

1 **Single-Session Feasibility of a Wearable Music-based Rhythmic Auditory Stimulation**
2 **Device to Improve Walking in Knee Osteoarthritis**

3 *Yiwen Yang, SPT**; *Michele Okamura, SPT**; *Ehyun Kim, MS*; *Deepak Kumar, PT, PhD*

4 **These authors contributed equally*

5 Department of Physical Therapy, Boston University, Boston, MA, United States

6

7 **Corresponding author**

8 Deepak Kumar

9 kumard@bu.edu

10 617-358-3037

11 635 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, MA 02215

12

13 **Word count:** 4,036

14

15 **Source of Funding:** Funding for this study was provided by MedRhythms Inc. and Boston
16 University Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program.

17 **Conflicts of Interest:** Dr. Kumar received funding for this work from MedRhythms, Inc.
18 MedRhythms was not involved in study design, data analysis, data interpretation, or manuscript
19 preparation. No MedRhythms employees or affiliates are authors on this work. Publication of
20 this manuscript was not contingent upon approval from MedRhythms.

21

22 **Running title:** Digital music-based RAS for Knee OA

23 **ABSTRACT**

24 **Objective:** We examined the single-session feasibility of a wearable device to deliver a closed-
25 loop music-based rhythmic auditory stimulation (RAS) walking intervention in people with knee
26 osteoarthritis (OA).

27 **Methods:** Fifteen participants with knee OA (age 70.0 ± 8.6 years; BMI 29.4 ± 5.9 kg/m²; 10
28 women) complete a supervised 30-minute walking session using a wearable music-based RAS
29 device. The device included shoe-worn inertial sensors, headphones, and a proprietary algorithm
30 embedded in a touchscreen control unit. The algorithm continuously assessed users' gait and
31 adjusted the tempo of the selected music to encourage improvements in gait quality.
32 Spatiotemporal gait measures were collected using separate inertial sensors during the session.
33 We examined change in gait during the session, participant's report of exertion, and participant-
34 reported acceptability.

35 **Results:** On average, participants showed ~12%, 30%, and 15% increases in cadence, gait speed,
36 and stride length, respectively without worsening variability or symmetry from before to during
37 the RAS session. Of the 15 participants, 9/15, 11/15, and 9/15 showed $\geq 10\%$ increase in
38 cadence, gait speed, and stride length, respectively. Rating of Perceived Exertion was on average
39 13.3 (range 12-15). There were no serious adverse events and small increase in knee pain that
40 resolved at the end of the session. Participants were highly accepting of the device and willing to
41 use it at home for longer periods.

42 **Conclusion:** A single-session feasibility study of a wearable closed-loop music-based RAS
43 device in people with knee OA demonstrated increases in cadence and gait speed while safely
44 walking at a moderate exercise intensity under supervision.

45 **Keywords:** gait speed; cadence; digital therapeutic; knee pain; therapeutic exercise

46 INTRODUCTION

47 People with knee osteoarthritis (**OA**) experience impairments in both quality and quantity of
48 walking. In terms of quality, altered gait patterns, including low cadence, slow gait speed, and
49 alterations of knee kinematics, kinetics, and muscle activation, are all well-known characteristics
50 of knee OA (1-5). These gait alterations can worsen both structural and symptomatic course of
51 knee OA (3, 6-8). Deficits in walking quantity are also ubiquitous with individuals with knee
52 pain walking 28% fewer steps/day on average compared to people without knee pain and over
53 50% of men and nearly 80% of women with or at risk of knee OA not meeting physical activity
54 guidelines (9). Given that regular physical activity is a core recommendation for managing knee
55 pain, reductions in physical activity can worsen knee pain leading to a vicious cycle (10, 11).
56 Hence, there is a need for innovative interventions that can address deficits in both quality and
57 quantity of walking in people with knee OA. However, such interventions currently do not exist.

58 We have previously reported that walking with low cadence, i.e., taking fewer steps per
59 minute, is related to increased risk of worsening pain and physical function in people with knee
60 OA (12). Walking with higher cadence could not only improve walking quality but also evoke a
61 metabolic response consistent with light-to-moderate intensity exercise (13). As such, strategies
62 to increase walking cadence could address impairments in both quality and quantity of walking
63 for people with knee OA. Rhythmic auditory stimulation (**RAS**) is an approach that has been
64 successfully used to improve walking related disability in people with neurological conditions
65 (14-18). RAS interventions provide an external auditory cue (e.g., metronome) and rely on
66 auditory-motor entrainment to achieve an improvement in walking performance. Auditory-motor
67 entrainment refers to an involuntary synchronization of motor and auditory rhythms due to the
68 entrainment of the neurons in the motor cortex via direct connections between the auditory and

69 motor regions of the brain (14, 19, 20). A Cochrane review reported that RAS improves cadence
70 (10.8 steps/min), gait speed (0.09 m/s), and stride length (0.12 m) when compared to usual
71 therapy or gait retraining, in people with stroke (15). In people with Parkinson’s disease, RAS
72 has been reported to improve gait speed and stride length with variable effects on cadence (21,
73 22). RAS has also been used effectively in people with traumatic brain injury, multiple sclerosis,
74 and cerebral palsy (23-25). However, RAS has not been examined as an intervention to increase
75 walking cadence in people with knee OA.

76 While RAS is typically delivered using a metronome, using music as the auditory cue can
77 further enhance the effects of RAS (26-33). Music itself has also been explored as an
78 intervention for chronic pain; while the specific mechanisms by which music alleviates pain are
79 not fully elucidated, music is thought to modulate the activity in the pain and emotion networks
80 of the brain (34-37). Music also evokes hedonic responses (e.g. positive affect, reduced
81 perceived exertion), which could lead to hedonic motivation (i.e. desire to move) and improve
82 adherence, a key barrier for people with knee OA (38). Finally, using wearable technology to
83 deliver music-based RAS in a closed loop could drive sustained benefits by adapting to an
84 individual’s walking performance throughout each session and over the course of the
85 intervention. Such a digital intervention may also facilitate self-efficacy and independence by
86 allowing access to the intervention in the person’s everyday life, outside of clinical settings.

