Efficacy and feasibility of synergy-based multichannel functional electrical stimulation for chronic stroke gait rehabilitation: a pilot study

Levine JT[1,2], Yu XS[1,3], Muñoz R[2], Fiorenza A[2], Smith T[5], Djuraskovic I[2,4], Peiffer JD[1,2], Ambrosini E[7], Ferrante S[7], Webster R[5], Sakai J[5], Robison J[5], Roth EJ[2,3], Laczko J[2,6], Cotton RJ[1,2,3], Pedrocchi A[7], Pons JL[1,2,3]

Affiliations:

1. Northwestern University, McCormick School of Engineering, Evanston, IL USA
2. Shirley Ryan AbilityLab, Chicago, IL USA
3. Northwestern University, Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Chicago, IL USA
4. Northwestern University, Department of Neuroscience, Evanston, IL USA
5. CIONIC Inc, San Francisco, CA USA
6. Pazmany Peter Catholic University, Faculty of Information Technology and Bionics, Budapest, Hungary
7. Politecnico Di Milano, Department of Electronics, Milan, Italy

Corresponding Author: Jackson T. Levine levinej@u.northwestern.edu

Disclosures: Robison J, Webster R, Smith T, and Sakai J are employed by CIONIC Inc. and may hold equity in the company. These individuals contributed to device design and provided technical support but were not involved in the study design, participant selection, therapist or participant training, outcome assessments or data analysis, in order to minimize potential bias.

Author Contributions: L.J.T., M.R. and P.J.L conceived and designed research; R.J., W.R., S.T., and S.J. modified device design and provided technical support; L.J.T., X.S.Y., M.R. and

F.A. performed experiments; L.J.T., X.S.Y., M.R., F.A., D.I. and P. J.D. analyzed data; L.J.T., X.S.Y., M.R., and F.A. interpreted results of experiments; L.J.T. prepared figures; L.J.T. drafted manuscript; X.S.Y., M.R., F.A., A.E., F.S., L.J..,C.R.J., P.A., and P.J.L. edited and revised manuscript; All authors read and approved the final manuscript

Abstract

Introduction: Chronic stroke gait disorders are characterized by impaired motor coordination (i.e., muscle synergies), which are related to functional impairment. While high-intensity gait training (HIGT) is the standard of care, and functional electrical stimulation (FES) to the tibialis anterior can address foot drop, evidence has shown that extending FES to multiple muscles improves functional and biomechanical outcomes. The Cionic Neural Sleeve provides a wearable platform that allows customizable stimulation to muscles of the leg with clinically feasible time to prepare the device and a user-friendly interface. We investigated the efficacy and clinical implementation of a personalized intervention based on the individual's specific motor coordination impairment–muscle synergy-based multichannel FES (MFES)–paired with HIGT to improve gait speed, endurance, biomechanics, and similarity of synergies to normative data. **Methods:** Fourteen individuals (six females) with chronic stroke gait impairments were recruited and randomly divided into two groups, both receiving six weeks of either HIGT or MFES+HIGT. Assessments of gait speed, endurance, balance, gait biomechanics, and muscle synergies were conducted at baseline, midpoint, post, and one month following completion of training. Feasibility was assessed with time to prepare the system and participant and therapist questionnaires. **Results:** Despite a small sample size, only the MFES+HIGT group had sustained improvements in fast walking speed and endurance. Additionally, while both groups improved in impaired limb step length, MFES+HIGT led to reduced step width while ankle dorsiflexion actually got worse after

HIGT. Finally, average similarity of muscle synergy activation profiles to normative data, measured through circular cross correlation, improved only for MFES+HIGT. Time to prepare the device plateaued at nine sessions at 4.53 minutes, and both participants and therapists rated the intervention highly feasible, acceptable, and usable. **Discussion:** Muscle synergy-based MFES+HIGT demonstrated improved outcomes in gait speed, endurance, biomechanics, and motor coordination with positive feedback on a highly usable and feasible stimulation interface. This research supports further pursuit of this personalized intervention through a randomized controlled clinical trial with larger sample sizes that can better characterize how individuals with varying baseline function respond to synergy-based MFES+HIGT.

Keywords: muscle synergies, stroke, gait, rehabilitation, functional electrical stimulation, personalized rehabilitation

Introduction

Among stroke survivors, gait disorders are one of the most common and debilitating outcomes, affecting up to 80% of survivors and severely impairing mobility and independence.(1) Post-stroke gait is well characterized by impaired motor coordination, which can be quantified through muscle synergy analysis–a mathematical dimensionality reduction technique (e.g., nonnegative matrix factorization, principal component analysis, etc.) to determine from multi-channel electromyography (EMG) the sources of common input to multiple muscles during a complex, multi-joint task. Muscle synergies during gait of neurologically intact individuals are highly consistent across individuals, terrains (e.g., treadmill, overground, etc.), speeds, and inclines, and typically consist of four synergies with clear biomechanical functions: weight acceptance, knee flexion, propulsion, foot clearance.(2-4) After a stroke, a reduction in the complexity of the

synergies (i.e., number of synergies required to explain muscle activity) and similarity of muscle synergies (i.e., muscle weights and activation profiles) with respect to normative data from neurologically intact individuals are highly related to functional impairment metrics, including walking speed, step length, and step width.(5, 6) Furthermore, improvement in gait spatiotemporal metrics after gait rehabilitation is accompanied by changing muscle synergy patterns in individuals with chronic stroke,(6, 7) suggesting that not only is it possible to alter muscle coordination after the neuroplastic window is closed but neuroplastic changes may contribute to changes in gait outcomes and biomechanics.

