvania, Perelman School of Medicine, Philadelphia, PA, USA
[6]Christiana Care Health System, Newark, DE, USA
[7]University of Delaware, Biomechanics and Movement Science (BIOMS) program, Newark, DE, USA
[8]Washington University School of Medicine, Program in Physical Therapy, St. Louis, MO, USA

Corresponding author:
Darcy Reisman, PT, PhD, FAPTA
University of Delaware Physical Therapy Dept
540 S. College Ave
Newark, DE 19713
Email: dreisman@udel.edu
Phone: 302-831-0508

Keywords: walking, stroke, high-intensity gait, step activity monitoring, treadmill

ABSTRACT

Background: Physical inactivity in people with chronic stroke has a profound effect on daily function and increases the risk of devastating cardiovascular complications.

Methods: We performed a multi-site assessor-blinded clinical trial involving 250 participants >6 months post-stroke who were randomly assigned to high-intensity walking training only (FAST), step activity monitoring only (SAM), or a combination protocol (FAST+SAM), for 12 weeks, with 2-3 sessions/week. FAST interventions included treadmill and overground walking while maximizing time spent in a target heart rate range. SAM interventions included progressive daily stepping goals and motivational interviewing and advisement. The primary outcome was the change in steps per day, and key secondary outcomes were self-selected walking speed and the 6-minute walk test.

Results: Among 250 randomized participants, average steps/day significantly increased from baseline in both the SAM (1548±269, $p<0.001$) and FAST+SAM groups (1305±281, $p<0.001$), but not in the FAST group (438±241, $p=0.07$). All three groups significantly improved endurance on the 6-minute walk test, but only FAST and FAST+SAM reached clinical significance.

Conclusions: A step activity monitoring and motivational interviewing program successfully increased steps per day in individuals with chronic stroke. However, our step monitoring program alone did not lead to a clinically meaningful change in walking endurance, illustrating the importance of both step monitoring and walking capacity training to increase physical activity and prevent debilitating future complications in people with chronic stroke. (ClinicalTrials.gov number NCT02835313)

INTRODUCTION

Over seven million Americans have survived an initial stroke,[1] making it one of the leading causes of disability in the U.S. and worldwide.[1] Many have persistent neurological deficits, leading to difficulties in walking, decreased independence,[2] and reduced physical activity, which further increases the risk of cardiovascular disease, recurrent stroke, and all-cause mortality.[1,3–7] Determining effective strategies to help those living with chronic stroke increase their physical activity is likely critical to improving their health and reducing mortality.

Poor walking capacity, such as decreased speed or endurance, limits home and community mobility, leading many intervention studies to focus on improving these elements of walking capacity.[8–14] This work has shown improvements in walking capacity with high-intensity training. However, few previous studies have measured daily stepping in this population, and an increase in real-world walking activity is rarely seen.[9,10,15]

Behavioral interventions like step monitoring programs, including tracking walking activity with worn accelerometers and goal setting, may be effective in increasing steps/day in many populations,[16] including one pilot study in chronic stroke.[17] A subsequent feasibility and preliminary efficacy study of a combined high intensity walking program and step activity monitoring program in people with chronic stroke found those with low levels of baseline steps per day had greater improvements with the combined intervention compared to high intensity walking alone.[18]

We aimed to examine the individual and combined effects of high-intensity walking training and step monitoring on real-world steps/day in people with chronic stroke. We hypothesized the combined program would yield a greater increase in step activity than either intervention alone.

METHODS

Trial Design

This multi-site assessor-blind randomized controlled trial was conducted at University of Delaware, Christiana Care Health System, University of Pennsylvania, and Indiana University. Participants were enrolled from July 2016-November 2021. The study was approved by all institutional review boards and registered at ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT02835313), with the protocol published.[19]