87 Our objective was to examine the feasibility of a novel wearable device to deliver a
88 music-based closed-loop RAS intervention in people with knee OA. Specifically, we examined
89 (a) whether people with knee OA can safely increase their cadence and speed while using the
90 device, (b) whether walking with the device yields a light-to-moderate intensity exercise
91 experience, and (c) whether the participants find the device acceptable.

92

93 **PARTICIPANTS AND METHODS**

94 Participants: We recruited the participants from a database of previous participants and online
95 advertisements on Craigslist. Participants were included if they were ≥ 50 years, had activity
96 related pain, experienced morning knee stiffness ≤ 30 minutes, had a $BMI < 40$, experienced knee
97 pain on most days for 3 months or more, were able to walk at least 20 minutes without
98 assistance, had knee pain severity of ≥ 4 on a 11-point numeric rating scale during previous week,
99 and were able to communicate using English at a level to understand the study procedures and
100 informed consent. We excluded people with contraindications to exercise, neurological
101 conditions (e.g., stroke, Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's disease, Multiple Sclerosis, diabetic
102 neuropathy, etc.), joint replacement in either hip or ankle, history of other diseases that may
103 involve the index joint including inflammatory joint disease such as rheumatoid arthritis,
104 seronegative spondyloarthropathy, crystalline disease, lupus erythematosus, knee joint
105 infections, Paget's disease affecting the knee, or knee joint tumors, previous knee osteotomy
106 partial or total knee replacement in either knee, corticosteroid or hyaluronic acid injections in
107 either knee in the previous 3 months, pregnancy, and suspected or known drugs or alcohol abuse.
108 Interested participants completed an online pre-screening questionnaire, followed by a screening
109 phone call with a researcher. Those eligible were then scheduled for a single study visit. During
110 the visit, the index knee was then defined as the more painful knee or a knee selected at random
111 if both knees were equally painful. All study procedures were approved by the Institutional
112 Review Board and all participants signed an informed consent before any study procedures. This
113 device feasibility study is reported in compliance with the Strengthening the Reporting of
114 Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) guidelines for cross-sectional studies.

115 Wearable music-based RAS device (Figure 1): The device consists of a kit including a
116 touchscreen device (Samsung, Korea) locked with a preloaded proprietary software application
117 (MedRhythms, Portland, ME), a bone conducting headset for delivery of RAS (Shokz, Austin,
118 TX), and two shoe-worn inertial sensors (Physilog, Switzerland). Bone conduction earphones
119 allow the user to still be able to hear other sounds while music is playing for safety. In the
120 walking session, after a brief baseline period without music, a 30-minute overground walking
121 session with music commenced and ended with a brief carryover walking period. The user was
122 guided through the full session via audio instructions. The user chose a music playlist from a
123 select list of available genres. Participants were instructed to begin walking at their regular pace
124 to calibrate the digital intervention during the baseline period without music, and record the
125 participant's baseline gait parameters for that session. This was followed by the 30-minute
126 walking session where personalized audio cues were embedded into time-shifted music based on
127 real-time decisions made by a closed-loop control algorithm that continuously assesses the gait
128 data collected by the inertial sensors. The algorithm tracked the user's ability to entrain to the
129 target tempo and also assessed gait quality (i.e., symmetry, variability). Both entrainment and
130 quality were used by the algorithm to tailor the intervention to a person's gait for personalized
131 intervention during each session. The algorithm also added a rhythm track overlay to the music if
132 needed to further assist with entrainment by increasing the salience of the beat. Participants were
133 allowed to take breaks as needed. A researcher accompanied the participant during the walk.

134 Gait measures: In addition to the sensors worn as part of the RAS device, participants were
135 instrumented with three additional inertial sensors (OPAL, APDM Inc, Portland, OR) worn on
136 each shoe and the lower back, prior to the RAS session. Sensor data from these OPAL sensors
137 were collected throughout the baseline, training, and carryover periods of the RAS session.

138 Manufacturer-provided validated algorithms were used to extract spatiotemporal gait measures
139 (e.g., cadence, gait speed, stride length, etc.) (39, 40). **Figure 2** shows cadence (measured by
140 OPAL sensors) and instances when the tempo of the music was altered by the algorithm during
141 the training part of the RAS session (excluding baseline and carryover) for a representative
142 participant. We additionally calculated measures of gait variability and symmetry from the
143 spatiotemporal measures. Variability was defined as the coefficient of variation (CoV) of step
144 duration and symmetry between left and right step duration was calculated using the symmetry
145 index method (41).

146 Knee pain: At the start of the visit, participants were trained to use the 11-point 0-10 Numeric
147 Pain Rating Scale (NPRS) for rating their knee pain. Subsequently, participants used the NPRS
148 to rate pain in the index and contralateral knees before the start of the RAS session, immediately
149 at the end of the RAS session (both maximal pain during the session and current pain), and 2-3
150 minutes after the end of the RAS session.

151 Exercise Intensity: At the start of the visit, participants were trained to use the Rating of
152 Perceived Exertion (**RPE**, range 6-20) scale. At the end of the RAS session, participants reported
153 the highest RPE they experienced during the session. Prior to the RAS session, participants wore
154 a heart rate monitor on the arm (OH1+, Polar Electro Inc, Kempele, Finland) and continuous
155 heart rate data were collected throughout the RAS session. We used the heart rate data to
156 estimate time spent in various exercise intensity zones using maximum heart rate (**HRmax**)
157 based on American College of Sports Medicine (ACSM) guidelines (42, 43). During the 30-
158 minute training phase of the RAS session, we quantified the time spent in light (<64% HRmax),
159 moderate (64-76% HRmax), and vigorous (77-95% HRmax) exercise intensity zones.