When paired with task-oriented movement intent, functional electrical stimulation (FES) can induce peripheral benefits(8) and enhance central nervous system neuroplasticity(9-13) by providing timed muscle activation and sensory feedback and helping to reshape neural control through repetitive training.(14, 15) FES is commonly used to stimulate the tibialis anterior (TA)/peroneal nerve during swing phase to address foot drop, one of the major gait impairments post-stroke.(16, 17) However, FES to a single muscle has demonstrated limited improvement over high intensity gait training (HIGT)–the standard of care–for improving chronic stroke gait.(18) Conversely, extending stimulation to multiple muscles of the lower limb can target a greater breadth of motor impairments that collectively impair gait. Several studies have investigated additional stimulation to the gastrocnemius (GAS),(19, 20) gluteus medius (GM),(21, 22) and quadriceps/hamstrings,(23, 24) showing improvements in motor outcomes. We hypothesize that an intervention stimulating all of the key muscles for gait may further improve outcomes, but the challenge is to identify an evidence-based approach to objectively determine when to stimulate each muscle and to develop an easy-to-learn and quick implementation of multi-channel, customizable FES.

Recently, our team pioneered a novel, personalized intervention: muscle synergy-based multichannel functional electrical stimulation (MFES) gait rehabilitation for chronic stroke.(25) This technique quantifies motor impairment of each individual post-stroke by identifying which synergies are impaired and designing a personalized stimulation strategy of each muscle based only on the impaired synergies. Additionally, the muscle synergy-based stimulation technique has been shown to reduce FES-induced fatigue in the upper limb compared to other MFES stimulation techniques.(26) Our team(25) and other colleagues(27) have developed pilot implementations of the novel intervention on two individuals post-stroke each in a four-week training protocol and found improved coordination and gait outcomes. These preliminary findings underscore the need for further exploration of its clinical implementation with a comprehensive evaluation of effectiveness through clinical, biomechanical, and neuromuscular assessments. CIONIC, Inc. has developed the Cionic Neural Sleeve, a FDA-approved MFES wireless sleeve that can record and stimulate from the major muscle groups of the leg and is currently approved for home use in individuals with upper motor neuron injuries.(28, 29) Setup and use are streamlined through a user-friendly application interface that allows users to select muscle targets and fine-tune stimulation parameters—including amplitude, pulse width, and frequency—for each muscle independently. The Cionic Neural Sleeve has been shown to improve ankle dorsiflexion in individuals with foot drop, based on a study involving 32 participants with various neurological impairments.(30) The study also reported improvements in quality of life, along with high feasibility and safety.(31)

In this study, we aim to investigate the efficacy of a six-week synergy-based MFES combined with HIGT protocol to improve functional gait outcomes, biomechanics, and muscle coordination compared to HIGT, the standard of care, in chronic stroke survivors. Furthermore, we intend to

implement this novel, personalized intervention in the clinical setting via the Cionic Neural Sleeve that was adapted for this study. We assessed clinical feasibility by tracking the time required to don the device and configure stimulation parameters, and by collecting feedback from both participants and therapists experienced in inpatient stroke gait rehabilitation. We hypothesized that improvements in gait outcomes would correspond with biomechanical and muscle coordination changes resembling those of neurologically intact individuals. Additionally, we expected that, following therapist familiarization, preparation times would support clinical feasibility and that the intervention would be rated as usable, acceptable, and appropriate by both participants and clinicians.

Methods

Device

This study used the Cionic Neural Sleeve (Figure 1C), an FDA-approved device (510(k) number K21362) intended to provide ankle dorsiflexion and/or plantarflexion in adult individuals with foot drop and/or to assist knee flexion or extension in adult individuals with muscle weakness related to upper motor neuron disease/injury (e.g. stroke, damage to pathways to the spinal cord).(28, 29) Available in multiple sizes to accommodate different body types, the sleeve integrates recording and biphasic stimulation electrodes targeting the tibialis anterior (TA), gastrocnemius (GAS), rectus femoris (RF), vastus lateralis (VL), semitendinosus (ST), and biceps femoris (BF). It also includes two embedded inertial measurement units (IMUs) on the shank and thigh. To enable stimulation of the gluteus medius (GM)—a key muscle for gait not covered by the standard sleeve—Cionic custom-developed an external hip unit for this study, equipped with an IMU and EMG/stimulation electrodes (depicted in right panel of Figure 1C). EMG signals were sampled at 2000 Hz and IMU data at 100 Hz. The study protocol was approved by the Northwestern

University Institutional Review Board (STU00218244) and conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki.