Participant Enrollment and Testing

Participants provided informed consent and met the inclusion criteria as follows: 1) age 21-85 years, 2) ≥6 months post-stroke, 3) able to walk without therapist assistance (assistive devices and orthotics permitted), 4) self-selected walking speeds 0.3 m/s-1.0 m/s, 5) average steps/day <8,000, 6) resting heart rate (HR) 40 -100 beats per minute, 7) resting blood pressure (BP) 90/60 -170/90. Exclusion criteria included: 1) evidence of cerebellar stroke, 2) other neurological deficits unrelated to stroke, 3) lower limb botulinum toxin injection ≤4 months previous, 4) currently in physical therapy, 5) unable to walk outside the home prior to stroke, 6) coronary artery bypass graft, stent placement, or myocardial infarction ≤3 months previous, 7) inability to communicate with

investigators, 8) score >1 on question 1b and >0 on question 1c on the NIH Stroke Scale (See Figure 1).[19]

Both pre- (PRE) and post-intervention (POST) clinical evaluations included resting BP, HR, body mass index (BMI), completing the Charlson Comorbidity Index, 10-meter walk test at self-selected (SSWS) and fast walking speeds, 6-minute walk test (6MWT), Activities-specific Balance Confidence scale, 9-item Patient Health Questionnaire, and Montreal Cognitive Assessment. PRE included a treadmill acclimation test,[19] and POST included a Global Rate of Change scale. At subsequent appointments during both PRE and POST, participants completed a fasting blood draw, and a symptom-limited treadmill graded exercise test (GXT).[19] During the evaluation period, participants were issued a Fitbit™ One or Zip (Google LLC, San Francisco, CA, USA), to collect steps/day for at least three full days.[20–22] Fitbits were worn on the non-paretic ankle.

Following initial evaluations, 250 participants were randomly assigned to one of the following groups:[19] 1) high intensity walking training alone (FAST), 2) step activity monitoring alone (SAM), or 3) combined high intensity walking training and step activity monitoring (FAST+SAM) (Figure 1). Participants were assigned using a random allocation sequence and concealed allocation. Group assignment was kept in sealed envelopes opened by the study coordinator and communicated directly to the training physical therapist. Therapists who assessed outcomes were blinded to training group assignment, and the biostatistician was blinded until primary and secondary analyses were completed. All participants who completed pre-intervention evaluations and were randomized were included in the intent-to-treat analysis.

The primary outcome was a change in steps per day after the intervention. Secondary outcomes were change in SSWS or 6MWT between PRE and POST evaluations.

At each study visit, participants were asked if they experienced adverse events (AEs) including pain, falls, or illness, since the previous session. During exercise testing and training, participant vital signs and other observed symptoms were monitored, as defined at the study start.[19] AEs were categorized as minor/serious, expected/unexpected, and study-related/not related.

Training Interventions

The attendance goal for all 3 arms was up to 36 sessions (~3x/week for 12 weeks), with participants classified as completing training if they attended at least 24 sessions.

FAST walking training (FAST and FAST+SAM groups)

Participants receiving FAST training completed up to 30 minutes/session of treadmill walking and 10 minutes of overground activities, all while maximizing time within their Target Heart Rate (THR) range. THR range was calculated as: ((max HR during GXT - resting HR) × 70-80%) + resting HR.[23] All treadmill walking was completed with an overhead chest-harness system for safety, which provided no body weight support. Participants were allowed to use handrails as needed throughout treadmill walking. The training speed was reduced if the: 1) participant requested to walk slower, 2) fast speed was no longer safe (e.g. increased toe scuffing or tripping), 3) participant reported a rate of perceived exertion (RPE) of ≥17 on the Borg RPE Scale,[24] or 4) THR range was

exceeded. If this occurred, treadmill speed was lowered until HR returned to, ((max HR found on GXT – resting HR) × 50-60%) + resting HR,[23] or RPE ≤13.

Overground activities were performed with the participant's usual assistive device. The goal was to practice important everyday community walking activities (e.g. turning, backward stepping, stair climbing, carrying objects). Participants were guarded, and activities progressed throughout training. Treadmill incline was adjusted or weights were added as needed to keep heart rate in THR range during all walking.

Step activity monitoring (SAM and FAST+SAM groups)

Step activity monitoring included individualized goal-setting for steps/day and coaching to improve daily stepping. Participants in SAM or FAST+SAM groups were provided with a Fitbit to track steps/day. Therapists used baseline step activity data from PRE to determine individualized step activity goals in consultation with the participant. Participants were encouraged to achieve their step goal on each non-training day. Step activity between sessions was reviewed at the next session. Participants were told whether their steps/day reached their activity goal. If the step goal was achieved regularly, it was increased (every 4-6 sessions). If not, individualized strategies were identified to increase activity and overcome barriers using a motivational interviewing framework.[25,26] Step goal increases averaged 5-8%. Once a participant attained 8,000 steps per day, their goal was to maintain this level of walking activity.