160 Patient-reported Outcomes: At the end of the RAS session, participants completed the Physical
161 Activity Enjoyment Scale (PACES) (44) to rate their experience with the device and provided
162 feasibility feedback via a custom questionnaire. This questionnaire asked the participants to rate
163 their comfort with the device (very uncomfortable, uncomfortable, comfortable, very
164 comfortable), difficulty of matching their steps to the beats of the music or ability to entrain
165 (very difficult, difficult, easy, very easy), satisfaction with the music choices (yes, no), and
166 willingness to use the device at home (yes, no, unsure). For those who were willing to use the
167 device at home, they were further asked about weeks of home use (< 1 week, 1 week, 2-4 weeks,
168 5-6 weeks, > 6 weeks), duration of each session at home (< 15 min, 15-30 min, 30-45 min, 60
169 min, > 60 min), and number of days per week of home use (0-7). Open-ended questions about
170 what would make the device more engaging or any other feedback about the device were also
171 included. Participants also completed the Knee injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Scale (KOOS)
172 (45).

173 Analysis: Our outcomes for device feasibility were the changes in gait measures (speed, cadence,
174 stride length) during the last 5 minutes of the RAS session compared to the baseline period as
175 measured by the OPAL sensors. While gait measures were collected bilaterally, only data for the
176 index leg are reported here. We also examined gait variability and symmetry as described earlier.
177 Exercise intensity was assessed with RPE and HRmax. We assessed safety as number of adverse
178 or serious adverse events during the RAS session. Potential device acceptability was assessed
179 with PACES and the custom acceptability questionnaire. We also explored if the pain during the
180 RAS session or a person's rating of difficulty matching their steps to the beats of the music were
181 related to the increase in cadence and gait speed during the session. For the former, we assessed
182 Pearson's correlation between change in pain and change in cadence/speed and for the latter, we

183 compared the changes in cadence/speed between people who reported it being easy/very easy vs.
184 difficult/very difficult to match their steps to the beats of the music. No sample size estimation
185 was performed *a priori*. All data are reported descriptively and no hypothesis testing was
186 performed.

187

188 **RESULTS**

189 Participant characteristics: The online pre-screening was completed by 44 persons of which 15
190 were enrolled (**Figure 3**). Participants were over 65 with an average BMI in the overweight
191 range (**Table 1**). A majority self-identified as women and White and had moderate OA-related
192 disability (KOOS scores range 40-70).

193 Gait: Participants completed 30 (range 23-30) median minutes and walked on average 2455 steps
194 (range 1916 to 2930) during the training phase of the RAS session. When comparing the last five
195 minutes of the training to the baseline of the RAS session, participants demonstrated a 12.1%
196 increase in cadence (Δ 12.5 [6.0, 18.9] steps per minute), a 29.5% increase in gait speed (Δ 0.3
197 [0.2, 0.4] m/s), and 14.8% increase in stride length (Δ 0.2 [0.1, 0.2] m) (**Figure 4**). Importantly,
198 despite increases in gait speed, gait variability and gait symmetry did not worsen from baseline
199 to last 5 minutes of the RAS session (**Supplementary Figure 1**). Using a threshold of 10%
200 increase, 9/15, 11/15, and 9/15 met the threshold for cadence, gait speed, and stride length
201 (**Figure 5**). Using a threshold of 5% increase, 10/15, 13/15, and 13/15 met the threshold for
202 cadence, gait speed, and stride length (**Figure 5**). When comparing the carryover (with music-
203 based RAS turned off) to the baseline, 5.2% increase in cadence, 15.9% increase in gait speed,
204 and 9.5% increase in stride length were still present (**Figure 4**).

205 Exercise intensity: Maximum RPE during the RAS session was on average 13.3 (range 12-15)
206 indicating moderate intensity of exercise. Based on HRmax, 20%, 37%, and 22% of the 30-
207 minute training session was spent in light, moderate, and vigorous intensity exercise,
208 respectively.

209 Safety: There were no falls during the RAS session and no participants required support from the
210 researcher; 3/15 and 1/15 participants took one and two breaks, respectively. Of these, one
211 participant took a break due to new onset hip pain that resolved at the end of the RAS session
212 and two participants took breaks due to fatigue. Additionally, for two participants, the RAS
213 session had to be paused to fix issues related to OPAL or heart rate sensors. Knee pain increased
214 by ~ 2.4 points in the index knee during the RAS session but returned to almost pre-RAS levels
215 within 1-2 minutes after the end of the session (**Supplementary Figure 2**).

216 Acceptability: There were no technical issues with the device for any of the participants. PACES
217 results showed that participants rated the session as enjoyable, absorbing, fun, and energizing
218 among other attributes (mean scores >4 on 7-point scales, **Supplementary Figure 3**). All 15
219 participants rated the comfort with the device as comfortable or very comfortable and ~ 73%
220 (11/15) found it easy or very easy to match their steps to the beats of the music (i.e., entrain). For
221 willingness to use at home, ~87% (13/15) were willing to use the device at home and 2/15 were
222 unsure. Of those who were willing to use the device at home, ~77% (10/13) mentioned being
223 willing to use it for more than 6 weeks, and the rest were willing to use it from 2-4 weeks or 5-6
224 weeks. Of those who were willing to use the device at home, everyone was willing to use the
225 device for at least 30 minutes at a time; for numbers of days per week, the participants identified
226 4 days/week (range 2-7) as the most frequent choice. In our cohort, 80% (12/15) were satisfied
227 the music choices available in the device and rest expressed a desire for more choices.

228 Preferences for further improving engagement with the device included more options for musical
229 genres, smoother transitions between songs, computability with other commercial headphones
230 (e.g., AirPods), and a low cost.