Participant Training

Population

Fourteen individuals with a history of a single, unilateral, supratentorial stroke of either ischemic or hemorrhagic etiology occurring at least six months prior were recruited for this study. Individuals were eligible if they experienced reduced walking ability, but could still walk independently for at least ten meters with or without an assistive device. Exclusion criteria included other neurological conditions or peripheral nerve injuries, comorbidities impacting gait (e.g., severe arthritis or recent fracture), significant spasticity (greater than or equal to 3 on the Modified Ashworth Scale), contraindications to FES, and current enrollment in other lower limb therapy or research studies. Of the eighteen individuals recruited for the study, three were unenrolled due to not meeting criteria upon in-person assessment and one dropped out. Prior to the initial visit, participants were randomly assigned to one of two groups: 1) HIGT or 2) HIGT in combination with synergy-based MFES (MFES+HIGT). All participants provided informed consent at the initial visit and then completed a baseline assessment. See Table 1 for general characteristics of participants. Three levels of ambulation are reported based on the self-selected walking speed during the 10MWT at baseline: household (<0.4 m/s), limited community (0.4-0.8 m/s), and community (>0.8 m/s).(32)

To assess clinical feasibility, four physical therapists from Shirley Ryan AbilityLab were recruited to deliver the MFES+HIGT training protocol. All therapists provided informed consent and completed two hours of training on both the rehabilitation protocol and use of the Cionic Neural Sleeve prior to being paired with a post-stroke participant for the six-week intervention. On

average, therapists had 4.5 years of experience in post-stroke gait rehabilitation and were familiar with single-channel FES for foot drop (primarily using the Bioness device to stimulate the TA).

Intervention

Participants in both groups completed three sessions per week for six weeks, for a total of eighteen training sessions. During training, participants ambulated on a treadmill with a harness donned for safety only (no external support provided), per recommendations by the clinical practice guidelines.(33) They were allowed to use upper extremity support on the handrails of the treadmill if needed. Training consisted of a five-minute warmup period, 20 minutes of HIGT with or without synergy-based MFES, and a five-minute cool down. During warmup and cool down, participants walked at their self-selected velocity (SSV), which was determined during the 10 Meter Walk Test (10MWT) at their baseline assessment. In both groups, therapists were instructed to challenge participants during the training session to reach 70-85% of their maximum heart rate (HR),(33) which was measured using a Polar OH1 sensor over the wrist extensors or biceps for real time feedback.(34, 35) Maximum HR was calculated using the following equation(36):

$$Max\ HR = 208 - 0.7 * (Age)$$

If the participant was on beta-blockers, the HR range was reduced by 15 bpm to account for the effects of the medication. Therapists could modulate speed and incline to increasingly challenge the participants.(37-39) For those unable to achieve the required intensity in their HR range (N=2), the Borg Rating of Perceived Exertion (RPE) scale,(40) which ranges from 6-20, was used to monitor intensity with a goal RPE rating of 15 to 17 (“hard” to “very hard”).

For participants in the MFES+HIGT group, therapists first donned the Cionic Neural Sleeve and the additional external hip unit on participants’ impaired limb. For each muscle, the maximum

comfortable stimulation amplitude that produced a strong visible contraction was determined individually (range: 15–100 mA), while stimulation frequency and pulse width were standardized at 30 Hz and 300 µs, respectively. Stimulation amplitude could be modified throughout training by the therapist as necessary. Time taken to don the device and set stimulation parameters was recorded during each session to assess clinical feasibility. Parameters set at the initial training visit were saved, and thus only tested and modified if needed at subsequent visits. Participants received personalized stimulation (see next section) only during the 20-minute high-intensity block of training.

Personalized Stimulation Control

The personalized stimulation control has been designed as described in our previous work,(25) validating the concept (depicted in Figure 1A with examples in 1B).

Participant EMG Processing and Muscle Synergies

Participant EMG was recorded at baseline during treadmill walking at SSV, which was determined during the baseline 10MWT. Signals were bandpass filtered (3rd order, 40-400 Hz cutoff, Butterworth filter), rectified, and low pass filtered (3rd order, 5 Hz cutoff, Butterworth). They were then segmented into gait cycles using peak sagittal shank IMU angle as a proxy for heel strike. Segmented EMG signals for each muscle were interpolated from 0 to 100% of the gait cycle and normalized to the peak to their peak-to-peak amplitude. An average EMG profile was computed for each muscle across all acceptable strides (Figure 1A Step 1).

Normative muscle synergy weights (***W***) and activation profiles (***H***) were computed as the average of fourteen neurologically intact individuals (age: 46.9±17.0) walking at ten speeds ranging from 0.45 m/s to 1.8 m/s for one minute each using nonnegative matrix factorization (NNMF) and a

variance accounted for threshold of 0.9 to define the number of synergies (four synergies were extracted on average).(41) To ensure accurate comparison between participant and normative synergies—and to prevent incorrect matching between non-corresponding components—a modified nonnegative matrix reconstruction algorithm was used.(25) The average normative weights (W_{Norm}) and activation profiles (H_{Norm}) were used in combination with the average participant EMG (M_{Pt}, 7 by 101 matrix) to perform two non-negative matrix reconstructions to obtain the participant weights (W_{Pt}) and activation profiles (H_{Pt}). Participant weights (W_{Pt}) were computed by fixing the normative activation profiles (H_{Norm}) and only allowing the participant weights to be updated in each iteration ***i*** of the algorithm below:

$$W_{Pt}^{i+1} = W_{Pt}^{i} \frac{(M_{Pt}, \cdot H_{Norm}^{T})}{(W_{Pt}^{i} \cdot H_{Norm} \cdot H_{Norm}^{T})}$$