Statistical Analyses

Data were analyzed by RP and ET using an intent-to-treat approach, consistent with the previously-established analysis plan,[19] using SPSS version 27 (IBM, Chicago, IL, USA). The intended sample size (225, 75 in each group) and power calculations indicated sufficient power ($1-\beta \geq 0.90$) to detect difference of 1700 steps per day over time among intervention groups.[19]

Participant characteristics were compared across groups at baseline using separate one-way ANOVAs for continuous variables and Fisher exact tests for categorical variables (Table 1). Per the pre-specified analysis plan,[19] any characteristic significantly different among groups was included as a covariate in the model to adjust for the difference. BMI was determined to be a significant covariate, with the SAM group's BMI being higher than the FAST or FAST+SAM groups' ($p<.05$, ${}_p\eta^2=.03$); therefore it was added to the model analyzing primary and secondary outcome variables.

A one-way ANOVA was used to compare the number of training sessions completed for each treatment group. Additionally, the average number of minutes walking on the treadmill per session and the percentage of treadmill time in the THR range were compared for the FAST versus FAST+SAM groups. The average number of Fitbit-wearing days per week and percentage of Fitbit-wearing days on which the steps/day goal was achieved were compared for the SAM versus FAST+SAM groups.

Primary and secondary outcomes were assessed via separate General Linear Mixed Models to detect possible main effects of group, time, or group-by-time interactions. The best fitting covariance matrix, compound symmetric, was chosen to provide the best fit

as determined by examining the Akaike information criterion (AIC) and Bayesian information criterion (BIC). The Satterthwaite approximation was used for degrees of freedom. The models used robust errors (Hubert-White) to account for mild departures of normality. Maximum likelihood estimation was used to obtain estimates in the presence of missing data without listwise deletion of the case. We attempted to include site as a random effect, but this resulted in model non-convergence, possibly due to the lower number of sites (4). Therefore, we tested site as a fixed effect, but it was non-significant for all analyses and results are reported without it.

RESULTS

A total of 2385 individuals were screened for this study (Figure 1), 596 enrolled, 346 were excluded or withdrawn prior to randomization, and the remaining 250 were randomized. There were no significant differences in baseline characteristics among groups (Table 1).

Training Fidelity

With intent-to-treat analysis, variables of training (average treadmill minutes walked/session, average Fitbit-wearing days/week, percentage of treadmill minutes in THR range, and percentage of Fitbit-wearing days on which step goals were achieved) and sessions attended are presented in Table 2. There was no between-group difference for number of sessions attended ($F(2,233)=0.81$, $p=0.45$), average treadmill walking minutes/session ($t(155)=0.41$, $p=0.68$), percentage of treadmill minutes in THR

range (t(155)=-0.50, p=0.62), or percentage of Fitbit-wearing days on which goals were achieved (t(151)=1.03, p=0.31). The FAST+SAM group wore their Fitbits significantly fewer days/week than the SAM group (t(151)=3.12, p=0.002; Cohen's d=0.51, effect size 95% CI=0.18-0.83).

Primary outcome (steps/day)

For the primary outcome (steps/day), there was a significant interaction effect observed, where the change over time among groups was different, (F(2,174)=5.33, p=0.006,f^2=0.01) (Figure 2).The main effect of time was significant (F(1,175)=51.94, p<0.001, f^2=0.01), and main effects of group and BMI were not significant (p>0.48 for both). The SAM group significantly increased their steps/day from PRE to POST (Δsteps/day=1548, SE=268.87 (95%CI: 1016.80-2078.96), F(1,157)=33.14, p<0.001), as did the FAST+SAM group (Δsteps/day=1305, SE=281.10 (95%CI: 749.70-1860.51), F(1,151)=21.56, p<0.001). The FAST group did not significantly increase steps/day (Δsteps/day=438, SE=241.08 (95%CI: -36.60-913.15), F(1,244)=3.31, p=0.07). The difference in steps/day change between the SAM and FAST+SAM groups was not significant (F(1,115)=0.43, p=0.51).