231 Factors related to changes in gait: The correlations between changes in pain and changes in
232 cadence ($r=0.11$) and speed ($r = -0.10$) were small. People who found it easy/very easy to match
233 their steps to the beats of the music ($n=11$) vs. those who found it difficult/very difficult ($n=4$)
234 had ~ 14% vs. 7% increase in cadence and ~ 34% vs. 16% increase in gait speed during the RAS
235 session.

236 **DISCUSSION**

237 Our objective was to examine the feasibility of a wearable device to deliver a closed-loop music-
238 based RAS intervention for people with knee OA. In this single session study, participants were
239 safely able to increase their cadence and gait speed while walking with the device at a moderate
240 exercise intensity under supervision. The participants rated their experience with the device
241 positively and were willing to use the device at home. Our preliminary findings suggest that this
242 device merits further examination as a potential intervention to improve gait quality and quantity
243 for people with knee OA.

244 In our study, participants were able to increase their cadence > 10% on average while
245 using the wearable music-based RAS device. We have previously reported associations between
246 low cadence and increased risk of worsening pain and physical function in people with knee OA
247 (12). Lower cadence is also related to greater knee joint loading and risk of cartilage damage
248 independent of walking speed in people with knee OA (1, 2). Increasing cadence reduces knee
249 loading in runners and reduces pain in individuals with patellofemoral pain (46-50). Hence,

250 walking with higher cadence could be a promising therapeutic strategy for people with knee OA.
251 Participants also increased their speed ~ 30% on average while wearing the device. Lower
252 walking speed in people with knee OA leads to increased mortality risk and hence is an
253 important therapeutic target (51, 52). Increases in gait speed are often a secondary consequence
254 of exercise interventions for knee OA, (53) but interventions that directly target gait speed, or
255 those that target cadence, are largely understudied for people with knee OA. While the increases
256 that we observed for gait speed of ~ 0.3 m/s are larger than the reported clinically important
257 differences ranging from 0.06-0.11 m/s for people with knee OA (54), controlled studies are
258 needed to ascertain if these increases will translate into improvements in comfortable walking
259 speed with longer-term use of this device. We also observed ~ 15% increase in stride length on
260 average. There is some evidence that longer step length is related to greater knee loading and risk
261 of structural worsening of knee OA (55, 56). It is likely that the benefits of increases in cadence
262 and gait speed, and engaging in moderate intensity exercise, outweigh any potential negative
263 effects of increase in stride length. However, this will need to be confirmed in future studies.

264 In a 4-week feasibility study of a similar wearable closed-loop music-based RAS
265 intervention as our study, participants with Parkinson's disease (n=23) experienced increases in
266 gait speed, stride length, and cadence within sessions and reductions in gait variability (57).
267 After 4-weeks, there were improvements in moderate intensity walking, number of steps per day,
268 quality of life, disease severity, and functional mobility. Importantly, participants completed
269 87% of the sessions, and no adverse events or falls were reported; participants reported that the
270 system was easy to use. A single-session feasibility study with a similar intervention reported
271 increases in gait speed and cadence in people with stroke (n=11) (58). More recently a multi-site
272 parallel-arm efficacy randomized controlled trial of a wearable closed-loop music-based RAS vs.

273 active control was completed in people with stroke (n=87) (59). Results showed greater
274 improvements in gait speed and greater proportion of treatment responders in the intervention
275 arm. Intervention was determined to be safe. Based on the results of this study, a closed-loop
276 music-based RAS intervention is currently commercially available in the US by prescription for
277 adults with chronic stroke with walking impairment. These prior studies and our findings from
278 this device feasibility study suggest that this wearable closed-loop music-based RAS device can
279 be a potential novel approach to improve gait quality and quantity in people with knee OA.

280 There was some variability across participants in terms of changes in gait while walking
281 with the device. Of the 15, five did not show at least a 5% increase in cadence while wearing the
282 device. However, only two did not show at least a 5% increase in gait speed, suggesting that at
283 least a few participants achieved increases in gait speed by increasing their stride length alone.
284 The correlations between changes in pain and gait measures were small and unlikely to be
285 clinically meaningful. Hence, knee pain does not appear to interfere with a person's ability to
286 improve their gait quality while using the RAS device. Although our sample size is quite small,
287 our exploratory results show that people who found it easy/very easy to match their steps to the
288 beats of the music had almost double the amount of increase in cadence and gait speed. There is
289 some prior evidence to support the speculation that beat perception ability can influence gait
290 parameters while walking with RAS (60-62). Importantly, auditory-motor entrainment is defined
291 as an involuntary process and asking participants about their comfort with matching their steps to
292 the music may not truly reflect the ability of their neuromotor system to achieve entrainment.
293 Nonetheless, whether a person's ability to perceive the beats and/or entrain influences their
294 response to a longer-term intervention with this device should be examined in future studies.

295 While walking with the device, all participants reported an RPE between 12-15 reflecting
296 a moderate intensity exertion. These self-reported data were consistent with the objective
297 findings from the heart rate measurements with participants spending ~ 60% of the time in
298 moderate-to-vigorous intensity exercise zone based on HRmax. Our findings are in line with
299 studies showing that increasing cadence can be a strategy to achieve moderate intensity effort
300 during walking exercise indicated by %HRmax of 64-76% and RPE of 12-13 (13)(63). It needs
301 to be examined whether people with knee OA can use this device for sustained engagement in
302 physical activity while meeting the 150-300 minutes per week of moderate intensity exercise
303 guidelines.

304 In this single supervised session, the device was found to be safe. There were no serious
305 adverse events (e.g., falls). Only one participant experienced new onset pain in the hip that was
306 resolved at the end of the session. While there were small increases in knee pain while walking
307 with the device as expected for people with knee OA, the pain largely subsided to pre-RAS
308 levels within a few minutes after the end of the session. We have previously reported that small
309 increase in pain with exercise is related to greater likelihood of experiencing exercise-induced
310 hypoalgesia (64). Two participants took breaks due to fatigue; exercise tolerance would be
311 expected to improve over the course of a longer intervention. For a longer intervention with this
312 device where the participants are expected to use the device on their own, safety monitoring
313 would be an important aspect including screening for fall risks, any cardiac or other conditions
314 that may preclude a person from engaging in moderate intensity exercise and educating the
315 participants about acceptable and unacceptable levels of pain.