Similarly, participant activation profiles (H_{Pt}) were computed by fixing the normative synergy weights (W_{Norm}) and only allowing the participant activation profiles to be updated in each iteration of the algorithm below:

$$H_{Pt}^{i+1} = H_{Pt}^{i} \frac{(W_{Norm}^{T} \cdot M_{Pt},)}{(W_{Norm}^{T} \cdot W_{Norm} \cdot H_{Pt}^{i})}$$

Both iterative algorithms were run together for a minimum of 30 and maximum of 300 iterations. If the reduction in error from the reconstructed EMG using W_{Pt} and H_{Pt} and the average participant EMG did not exceed 10^{-5} and the minimum number of iterations was reached, the iterative algorithm was concluded. Once the iterative algorithm was complete, the unitary norm of participant synergies was taken for comparison with normative synergies (Figure 1A Step 2).

Identification of Impaired Participant Synergies

Participant synergies were compared to average normative synergies, and the degree of deviation was quantified using three metrics: cosine similarity of weights $\boldsymbol{W}$, circular cross correlation coefficient of activation profiles $\boldsymbol{H}$, and circular cross correlation time lag of activation profiles $\boldsymbol{H}$.(25) The time lag was computed as $Tlag = 1 - \left|\frac{lag}{100}\right|$, where lag represents a percentage of the gait cycle (value between -50 and 50%). The mean and standard deviation for all three metrics of muscle synergies of neurologically intact individuals with the average normative synergies were first computed. For each participant synergy, comparisons to normative averages were computed, and a synergy was classified as impaired if any of the three metrics deviated by more than two standard deviations from the normative average (Figure 1A Step 3).

Personalized Participant Stimulation Profiles

Only the impaired synergies were used to drive the personalized stimulation profile development. The normative weights and activation profiles of synergies that were deemed impaired for each participant were used for nonnegative matrix reconstruction to compute a stimulation profile for each muscle (***m***) according to the following equation:

$$Stimulation_m = \sum_{i=1}^{n} W_{Norm,i} * H_{Norm,i}$$

where ***n*** is the set of impaired synergies and ***i*** is the specific impaired synergy. The stimulation profile was then normalized such that the minimum value was set to zero and maximum value was set to one. To prevent continuous stimulation throughout the gait cycle and minimize fatigue, only stimulation values exceeding 0.2 were included in the stimulation profile. These values were then

scaled to the maximum stimulation amplitude set by the therapist through the interface (Figure 1A Step 4).

Gait Event Detection

The duration of each gait cycle was continuously updated using an exponential moving average based on the previous ten cycles. Because participants may experience prolonged phases within the gait cycle, relying solely on heel strike to trigger stimulation could lead to inappropriately timed stimulation. To address this, key gait events were identified in the fourteen neurologically intact individuals using sagittal plane IMU angles from the shank and thigh. These events and their average timing within the gait cycle were: peak shank (0/100%), negative zero crossing (positive to negative) shank (28%), minimum thigh (57%), positive zero crossing (negative to positive) thigh (68%), minimum shank (73%), and positive zero crossing (negative to positive) shank (91%). Gait events that occurred nearest in time (% gait cycle) to the desired onset of the stimulation ramp-up and ramp-down phases were identified from each participant's gait cycle. These events were used to trigger stimulation onset of ramp-up and ramp-down, respectively, with brief delays applied to each to ensure alignment with the personalized stimulation timing profile (Figure 1A Step 5).

A. Steps for Personalized Stimulation

1. At baseline, record EMG and compute ***participant synergies*** with nonnegative matrix factorization iterative algorithm
2. Compare ***participant synergies*** to ***average normative synergies*** from neurologically intact individuals
3. Identify ***impaired*** participant synergies with ***cosine similarity*** and ***circular cross correlation***
4. Nonnegative matrix reconstruction of each muscle with ***only impaired synergies***
5. Provide ***precisely timed*** stimulation based on reconstructed activation profiles during ***HIGT*** block



B. Example Personalized Stimulation



C. Cionic Neural Sleeve

258

Figure 1: Personalized Synergy-Based Stimulation. A) Steps for identifying impaired synergies, computing personalized stimulation based on the identified impaired synergies, and precisely timing stimulation. B) Example of personalized stimulation profiles for two participants with varying baseline synergy impairments. C) Cionic Neural Sleeve with electrode placement, sleeve fit, and the application interface with the ability to modify frequency, pulse width, and intensity (current). The placement of the external hip unit is also displayed, with labels for the stimulation electrodes and sensor for recording electromyography (EMG) and inertial measurement unit (IMU) signals. GM = Gluteus Medius, GAS = Gastrocnemius, TA = Tibialis Anterior, VL = Vastus Lateralis, RF = Rectus Femoris, BF = Biceps Femoris, ST = Semitendinosus.