Secondary outcomes (6MWT and SSWS)

For 6MWT, the main effect of time was significant, (F(1,160)=86.80, p<0.001, f^2<0.001), with increases in 6MWT distance, Δ6MWT=40.2m, SE=8.31 (95%CI: 23.67-56.68). However, changes across groups were not different (F(2,167)=2.25, p=0.11, f^2<0.001) (see Figure 3a-3b). The FAST group's increase: Δ6MWT=43.3m, SE=5.73 (95%CI: 32.00-54.54). The FAST+SAM group's increase: Δ6MWT=40.2m, SE=8.31 (95%CI:

23.67-56.68). The SAM group's increase: Δ6MWT=26.2m, SE=6.06 (95%CI: 14.20-38.04). BMI was significantly positively related to 6MWT in this model (b=1.57, SE=0.60, 95%CI: 0.39-2.76, F(1,438)=6.82, p=0.009).

For SSWS, the main effect of time was significant (F(1,180)=187.98, p<0.001, f^2<0.001), with increases in SSWS, ΔSSWS=0.14m/s, SE=0.017 (95%CI: 0.10-0.17). However, changes across groups were not different (F(2,180)=0.63, p=0.53, f^2<0.001) (see Figure 3c-3d). The FAST group's increase: ΔSSWS=0.14m/s, SE=0.016 (95%CI: 0.11-0.17). The FAST+SAM group's increase: ΔSSWS=0.14m/s, SE=0.017 (95%CI: 0.10-0.17). The SAM group's increase was: ΔSSWS=0.12m/s, SE=0.016 (95%CI: 0.08-0.15). BMI was significantly positively related to SSWS in this model (b=0.005, SE=0.001, 95%CI: 0.002-0.007, F(1,438)=12.08, p<0.001).

Adverse events (AEs)

There were no serious study-related AEs (Table 3). Seven minor study-related AEs were reported (muscle pain/soreness (n=5), dizziness/fainting (n=1) and falls (n=1)). Eleven serious non-study-related AEs were reported (fracture (n=1) and hospitalizations (n=10)). The majority of AEs were minor and non-study-related (n=63), (falls (n=43), muscle pain/soreness (n=10), COVID-19 (n=3) or other illness (n=7)). Non-study-related totals for falls and muscle pain/soreness reflect some participants sustaining the same event multiple times.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine the individual and combined effects of a high-intensity walking program and step monitoring program on real-world step activity in people with chronic stroke, as providing interventions targeting both walking capacity and physical activity is rarely performed in individuals post-stroke. The primary outcome, steps/day, was significantly increased in the SAM and FAST+SAM groups, suggesting that a behavioral intervention integrating step activity monitoring with skilled coaching and goal progression was needed to observe gains in physical activity. The FAST results, by contrast, are in line with most previous studies that did not incorporate a step activity monitoring program, and found either no change[9,10,27] or smaller gains immediately post-intervention.[8,28,29]

Accordingly, our hypothesis that FAST+SAM would improve steps/day more than either the FAST or SAM intervention alone was partially supported by these results. FAST+SAM did not show a greater increase than SAM, despite the additional capacity-building training FAST+SAM received. This may be due to FAST+SAM performing less stepping activity outside training sessions, perhaps due to fatigue from their dual protocol or prioritizing treadmill sessions over their daily monitored step activity. Though we did not systematically assess fatigue, this idea is supported by the fact that FAST+SAM participants wore their Fitbits for fewer days per week than SAM participants.

When comparing groups on secondary outcomes of walking capacity, FAST+SAM and FAST saw similar improvements in 6MWT (43.3 and 40.2 m respectively), with smaller changes in SAM (26.1m). The gains in FAST+SAM and FAST approximated the minimal clinically important difference (MCID) range for 6MWT in those with chronic stroke or related populations (34-50m[30–32]) and the minimal detectable change (MDC_{90}) for 6MWT in those with chronic stroke (34-43m[33,34]). Conversely, the SAM group's change falls below these estimates. These results suggest participants in the FAST+SAM group experienced a potentially clinically relevant improvement in both step activity *and* walking capacity. This dual change was not demonstrated by either single-intervention group.