316 Participants in our study were enthusiastic about the device. They reported a largely
317 positive experience across several enjoyment domains assessed in PACES. Some participants

318 were not satisfied with the music choices, indicating the potential for further refinement. A
319 majority of the participants were willing to use the device at home, at least 30 minutes per
320 session, for 4 days per week, for at least 6 weeks. These findings provide further support for
321 examining the potential of this device as digital therapeutic strategy for people with knee OA.

322 Our findings need to be interpreted considering study limitations. This was a device
323 feasibility study and not a study of the effects of this intervention on health-related outcomes. It
324 is important to acknowledge that the reported changes in gait while walking with the device are
325 likely not reflective of potential therapeutic effects of this device if used over the long-term. We
326 did not select our participants to be physically inactive. Also, our cohort was not racially diverse,
327 with a majority having at least an undergraduate degree and annual family income > \$50,000.
328 Hence, our findings may not be generalizable to people with knee OA who differ from our
329 cohort in terms of their physical activity level, racial background, education or income levels,
330 BMI, and levels of disability.

331 To conclude, this single-session feasibility study of a wearable closed-loop music-based
332 RAS device demonstrates increases in cadence and gait speed while safely walking at a moderate
333 exercise intensity under supervision in people with knee OA. Participants reported a positive
334 experience with the device and were willing to use the device at home for longer durations.
335 Longer-term randomized studies to examine whether this device can improve both quality and
336 quantity of walking for people with knee OA are needed.

337 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

338 The authors would like to thank the participants of this study.

339

340 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

341

342 Dr. Kumar had full access to all of the data in the study and took responsibility for the integrity of the data

343 and the accuracy of the data analysis.

344 Study conception and design: Kumar

345 Acquisition of data: Yang, Okamura, Kim

346 Analysis and interpretation of data: All authors

347 Manuscript drafting and approval: All authors

348

349 **ROLE OF THE STUDY SPONSOR**

350 MedRhythms was not involved in study design, data analysis, data interpretation, or manuscript

351 preparation. No MedRhythms employees or affiliates are authors on this work. Publication of

352 this manuscript was not contingent upon approval from MedRhythms.

353 REFERENCES

- 354 1. Hart HF, Birmingham TB, Primeau CA, Pinto R, Leitch K, Giffin JR. Associations Between Cadence
355 and Knee Loading in Patients With Knee Osteoarthritis. *Arthritis care & research*. 2021;73(11):1667-71.
- 356 2. Hart HF, Gross KD, Crossley KM, Barton CJ, Felson DT, Guermazi A, et al. Step Rate and
357 Worsening of Patellofemoral and Tibiofemoral Joint Osteoarthritis in Women and Men: The Multicenter
358 Osteoarthritis Study. *Arthritis care & research*. 2020;72(1):107-13.
- 359 3. Miyazaki T, Wada M, Kawahara H, Sato M, Baba H, Shimada S. Dynamic load at baseline can
360 predict radiographic disease progression in medial compartment knee osteoarthritis. *AnnRheumDis*.
361 2002;61(7):617-22.
- 362 4. Brown C, Marinko L, LaValley MP, Kumar D. Quadriceps Strength After Anterior Cruciate
363 Ligament Reconstruction Compared With Uninjured Matched Controls: A Systematic Review and Meta-
364 analysis. *Orthop J Sports Med*. 2021;9(4):2325967121991534.
- 365 5. Kumar D, Manal KT, Rudolph KS. Knee joint loading during gait in healthy controls and
366 individuals with knee osteoarthritis. *Osteoarthritis and cartilage*. 2013;21(2):298-305.
- 367 6. Bennell KL, Bowles KA, Wang Y, Cicuttini F, Davies-Tuck M, Hinman RS. Higher dynamic medial
368 knee load predicts greater cartilage loss over 12 months in medial knee osteoarthritis. *Ann Rheum Dis*.
369 2011;70(10):1770-4.
- 370 7. Hodges PW, van den Hoorn W, Wrigley TV, Hinman RS, Bowles KA, Cicuttini F, et al. Increased
371 duration of co-contraction of medial knee muscles is associated with greater progression of knee
372 osteoarthritis. *Manual therapy*. 2016;21:151-8.
- 373 8. Wink AE, Gross KD, Brown CA, Guermazi A, Roemer F, Niu J, et al. Varus thrust during walking
374 and the risk of incident and worsening medial tibiofemoral MRI lesions: the Multicenter Osteoarthritis
375 Study. *Osteoarthritis and cartilage*. 2017;25(6):839-45.
- 376 9. Chang AH, Song J, Lee J, Chang RW, Semanik PA, Dunlop DD. Proportion and associated factors
377 of meeting the 2018 Physical Activity Guidelines for Americans in adults with or at risk for knee
378 osteoarthritis. *Osteoarthritis and cartilage*. 2020;28(6):774-81.
- 379 10. Kolasinski SL, Neogi T, Hochberg MC, Oatis C, Guyatt G, Block J, et al. 2019 American College of
380 Rheumatology/Arthritis Foundation Guideline for the Management of Osteoarthritis of the Hand, Hip,
381 and Knee. *Arthritis Rheumatol*. 2020;72(2):220-33.
- 382 11. Bannuru RR, Osani MC, Vaysbrot EE, Arden NK, Bennell K, Bierma-Zeinstra SMA, et al. OARSI
383 guidelines for the non-surgical management of knee, hip, and polyarticular osteoarthritis. *Osteoarthritis*
384 *and cartilage*. 2019.
- 385 12. Bacon KL, Felson DT, Jafarzadeh SR, Kolachalama VB, Hausdorff JM, Gazit E, et al. Gait
386 Alterations and Association With Worsening Knee Pain and Physical Function: A Machine Learning
387 Approach With Wearable Sensors in the Multicenter Osteoarthritis Study. *Arthritis care & research*.
388 2024;76(7):984-92.
- 389 13. Slaght J, Sénéchal M, Hrubeniuk TJ, Mayo A, Bouchard DR. Walking Cadence to Exercise at
390 Moderate Intensity for Adults: A Systematic Review. *J Sports Med (Hindawi Publ Corp)*.
391 2017;2017:4641203.
- 392 14. Merchant H, Grahn J, Trainor L, Rohrmeier M, Fitch WT. Finding the beat: a neural perspective
393 across humans and non-human primates. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci*. 2015;370(1664):20140093.
- 394 15. Magee WL, Clark I, Tamplin J, Bradt J. Music interventions for acquired brain injury. *Cochrane*
395 *Database Syst Rev*. 2017;1(1):Cd006787.
- 396 16. Nascimento LR, de Oliveira CQ, Ada L, Michaelsen SM, Teixeira-Salmela LF. Walking training with
397 cueing of cadence improves walking speed and stride length after stroke more than walking training
398 alone: a systematic review. *J Physiother*. 2015;61(1):10-5.