Assessment Visits and Outcome Measures

Assessment Visit

Assessments were performed at baseline, midpoint (after completing nine training sessions), post (after completing all training sessions), and one month after completing the training. The baseline assessment was completed one week prior to the beginning of training. During this week, the participant wore a step-counting device (ActiGraph, USA)(42-44) to track average daily number of steps taken as a measure of participation. This was repeated immediately following completion of all training sessions.

At each assessment point, participants completed three clinical assessments: the 10-Meter Walk Test (10MWT) at both SSV and fast velocity (FV), the 6-Minute Walk Test (6MWT), and the Berg Balance Scale (BBS). The 10MWT was repeated twice at both speeds while participants were recorded using a markerless motion capture system developed by our team,(45) enabling extraction of spatiotemporal gait parameters and joint kinematics. For both the 10MWT and 6MWT, participants were permitted to use the same assistive device for all assessment points (e.g., cane or

walker), but ankle-foot orthoses were not allowed to assess intrinsic ankle motor control impairments.

Following completion of the clinical assessments, at each assessment visit, all participants donned the Neural Sleeve on the affected limb with the addition of the external hip sensors. Following a two-minute warm-up, participants walked on a treadmill for two minutes at their SSV while the Neural Sleeve recorded IMU angular data and EMG from the same muscles used for stimulation. No stimulation was administered during assessment visits.

Gait Biomechanics Outcome Measures

Markerless motion capture data taken during 10MWT SSV was processed according to Cotton et al.(45, 46) Videos were collected from multiple calibrated and synchronized cameras. Participant tracking using EasyMocap(47) and 2D joint location estimation using MeTRAbs-ACAE(48) was facilitated using PosePipe.(49) We used an end-to-end reconstruction approach to jointly learn the body scale parameters and joint angles of a differentiable biomechanical model most consistent with video observations.(46) From these biomechanical reconstructions, we extracted gait event timings(50, 51) and calculated the following spatiotemporal measures: step length, step width, and stance percent. Kinematic analysis was focused on joint movements and phases specific to stroke impairment on the impaired limb: peak ankle dorsiflexion during swing (foot clearance), peak hip abduction during swing (hip circumduction compensatory mechanism for impaired foot clearance), peak hip extension during stance (propulsion), peak knee extension during stance (stance stability and hyperextension), and knee flexion during swing (limb advancement and clearance).

Muscle Synergy Outcome Measures

Cosine similarity and circular cross correlation coefficient and lag were assessed for the impaired limb compared to normative synergies. These measures were computed for each synergy, and the average among synergies was reported. Additionally, the number of impaired synergies was reported.

Feasibility Outcome Measures

To obtain participant feedback on the experimental intervention, participants in both groups completed the Patient Perceived Usefulness Questionnaire, derived from the Global Rating of Change Scale,(52) with the prompt "*With respect to your walking ability, how would you describe yourself now compared to before starting your rehabilitation program?"* at the follow-up assessment via a scale from -5 (Much Worse) to 5 (Completely Recovered). Participants also had the opportunity to provide written feedback and any comments on how the training affected their outside life at the follow-up assessment.

To assess clinical feasibility, the time required to don the Cionic Neural Sleeve and set stimulation parameters was recorded for each session. To assess the ability of therapists to challenge their participants to achieve the requirements of HIGT, mean HR, peak HR, percentage of time spent in the target HR zone, and RPE were evaluated for each session. Therapists also completed a questionnaire, the Therapist Perceived Usefulness Questionnaire, derived from the Global Rating of Change Scale,(52) with the prompt "*With respect to the rehabilitation program used for this patient, how likely would you be to integrate this into your clinical practice*?", ranging from -5 (Very Unlikely) to 5 (Very Likely). This form also provided space to explain their choices and provide any additional feedback. Additionally, therapists completed two more surveys: Brooke System Usability Scale(53) and Weiner Acceptability, Appropriateness and Feasibility of

Intervention Measure.(54) All therapist forms were collected after completing at least six training sessions.

Statistics

SPSS 26.0.0.1 was used for statistical analysis. To compare participant demographics between groups, a linear mixed model was used with group (HIGT, MFES+HIGT) as a fixed effect. To ensure that the training sessions were equally challenging between groups, measures of heart rate and RPE were compared using a linear mixed model with Session Number and Group as effects and Participant, Therapist, Ambulation Level, Age, and Years Since Stroke as random effects. Because of the small and variable sample collected in this study, statistical analysis of training effects included a within group (HIGT, MFES+HIGT) linear mixed effects model to account for changes over time (pre, mid, post, follow-up) as a result of each type of training and a between group linear mixed effects model to compare the change from baseline between groups at each assessment point (mid, post, follow-up). Random effects included Participant, Ambulation Level (household, limited community, community), Age and Years Since Stroke. A significance value of 0.05 was used for all of our models. Simple linear regression was used to assess whether muscle synergy-related metrics (cosine similarity, cross correlation coefficient, cross correlation lag) predicted clinical outcomes at baseline (10MWT SSV, 10MWT FV, 6MWT). A linear plateau model was applied in RStudio 2025.05.0 to determine the inflection point at which setup time plateaued. Setup durations from 57 total sessions conducted by four physical therapists (PT1: 13 sessions, PT2: 15 sessions, PT3: 15 sessions, PT4: 14 sessions) were analyzed. Assumptions of linearity, independence, homoscedasticity, normality of residuals, and absence of multicollinearity were verified prior to analysis and data were transformed if residuals were not normal according

to Shapiro-Wilk's test. If after transformation, residuals were not normal, then a generalized linear mixed effects model was used.