Our results suggest groups that received a behavioral intervention aimed at improving daily step activity (SAM and FAST+SAM) demonstrated improvements in steps/day, while not providing that intervention (i.e. FAST group) does not yield similar gains. Similarly, groups that received walking training aimed at improving capacity (FAST and FAST+SAM) saw meaningful improvements in the 6MWT, whereas the group that did not receive this intervention (SAM) did not. In people with chronic stroke, results indicate walking interventions are best targeted to the desired outcome[35] and it cannot be assumed that an intervention aimed at one outcome will translate into improvements in the other.

The sample size for this study was calculated to detect a significant change in steps/day at 90% power, and may have limited our ability to detect changes among our secondary

outcomes (SSWS and 6MWT). Additionally, overall results did not fully support our hypothesis that the combined intervention (FAST+SAM) would lead to a greater steps/day change than either intervention alone. Given the heterogeneity in this population, further planned analysis will be conducted to identify characteristics of participants who benefited more from the combined intervention in terms of walking capacity, step activity, or both.

In conclusion, individuals with chronic stroke who completed a program emphasizing daily step activity through monitoring, individualized goals, guidance and coaching demonstrated significant real world step activity improvement. Clinically meaningful improvements in walking capacity were observed in the groups receiving high intensity walking training. Only the FAST+SAM group achieved both improved step activity and clinically meaningful improvement in walking capacity. Strategies that improve both walking capacity and physical activity could decrease the risk of costly and debilitating complications in people with chronic stroke.

REFERENCES

1. Virani SS, Alonso A, Benjamin EJ, et al. Heart Disease and Stroke Statistics—2020 Update: A Report From the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2020;141(9). doi:10.1161/CIR.0000000000000757
2. Mayo NE, Wood-Dauphinee S, Côté R, Durcan L, Carlton J. Activity, participation, and quality of life 6 months poststroke. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*. 2002;83(8):1035-1042. doi:10.1053/apmr.2002.33984
3. Michael KM, Allen JK, Macko RF. Reduced Ambulatory Activity After Stroke: The Role of Balance, Gait, and Cardiovascular Fitness. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*. 2005;86(8):1552-1556. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2004.12.026
4. English C, Manns PJ, Tucak C, Bernhardt J. Physical Activity and Sedentary Behaviors in People With Stroke Living in the Community: A Systematic Review. *Physical Therapy*. 2014;94(2):185-196. doi:10.2522/ptj.20130175
5. Michael K, Macko RF. Ambulatory Activity Intensity Profiles, Fitness, and Fatigue in Chronic Stroke. *Topics in Stroke Rehabilitation*. 2007;14(2):5-12. doi:10.1310/tsr1402-5
6. Billinger SA, Arena R, Bernhardt J, et al. Physical Activity and Exercise Recommendations for Stroke Survivors: A Statement for Healthcare Professionals From the American Heart Association/American Stroke Association. *Stroke*. 2014;45(8):2532-2553. doi:10.1161/STR.0000000000000022
7. MacKay-Lyons M, Billinger SA, Eng JJ, et al. Aerobic Exercise Recommendations to Optimize Best Practices in Care After Stroke: AEROBICS 2019 Update. *Physical Therapy*. Published online October 9, 2019:pzz153. doi:10.1093/ptj/pzz153
8. Moore JL, Roth EJ, Killian C, Hornby TG. Locomotor Training Improves Daily Stepping Activity and Gait Efficiency in Individuals Poststroke Who Have Reached a “Plateau” in Recovery. *Stroke*. 2010;41(1):129-135. doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.109.563247
9. Mudge S, Barber PA, Stott NS. Circuit-Based Rehabilitation Improves Gait Endurance but Not Usual Walking Activity in Chronic Stroke: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*. 2009;90(12):1989-1996. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2009.07.015
10. Bowden MG, Behrman AL, Neptune RR, Gregory CM, Kautz SA. Locomotor Rehabilitation of Individuals With Chronic Stroke: Difference Between Responders and Nonresponders. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*. 2013;94(5):856-862. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2012.11.032
11. Mehta S, Pereira S, Viana R, et al. Resistance Training for Gait Speed and Total Distance Walked During the Chronic Stage of Stroke: A Meta-Analysis. *Topics in Stroke Rehabilitation*. 2012;19(6):471-478. doi:10.1310/tsr1906-471
12. Saunders DH, Sanderson M, Hayes S, et al. Physical fitness training for stroke patients. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2016;2016(3):CD003316. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD003316.pub6
13. Reisman DS, Binder-MacLeod S, Farquhar WB. Changes in Metabolic Cost of Transport Following Locomotor Training Poststroke. *Topics in Stroke Rehabilitation*. 2013;20(2):161-170. doi:10.1310/tsr2002-161
14. Boyne P, Billinger SA, Reisman DS, et al. *A Multicenter Randomized Comparison of High-Intensity Interval Training and Moderate-Intensity Exercise to Recover Walking Post-Stroke: Results of the HIT-Stroke Trial*. Rehabilitation Medicine and Physical Therapy; 2022. doi:10.1101/2022.08.01.22278246
15. Danks KA, Pohlig RT, Roos M, Wright TR, Reisman DS. Relationship Between Walking Capacity, Biopsychosocial Factors, Self-efficacy, and Walking Activity in Persons Poststroke: *Journal of Neurologic Physical Therapy*. 2016;40(4):232-238. doi:10.1097/NPT.0000000000000143