- 399 17. Ghai S, Ghai I, Schmitz G, Effenberg AO. Effect of rhythmic auditory cueing on parkinsonian gait:
400 A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sci Rep*. 2018;8(1):506.
- 401 18. Shahraki M, Sohrabi M, Taheri Torbati HR, Nikkhah K, NaeimiKia M. Effect of rhythmic auditory
402 stimulation on gait kinematic parameters of patients with multiple sclerosis. *J Med Life*. 2017;10(1):33-7.
- 403 19. Chauvigné LA, Gitau KM, Brown S. The neural basis of audiomotor entrainment: an ALE meta-
404 analysis. *Front Hum Neurosci*. 2014;8:776.
- 405 20. Thaut MH. The discovery of human auditory-motor entrainment and its role in the development
406 of neurologic music therapy. *Prog Brain Res*. 2015;217:253-66.
- 407 21. Ye X, Li L, He R, Jia Y, Poon W. Rhythmic auditory stimulation promotes gait recovery in
408 Parkinson's patients: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Front Neurol*. 2022;13:940419.
- 409 22. Ghai S, Ghai I, Schmitz G, Effenberg AO. Effect of rhythmic auditory cueing on parkinsonian gait:
410 A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Scientific Reports*. 2018;8(1):506.
- 411 23. Hurt CP, Rice RR, McIntosh GC, Thaut MH. Rhythmic Auditory Stimulation in Gait Training for
412 Patients with Traumatic Brain Injury. *J Music Ther*. 1998;35(4):228-41.
- 413 24. Ghai S, Ghai I. Effects of Rhythmic Auditory Cueing in Gait Rehabilitation for Multiple Sclerosis: A
414 Mini Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Front Neurol*. 2018;9:386.
- 415 25. Ghai S, Ghai I, Effenberg AO. Effect of rhythmic auditory cueing on gait in cerebral palsy: a
416 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Neuropsychiatr Dis Treat*. 2018;14:43-59.
- 417 26. Bella SD, Benoit CE, Farrugia N, Schwartze M, Kotz SA. Effects of musically cued gait training in
418 Parkinson's disease: beyond a motor benefit. *Ann N Y Acad Sci*. 2015;1337:77-85.
- 419 27. Zatorre RJ, Chen JL, Penhune VB. When the brain plays music: auditory-motor interactions in
420 music perception and production. *Nat Rev Neurosci*. 2007;8(7):547-58.
- 421 28. Ottaviani S, Bernard JL, Bardin T, Richette P. Effect of music on anxiety and pain during joint
422 lavage for knee osteoarthritis. *Clin Rheumatol*. 2012;31(3):531-4.
- 423 29. Hsu CC, Chen SR, Lee PH, Lin PC. The Effect of Music Listening on Pain, Heart Rate Variability,
424 and Range of Motion in Older Adults After Total Knee Replacement. *Clin Nurs Res*. 2019;28(5):529-47.
- 425 30. Innes KE, Selfe TK, Kandati S, Wen S, Huysmans Z. Effects of Mantra Meditation versus Music
426 Listening on Knee Pain, Function, and Related Outcomes in Older Adults with Knee Osteoarthritis: An
427 Exploratory Randomized Clinical Trial (RCT). *Evid Based Complement Alternat Med*. 2018;2018:7683897.
- 428 31. Cheever T, Taylor A, Finkelstein R, Edwards E, Thomas L, Bradt J, et al. NIH/Kennedy Center
429 Workshop on Music and the Brain: Finding Harmony. *Neuron*. 2018;97(6):1214-8.
- 430 32. Brown EL, Gannotti ME, Veneri DA. Including Arts in Rehabilitation Enhances Outcomes in the
431 Psychomotor, Cognitive, and Affective Domains: A Scoping Review. *Phys Ther*. 2022;102(4).
- 432 33. Hsu HF, Chen KM, Belcastro F. The effect of music interventions on chronic pain experienced by
433 older adults: A systematic review. *J Nurs Scholarsh*. 2022;54(1):64-71.
- 434 34. Sihvonen AJ, Pitkäniemi A, Särkämö T, Soinila S. Isn't There Room for Music in Chronic Pain
435 Management? *J Pain*. 2022;23(7):1143-50.
- 436 35. Usui C, Kirino E, Tanaka S, Inami R, Nishioka K, Hatta K, et al. Music Intervention Reduces
437 Persistent Fibromyalgia Pain and Alters Functional Connectivity Between the Insula and Default Mode
438 Network. *Pain Med*. 2020;21(8):1546-52.
- 439 36. Lee JH. The Effects of Music on Pain: A Meta-Analysis. *J Music Ther*. 2016;53(4):430-77.
- 440 37. Loewy J. Underlying Music Mechanisms Influencing the Neurology of Pain: An Integrative Model.
441 *Brain Sci*. 2022;12(10).
- 442 38. Park KS, Williams DM, Etnier JL. Exploring the use of music to promote physical activity: From
443 the viewpoint of psychological hedonism. *Front Psychol*. 2023;14:1021825.
- 444 39. Washabaugh EP, Kalyanaraman T, Adamczyk PG, Claflin ES, Krishnan C. Validity and repeatability
445 of inertial measurement units for measuring gait parameters. *Gait Posture*. 2017;55:87-93.