Results

Participant Demographics

Seven participants per group (four males, three females) completed the training, with demographics displayed in Table 1. There was no significant difference between groups in age (HIGT: 60.6±10.7, MFES+HIGT: 57.7±10.2, p=0.331), years since stroke (p=0.703), baseline 10MWT SSV (p=0.625), baseline 6MWT (p=0.462), nor baseline BBS (p=0.909). Only one individual (who had been assigned to the HIGT group) dropped out of the study due to pre-existing medical issues before mid-assessment and therefore was not included in the analysis.

Table 1: Participant Demographics

ID	Group	Gender	Hemi Side	Years Since Stroke	Stroke Type	Baseline 10MWT SSV (m/s)	Baseline 6MWT (m)	Baseline BBS (/56)	Baseline Ambulatory Group
1	HIGT	Female	Right	21	Hemorrhagic	0.49	208	42	Limited
2	HIGT	Female	Right	5	Ischemic	0.69	250	48	Limited
3	HIGT	Male	Left	6	Ischemic	0.91	371	50	Community
4	HIGT	Male	Right	4	Ischemic	0.58	243	44	Limited
5	HIGT	Male	Right	15	Unknown	0.73	201	42	Limited
6	HIGT	Female	Left	2	Ischemic	1.01	366	54	Community
7	HIGT	Male	Left	6	Hemorrhagic	0.23	79	41	Household
7	**Mean ± Std**	**4M/3F**	**4R/3L**	**8.4 ± 6.9**		**0.66 ± 0.26**	**245.4 ± 101.2**	**45.9 ± 4.9**	**1 House, 4 Limited, 2 Community**
8	MFES+HIGT	Male	Left	3	Hemorrhagic	1.35	502	48	Community
9	MFES+HIGT	Female	Left	8	Hemorrhagic	0.4	133	49	Limited
10	MFES+HIGT	Male	Right	12	Ischemic	0.81	394	54	Community
11	MFES+HIGT	Male	Left	10	Hemorrhagic	0.15	47	33	Household
12	MFES+HIGT	Male	Left	2	Hemorrhagic	0.41	164	50	Limited
13	MFES+HIGT	Female	Left	15	Ischemic	0.11	43	34	Household
14	MFES+HIGT	Female	Left	3	Ischemic	0.75	58	50	Limited
7	**Mean ± Std**	**4M/3F**	**1R/6L**	**7.6 ± 5.1**		**0.57 ± 0.44**	**191.6 ± 183.6**	**45.4 ± 8.4**	**2 House, 3 Limited, 2 Community**

HIGT = High-Intensity Gait Training, MFES = Multichannel Functional Electrical Stimulation, Hemi = Hemiplegic, 10MWT SSV = 10 Meter Walk Test Self-Selected Velocity, 6MWT = 6 Minute Walk Test, BBS = Berg Balance Scale

Training Measures

Training and cardiovascular intensity results demonstrate that, on average, both groups were able to maintain HR intensities of 70-85% of maximum HR for 50% of each session, which is consistent with other HIGT studies.(55) In addition, average RPE was 14.1±3.2 for participants in HIGT and 14.9±2.9 for participants in MFES+HIGT, indicating that all participants perceived the intensity of the intervention close to 'Hard'. Only two participants (both in the MFES+HIGT group) were unable to achieve their target HR zone for more than 30% of the training time; however, their average RPE ratings were 16.6±1.5 and 13.2±1.0, respectively. There was no main effect of group, session, nor group*session interaction for mean HR (as a percentage of maximum predicted HR), peak HR (as a percentage of maximum predicted HR), percentage of time in HR zone, nor mean RPE. P-values are reported along with mean and standard deviations for all metrics (see Table 2). There were no adverse reactions in either group to training.

Table 2: Training and Cardiovascular Intensity Details

	HIGT	**MFES+HIGT**	**P-value**
Mean HR (% Predicted Max)	73.9 ± 6.0 %	70.0 ± 8.4 %	0.31
Peak HR (% Predicted Max)	82.1 ± 7.6 %	77.5 ± 8.9 %	0.28
Percent of Time in HR Zone	72.6 ± 30.2 %	49.2 ± 37.6 %	0.17
Mean RPE	14.1 ± 3.2	14.9 ± 2.9	0.65

HIGT = High-Intensity Gait Training, MFES = Multichannel Functional Electrical Stimulation, HR = Heart Rate, RPE = Borg Rating of Perceived Exertion (Range = 6-20).