16. Bravata DM, Smith-Spangler C, Sundaram V, et al. Using Pedometers to Increase Physical Activity and Improve HealthA Systematic Review. *JAMA*. 2007;298(19):2296-2304. doi:10.1001/jama.298.19.2296
17. Danks KA, Roos MA, McCoy D, Reisman DS. A step activity monitoring program improves real world walking activity post stroke. *Disability and Rehabilitation*. 2014;36(26):2233-2236. doi:10.3109/09638288.2014.903303
18. Danks KA, Pohlig R, Reisman DS. Combining Fast-Walking Training and a Step Activity Monitoring Program to Improve Daily Walking Activity After Stroke: A Preliminary Study. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*. 2016;97(9):S185-S193. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2016.01.039
19. Wright H, Wright T, Pohlig RT, Kasner SE, Raser-Schramm J, Reisman D. Protocol for promoting recovery optimization of walking activity in stroke (PROWALKS): a randomized controlled trial. *BMC Neurol*. 2018;18(1):39. doi:10.1186/s12883-018-1044-1
20. Tudor-Locke C, Bassett DR. How Many Steps/Day Are Enough?: Preliminary Pedometer Indices for Public Health. *Sports Medicine*. 2004;34(1):1-8. doi:10.2165/00007256-200434010-00001
21. Feehan LM, Geldman J, Sayre EC, et al. Accuracy of Fitbit Devices: Systematic Review and Narrative Syntheses of Quantitative Data. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth*. 2018;6(8):e10527. doi:10.2196/10527
22. Klassen TD, Semrau JA, Dukelow SP, Bayley MT, Hill MD, Eng JJ. Consumer-Based Physical Activity Monitor as a Practical Way to Measure Walking Intensity During Inpatient Stroke Rehabilitation. *Stroke*. 2017;48(9):2614-2617. doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.117.018175
23. Whaley M, Armstrong L. *ACSM's Guidelines for Exercise Testing and Prescription*. 7th ed. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 2006.
24. Borg G. Ratings of perceived exertion and heart rates during short-term cycle exercise and their use in a new cycling strength test. *Int J Sports Med*. 1982;3(3):153-158.
25. Miller WR, Rollnick S. Meeting in the middle: motivational interviewing and self-determination theory. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*. 2012;9:25. doi:10.1186/1479-5868-9-25
26. Burke BL, Arkowitz H, Menchola M. The efficacy of motivational interviewing: a meta-analysis of controlled clinical trials. *J Consult Clin Psychol*. 2003;71(5):843-861. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.71.5.843
27. Michael K, Goldberg AP, Treuth MS, Beans J, Normandt P, Macko RF. Progressive Adaptive Physical Activity in Stroke Improves Balance, Gait, and Fitness: Preliminary Results. *Topics in Stroke Rehabilitation*. 2009;16(2):133-139. doi:10.1310/tsr1602-133
28. Hornby TG, Plawecki A, Lotter JK, Scofield ME, Lucas E, Henderson CE. Gains in Daily Stepping Activity in People With Chronic Stroke After High-Intensity Gait Training in Variable Contexts. *Physical Therapy*. 2022;102(8):pzac073. doi:10.1093/ptj/pzac073
29. Holleran CL, Straube DD, Kinnaird CR, Leddy AL, Hornby TG. Feasibility and Potential Efficacy of High-Intensity Stepping Training in Variable Contexts in Subacute and Chronic Stroke. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2014;28(7):643-651. doi:10.1177/1545968314521001
30. Bohannon RW, Crouch R. Minimal clinically important difference for change in 6-minute walk test distance of adults with pathology: a systematic review. *J Eval Clin Pract*. 2017;23(2):377-381. doi:10.1111/jep.12629
31. Perera S, Mody SH, Woodman RC, Studenski SA. Meaningful Change and Responsiveness in Common Physical Performance Measures in Older Adults: MEANINGFUL CHANGE AND PERFORMANCE. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. 2006;54(5):743-749. doi:10.1111/j.1532-5415.2006.00701.x
32. Tang A, Eng JJ, Rand D. Relationship Between Perceived and Measured Changes in Walking After Stroke. *Journal of Neurologic Physical Therapy*. 2012;36(3):115-121. doi:10.1097/NPT.0b013e318262dbd0