- 446 40. Salarian A, Russmann H, Vingerhoets FJ, Dehollain C, Blanc Y, Burkhard PR, et al. Gait assessment
447 in Parkinson's disease: toward an ambulatory system for long-term monitoring. *IEEE Trans Biomed Eng.*
448 2004;51(8):1434-43.
- 449 41. Robinson RO, Herzog W, Nigg BM. Use of force platform variables to quantify the effects of
450 chiropractic manipulation on gait symmetry. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther.* 1987;10(4):172-6.
- 451 42. GELLISH RL, GOSLIN BR, OLSON RE, McDONALD A, RUSSI GD, MOUDGIL VK. Longitudinal
452 Modeling of the Relationship between Age and Maximal Heart Rate. *Medicine & Science in Sports &*
453 *Exercise.* 2007;39(5):822-9.
- 454 43. Schulz JM, Birmingham TB, Atkinson HF, Woehrl E, Primeau CA, Lukacs MJ, et al. Are we
455 missing the target? Are we aiming too low? What are the aerobic exercise prescriptions and their effects
456 on markers of cardiovascular health and systemic inflammation in patients with knee osteoarthritis? A
457 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Sports Med.* 2020;54(13):771-5.
- 458 44. Kendzierski D, DeCarlo KJ. Physical Activity Enjoyment Scale: Two Validation Studies. *Journal of*
459 *Sport and Exercise Psychology.* 1991;13(1):50-64.
- 460 45. Roos EM, Roos HP, Lohmander LS, Ekdahl C, Beynon BD. Knee Injury and Osteoarthritis
461 Outcome Score (KOOS)--development of a self-administered outcome measure. *J Orthop Sports Phys*
462 *Ther.* 1998;28(2):88-96.
- 463 46. Heiderscheid BC, Chumanov ES, Michalski MP, Wille CM, Ryan MB. Effects of step rate
464 manipulation on joint mechanics during running. *Medicine and science in sports and exercise.*
465 2011;43(2):296-302.
- 466 47. Willy RW, Willson JD, Clowers K, Baggaley M, Murray N. The effects of body-borne loads and
467 cadence manipulation on patellofemoral and tibiofemoral joint kinetics during running. *J Biomech.*
468 2016;49(16):4028-33.
- 469 48. Bramah C, Preece SJ, Gill N, Herrington L. A 10% Increase in Step Rate Improves Running
470 Kinematics and Clinical Outcomes in Runners With Patellofemoral Pain at 4 Weeks and 3 Months. *Am J*
471 *Sports Med.* 2019;47(14):3406-13.
- 472 49. Neal BS, Barton CJ, Birn-Jeffrey A, Daley M, Morrissey D. The effects & mechanisms of increasing
473 running step rate: A feasibility study in a mixed-sex group of runners with patellofemoral pain. *Phys Ther*
474 *Sport.* 2018;32:244-51.
- 475 50. Esculier JF, Bouyer LJ, Roy JS. Running gait modifications can lead to immediate reductions in
476 patellofemoral pain. *Front Sports Act Living.* 2022;4:1048655.
- 477 51. Master H, Neogi T, Callahan LF, Nelson AE, LaValley M, Cleveland RJ, et al. The association
478 between walking speed from short- and standard-distance tests with the risk of all-cause mortality
479 among adults with radiographic knee osteoarthritis: data from three large United States cohort studies.
480 *Osteoarthritis Cartilage.* 2020;28(12):1551-8.
- 481 52. Master H, Neogi T, LaValley M, Thoma LM, Zhang Y, Voinier D, et al. Does the 1-year Decline in
482 Walking Speed Predict Mortality Risk Beyond Current Walking Speed in Adults With Knee Osteoarthritis?
483 *J Rheumatol.* 2021;48(2):279-85.
- 484 53. Li S, Ng WH, Abujaber S, Shaharudin S. Effects of resistance training on gait velocity and knee
485 adduction moment in knee osteoarthritis patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Scientific*
486 *Reports.* 2021;11(1):16104.
- 487 54. Gilbert AL, Song J, Cella D, Chang RW, Dunlop DD. What Is an Important Difference in Gait Speed
488 in Adults With Knee Osteoarthritis? *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken).* 2021;73(4):559-65.
- 489 55. Stefanik JJ, Gross KD, Guermazi A, Felson DT, Roemer FW, Niu J, et al. Relation of Step Length to
490 Magnetic Resonance Imaging-Detected Structural Damage in the Patellofemoral Joint: The Multicenter
491 Osteoarthritis Study. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken).* 2016;68(6):776-83.