Baseline Regression of Synergy Metrics with Clinical Assessments

Regression of synergy metrics and clinical assessments was run with baseline data for all participants, irrespective of training group, with the goal of validating the rationale behind driving changes in muscle synergies to improve clinical outcomes. As predicted, average cosine similarity and circular cross correlation coefficient at baseline were positively correlated with 10MWT SSV, 10MWT FV, and 6MWT. BBS was correlated with average cosine similarity and circular cross

correlation lag. Correlation coefficients and p values are displayed in Table 3, and regression analysis is depicted in Figure 2 for 10MWT FV with cosine similarity and 6MWT with circular cross correlation coefficient. On average, 2.1±1.6 and 2.3±0.8 synergies were impaired at baseline for the HIGT group and MFES+HIGT group, respectively (see Supplementary Table 1). In both groups, the synergy related to propulsion (primary activators: gastrocnemius) was the most frequently impaired (HIGT: 5/7, MFES+HIGT: 6/7) while the synergy related to weight acceptance (primary activators: gluteus medius, rectus femoris, vastus lateralis) was the least frequently impaired (2/7 in both groups).



Figure 2: Regression of Baseline Clinical Assessments with Synergy Metrics. Linear regression analysis compared clinical assessments and muscle synergy metrics at baseline to confirm their relationship prior to training. Exemplary correlations are demonstrated with 10 Meter Walk Test Fast Velocity (10MWT FV) vs average cosine similarity and 6 Minute Walk Test (6MWT) vs circular cross correlation coefficient. All data are displayed in Table 3.

Table 3: Baseline Regression of Synergy Metrics with Clinical Assessments

	Cosine Similarity	**Cross Correlation Coefficient**	**Cross Correlation Lag**
10MWT SSV	R = .633, P = 0.015*	R = 0.585, P = 0.028*	R = 0.487, P = 0.077
10MWT FV	R = .628, P = 0.016*	R = 0.557, P = 0.038*	R = 0.483, P = 0.080
6MWT	R = 0.572, P = 0.032*	R = 0.582, P = 0.029*	R = 0.351, P = 0.219
BBS	R = 0.678, P = 0.008*	R = 0.513, P = 0.061	R = 0.686, P = 0.007*

** Indicates significance regression where P < 0.05. 10MWT = 10 Meter Walk Test, SSV = Self-Selected Velocity, FV = Fast Velocity, 6MWT = 6 Minute Walk Test, BBS = Berg Balance Scale.*

Clinical Assessments

Clinical assessments are displayed in Figure 3. No differences were identified between groups at baseline (all p>0.05). For the 10MWT SSV, within the HIGT group, there was a main effect of time (p=0.043), with increases observed at post-intervention (0.75±0.31 m/s, p=0.005) and follow-up (0.74±0.32 m/s, p=0.011) compared to baseline (pre: 0.66±0.26 m/s). In the MFES+HIGT group, there was a main effect of time (p=0.004), with SSV higher at mid (0.64±0.44 m/s, p=0.022), post (0.67±0.45 m/s, p=0.003), and follow-up (0.69±0.50 m/s, p=0.001) compared to baseline (0.57±0.43 m/s). No differences in changes from baseline were identified between groups. For the 10MWT FV, within the HIGT group, no main effect of time was detected (avg=1.05±0.52 m/s, p=0.318). In the MFES+HIGT group, there was a main effect of time (p=0.022), with greater FV at post (0.84±0.56 m/s, p=0.015) and follow-up (0.87±0.61 m/s, p=0.004) compared to baseline (0.71±0.53 m/s). The improvement in fast velocity at follow-up was greater for MFES+HIGT than HIGT (p=0.040). For the 6MWT distance, within the HIGT group, there was a main effect of time (p=0.043), with greater distance at mid (277±122 m) compared to baseline (pre: 245±102 m, p=0.006). In the MFES+HIGT group, there was a main effect of time (p=0.014), with greater distance at mid (237±173 m, p=0.049), post (264±187 m, p=0.004) and follow-up (259±188 m, p=0.006) compared to baseline. No differences in changes from baseline were identified between groups. For the BBS, within the HIGT group, there was a main effect of time (p=0.039), with a higher score at mid (48.9±3.9) compared to baseline (pre: 45.9±4.91, p=0.005), while the MFES+HIGT group exhibited no effect of time (avg=45.1±7.8, p=0.521). This improvement from baseline for the HIGT group at midpoint was greater than the improvement for the MFES+HIGT group (p=0.017), however improvements were not maintained at post and follow-up. Average

number of steps per day had no main effect of time in either group (HIGT: 1908±1295, p=0.203; MFES+HIGT: 3035±2285, p=0.375) and the improvement did not differ (p=0.150).



Figure 3: Change in Clinical Assessments from Baseline. The 10 Meter Walk Test (10MWT) at self-selected velocity (SSV) and fast velocity (FV) and the 6 Minute Walk Test (6MWT) are presented. Box plots display group data and individual points display participant data on the difference from the baseline visit. Group is depicted by color and baseline ambulatory category is depicted in the shape (see legend). * represents a within group significant difference across time with the color of the * matching the group. ╪ represents a difference between groups at a specific time point. A significance threshold of $p < 0.05$ was used.