33. Eng JJ, Dawson AS, Chu KS. Submaximal exercise in persons with stroke: test-retest reliability and concurrent validity with maximal oxygen consumption11No commercial party having a direct financial interest in the results of the research supporting this article has or will confer a benefit upon the author(s) or upon any organization with which the author(s) is/are associated. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*. 2004;85(1):113-118. doi:10.1016/S0003-9993(03)00436-2
34. Flansbjer, Ulla-Britt J, Holmbäck AM, Downham D, Patten C, Lexell J. Reliability of gait performance tests in men and women with hemiparesis after stroke. *Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine*. 2005;37(2):75-82. doi:10.1080/16501970410017215
35. Hornby TG, Reisman DS, Ward IG, et al. Clinical Practice Guideline to Improve Locomotor Function Following Chronic Stroke, Incomplete Spinal Cord Injury, and Brain Injury. *Journal of Neurologic Physical Therapy*. 2020;44(1):49-100. doi:10.1097/NPT.0000000000000303

Figure 1. CONSORT diagram. PT denotes physical therapy, GXT graded exercise test.



Table 1. Baseline participant characteristics.

BASELINE PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS (either by mean (SD) or N (%))			
	FAST alone (n=89)	**SAM alone (n=81)**	**FAST + SAM (n=80)**
Age, years	63.98 (11.96)	62.16 (12.91)	62.10 (13.07)
Time since stroke, months	46.12 (62.25)	46.77 (73.22)	42.73 (48.75)
Body mass index	29.79 (6.39)	31.58 (7.05)	30.13 (5.45)
Self-selected gait speed, m/s	0.71 (0.20)	0.68 (0.22)	0.68 (0.22)
6-minute walk test distance, m	295.55 (113.19)	279.20 (110.10)	283.10 (122.19)
Steps per day	3959 (2021)	3845 (2192)	3768 (2074)
Females, N (%)	41 (46.07%)	39 (48.15%)	36 (45.00%)
Race, N (%)			
Native American/Alaskan native	4 (4.49%)	4 (4.94%)	3 (3.75%)
Asian	8 (8.99%)	2 (2.47%)	4 (5.00%)
Native Hawaiian/Pacific islander	0	0	0
Black/African-American	24 (26.97%)	27 (33.33%)	21 (26.25%)
White	57 (64.04%)	52 (64.20%)	55 (68.75%)
Multiple races	5 (5.62%)	5 (6.17%)	6 (7.50%)
Prefer not to identify race	1 (1.12%)	0	1 (1.25%)
Hispanic/Latinx ethnicity, N (%)	5 (5.62%)	2 (2.57%)	3 (3.75%)
Side of hemiparesis, N (%)			
Left	43 (48.31%)	42 (51.85%)	39 (48.75%)
Right	43 (48.31%)	34 (41.98%)	37 (46.25%)
Neither/both affected	3 (3.37%)	5 (6.17%)	4 (5.00%)
Assistive device use, N (%)	46 (51.69%)	47 (58.02%)	36 (45.00%)
Orthotic device use, N (%)	21 (23.60%)	25 (30.86%)	22 (27.50%)