- 492 56. Bacon K, Felson D, Jafarzadeh SR, Hausdorff JM, Gazit E, Segal N, et al., editors. Association of
493 wearable-sensor derived gait measures with cartilage worsening over 2 years in the Multicenter
494 Osteoarthritis Study. OARSI Annual Congress; 2024; Vienna, Austria: Osteoarthritis and Cartilage.
- 495 57. Zajac JA, Porciuncula F, Cavanaugh JT, McGregor C, Harris BA, Smayda KE, et al. Feasibility and
496 Proof-of-Concept of Delivering an Autonomous Music-Based Digital Walking Intervention to Persons
497 with Parkinson's Disease in a Naturalistic Setting. *J Parkinsons Dis*. 2023.
- 498 58. Hutchinson K, Sloutsky R, Collimore A, Adams B, Harris B, Ellis TD, et al. A Music-Based Digital
499 Therapeutic: Proof-of-Concept Automation of a Progressive and Individualized Rhythm-Based Walking
500 Training Program After Stroke. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2020;34(11):986-96.
- 501 59. Awad LN, Jayaraman A, Nolan KJ, Lewek MD, Bonato P, Newman M, et al. Efficacy and safety of
502 using auditory-motor entrainment to improve walking after stroke: a multi-site randomized controlled
503 trial of InTandemTM. *Nature Communications*. 2024;15(1):1081.
- 504 60. Ready EA, McGarry LM, Rinchon C, Holmes JD, Grahn JA. Beat perception ability and instructions
505 to synchronize influence gait when walking to music-based auditory cues. *Gait Posture*. 2019;68:555-61.
- 506 61. Roberts BS, Ready EA, Grahn JA. Musical enjoyment does not enhance walking speed in healthy
507 adults during music-based auditory cueing. *Gait & Posture*. 2021;89:132-8.
- 508 62. Ready EA, Holmes JD, Grahn JA. Gait in younger and older adults during rhythmic auditory
509 stimulation is influenced by groove, familiarity, beat perception, and synchronization demands. *Hum*
510 *Mov Sci*. 2022;84:102972.
- 511 63. McAvoy CR, Moore CC, Aguiar EJ, Ducharme SW, Schuna JM, Barreira TV, et al. Cadence
512 (steps/min) and relative intensity in 21 to 60-year-olds: the CADENCE-adults study. *International Journal*
513 *of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*. 2021;18(1):27.
- 514 64. Lee S, Neogi T, Senderling B, Gheller M, Adamowicz L, Georgiev P, et al., editors. No Pain, No
515 Gain: Association Of Pain Increase During Exercise With Exercise-Induced Hypoalgesia In People With
516 Knee Osteoarthritis. OARSI Annual Congress; 2023; Denver, CO.

517


518 **Tables 1. Participant Characteristics. Mean and standard deviation are reported unless**
 519 **indicated otherwise.**

Participants	n=15
Age, years	70.0 ± 8.6
Women, n (%)	10 (67%)
BMI, kg/m²	29.4 ± 5.9
KOOS (0-100)	
<i>Pain</i>	64.6 ± 9.6
<i>ADL</i>	70.0 ± 12.9
<i>Symptoms</i>	68.8±12.5
<i>Sports/Recreation</i>	41.3±17.0
<i>QOL</i>	52.1±12.6
Education, n (%)	
<i>with undergraduate degree</i>	5 (33%)
<i>with graduate degree</i>	9 (60%)
<i>Other*</i>	1 (7%)
Annual family income, n (%)	
<i>Between \$25,000 and \$50,000</i>	4 (27%)
<i>≥\$50,000</i>	8 (53%)
<i>< \$25,000, unknown, or did not report*</i>	3 (20%)
Race, n (%)*	
<i>White</i>	13 (87%)
<i>Other*</i>	2 (13%)

**Categories combined to maintain privacy*

BMI = Body Mass Index; KOOS = Knee injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score; ADL = Activities of Daily Living; QOL = Quality of Life

520



530 **FIGURE 1. Wearable closed-loop music-based RAS intervention**

531

532

533


534

535

536

537

538




539

540 **FIGURE 2. Walking cadence and target music tempo during the walking session for one**

541 **participant during the RAS session**

542



543
544 **FIGURE 3. Participant flow**


545

546

547


548

549



550
551
552
553
554
555

FIGURE 4. Cadence, speed, and stride length during the RAS session. The shaded vertical grey zones represent baseline and carryover phases. The black boxes indicate the time periods used to calculate the change in gait measures from baseline to last 5-minutes of training while using the device.




% Change from Baseline to Last 5-minutes of RAS Session

556

557 **FIGURE 5. Individual changes in cadence, speed, and stride length (assessed as % change)**
558 **during the last 5-minutes of the training phase vs. baseline of the RAS session. The**
559 **participants are ordered by the largest to smallest change in cadence. Dotted red lines**
560 **denote change of 5% and 10%.**


561 **SUPPLEMENTRAY MATERIAL**



562

563 **SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURE 1. Coefficient of Variation (CoV) of step duration (TOP)**


564 **and symmetry index of step duration (BOTTOM) during the RAS session**



Index knee	1.2 (0.3, 2.1)	3.6 (2.5, 4.7)	2.1 (0.8, 3.3)	1.7 (0.5, 2.9)
Contralateral knee	0.5 (0.1, 0.9)	2.1 (1.2, 3)	1.2 (0.3, 2.1)	0.8 (0, 1.6)
Change in pain of index knee from Pre-RAS	-	2.4 (1.7, 3.1)	0.9 (0.2, 1.6)	0.5 (-0.2, 1.1)
Change in pain of contralateral knee from Pre-RAS	-	1.6 (1, 2.2)	0.7 (0.2, 1.3)	0.3 (-0.1, 0.8)

565

566 **SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURE 2: Pain in the index and contralateral knee on the 0-10**
 567 **numeric pain rating scale during the visit. All data are reported as mean (95% confidence**
 568 **intervals). Pre-RAS refers to before the start of the RAS session; Max RAS refers to pain**
 569 **rating of maximum knee pain during the RAS session; Post-RAS1 refers to pain rating**
 570 **immediately at the end of the RAS session; Post-RAS2 refers to pain rating 2-3 minutes**
 571 **after the end of the RAS session.**



572

573 **SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURE 3. Proportion of participants in each response category**

574 **(range 1-7) for each item of the Physical Activity Enjoyment Scale (PACES). Where**

575 **necessary, item responses have been reordered such that higher scores indicate a more**

576 **positive response.**