Table 2. Comparison of training in single-intervention groups (FAST, SAM) versus the combined group (FAST+SAM). All three groups on average reached the intervention target of 24 sessions to indicate completion of the assigned treatment protocol. Only one between-group difference was found: participants in the FAST+SAM group wore their Fitbits significantly fewer days per week during training than those in the SAM group.

TRAINING COMPARISON (mean(SD))

	FAST	**SAM**	**FAST+SAM**	***p*-value**
Sessions attended	26.1 (7.90)	24.5 (6.87)	25.5 (9.20)	$p = 0.45$
Ave treadmill minutes walked/session	28.5 (2.59)	--	28.3 (2.80)	$p = 0.68$
% of treadmill minutes spent in THR range	53.8 (22.5)	--	55.6 (22.6)	$p = 0.62$
Ave Fitbit-wearing days/week	--	4.40 (0.71)	3.96 (0.98)	$p = 0.002$
% of Fitbit-wearing days on which step goal was achieved	--	69.2 (23.4)	65.1 (26.3)	$p = 0.31$

Figure 2. Primary outcome: Change in steps/day by group. a) Steps/day mean values by group (error bars denote standard error). SAM and FAST+SAM groups increased significantly ($^{+}p<0.001$ for each group), while FAST alone did not ($p=0.07$). b) Magnitude of steps/day change for each group (as mean(SE)).



Figure 3. Secondary outcomes, by group. a) 6MWT mean values by group (error bars denote standard error). All groups increased significantly ($^{+}p<0.001$ for each group). b) Change in 6MWT distance. c) SSWS mean values by group (error bars denote standard error). All groups increased significantly ($^{+}p<0.001$ for each group). d) Change in self-selected walking speed.



Table 3. Adverse events by group. Due to some participants experiencing falls or muscle pain/soreness multiple times, all data are presented both as the raw number of events per category, and the percentages of participants in each group who experienced that event. With non-study-related falls, for example, 14 falls in the FAST group were sustained by five people, seven falls in the SAM group were sustained by three people, and two falls in the FAST+SAM group were sustained by one person.

ADVERSE EVENTS BETWEEN RANDOMIZATION AND POST-TESTING
(number of events, % of participants in the group experiencing that event)

	FAST	SAM	FAST + SAM
SERIOUS ADVERSE EVENTS			
No serious adverse events were judged to be study-related.			
Not study-related			
Recurrent stroke	0	0	0
Myocardial infarction	0	0	0
Fracture	1 (1.12%)	0	0
Hospitalization	3 (3.37%)	1 (1.23%)	6 (7.50%)
Death	0	0	0
Significant incapacity to ADLs lasting > 48 hours	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0
TOTAL	**4**	**1**	**6**
MINOR ADVERSE EVENTS			
Study-related			
Falls	1 (1.12%)	0	0
Dyspnea	0	0	0
Open sore/blister/cut	0	0	0
Muscle pain/soreness lasting > 48 hours	3 (3.37%)	0	2 (2.50%)
Dizziness/fainting	1 (1.12%)	0	0
Diaphoresis	0	0	0
COVID-19 illness	0	0	0
Other illness	0	0	0
TOTAL	**5**	**0**	**2**
Not study-related			
Falls	25 (14.60%)	9 (7.40%)	9 (10.00%)
Dyspnea	0	0	0
Open sore/blister/cut	0	0	0
Muscle pain/soreness lasting > 48 hours	6 (6.74%)	2 (2.47%)	2 (2.50%)
Dizziness/fainting	0	0	0
Diaphoresis	0	0	0
COVID-19 illness	2 (2.25%)	1 (1.23%)	0
Other illness	3 (3.37%)	3 (3.70%)	1 (1.25%)
TOTAL	**36**	**15**	**12**