Gait Spatiotemporal Metrics and Biomechanics

Spatiotemporal metrics and joint kinematics during SSV are reported in Figure 4 and Supplementary Table 2. No differences were identified between groups at baseline for spatiotemporal metrics and joint angles (all p>0.05). Both groups demonstrated a significant effect

of time on step length of the impaired limb (HIGT: p=0.027, MFES+HIGT: p=0.033), with both exhibiting improvements at post (HIGT: p=0.033, MFES+HIGT: p=0.013) and follow-up (HIGT: p=0.007, MFES+HIGT: p=0.010) compared to baseline. No differences in changes from baseline were identified between groups (all p>0.05). For step width, within the HIGT group, no main effect of time was found (p=0.213), but a main effect of time was identified in the MFES+HIGT group (p=0.028), with a significant reduction from baseline to mid (p=0.048), post (p=0.042), and follow-up (p=0.004). The change at follow-up was significantly different between groups (p=0.019). For stance percent of the impaired limb, within the HIGT group, no main effect of time was found (p=0.602), but a main effect of time was identified in the MFES+HIGT group (p=0.018), with stance percent getting worse (less) at post compared to baseline (p=0.004). No between group differences in changes from baseline were identified (all p>0.05).

In the HIGT group, the maximum dorsiflexion angle during swing had a main effect of time (p=0.050), with participants exhibiting worse dorsiflexion (less) at post compared to baseline (p=0.008), while no main effect of time was found in the MFES+HIGT group (p=0.682). For hip extension during stance (a proxy measure of propulsion), while neither group exhibited a change over time (HIGT: p=0.590, MFES+HIGT: p=0.083), participants in the MFES+HIGT group exhibited a moderate increase in extension at post (14.3±.10.3°) compared to baseline (9.7±.13.2°). No other kinematic metrics (hip abduction during swing, knee extension during stance, knee flexion during swing) changed with time in either group (all p>0.05). No differences in changes from baseline were identified between groups for all kinematic metrics (all p>0.05).



Figure 4: Change in Biomechanics. Top panel: change in impaired limb step length, step width, and impaired limb stance percent. Bottom panel: change in peak ankle dorsiflexion angle during swing, peak knee extension angle during stance, and peak hip extension angle during stance. Positive orientation for each joint are as follows: ankle = dorsiflexion, knee = extension, hip = flexion. Box plots display group data and individual points display participant data on the difference from the baseline visit. Group is depicted by color and baseline ambulatory category is depicted in the shape (see legend). * represents a within group significant difference across

time with the color of the * matching the group. ╪ represents a difference between groups at a specific time point. A significance threshold of $p < 0.05$ was used. DF = Dorsiflexion, PF = Plantarflexion, Flex = Flexion, Ext = Extension.

Muscle Synergies

On average, four muscle synergies were extracted from neurologically intact individuals, and therefore, four synergies were used for the average normative data. Muscle synergies of participants were compared with average normative data and results are displayed in Figure 5. No differences were identified between groups at baseline (all $p>0.05$). The average cosine similarity across all impaired-side synergies showed no significant effect of time in either group (HIGT: avg=0.93±0.07, p=0.527; MFES+HIGT: avg=0.91±0.06, p=0.670). Similarly, the average circular cross-correlation coefficient did not change over time in the HIGT group (avg=0.83±0.10, p=0.695). However, in the MFES+HIGT group, a significant main effect of time on circular cross correlation coefficient was observed (p=0.038), with increases at post (0.82±0.04, p=0.036) and follow-up (0.81±0.04, p=0.027) compared to baseline (0.79±0.05). The absolute time lag of the circular cross-correlation showed no effect of time in either group (HIGT: avg=0.88±0.11, p=0.863; MFES+HIGT: avg=0.86±0.06, p=0.993). Number of impaired synergies showed no effect of time in either group (HIGT: avg=2.39±1.26, p=0.129; MFES+HIGT: avg=3.39±0.74, p=0.564). No differences between the changes from baseline were identified between groups for all synergy metrics (all $p>0.05$).



Figure 5: Change in Average Muscle Synergy Metrics of Impaired Limb. Cosine similarity and circular cross correlation coefficient were computed between participant synergies and average normative data. Line plots display individual data for each participant on the left, with averages depicted by thicker lines. Box plots display group data and individual points display participant data on the difference from the baseline visit on the right. Group is depicted by color and baseline ambulatory category is depicted in the shape (see legend). * represents a within group significant difference across time where $p < 0.05$ with the color of the * matching the group.

Feasibility

Participants completed the Patient Perceived Usefulness Questionnaire, rating between -5 (“Much Worse”) and 5 (“Completely Recovered”). On average, the MFES+HIGT group rating was

+3.43±1.51, while the HIGT group rating was +3.14±0.38, which were not significantly different ($p = 0.636$). Below are responses from three participants in the MFES+HIGT group, emphasizing their greater independence, perceived improvement in endurance, and improvement in quality of life:

"I am walking much better than before…I was relying on a brace…walking and now I don't use any device at all. My balance is much improved and I am more independent in living my life. My wife says that I am walking much better."

"I am walking much (more) without my brace and moving much faster."

"Confidently walking at home without AFO"

Participants in the HIGT group also reported improvements in endurance and balance, but did not report the reduction in dependence on assistive devices as much as the MFES+HIGT group.

The time to don the device and set FES parameters was recorded and assessed for clinical feasibility, as displayed in Figure 6. The inflection point, where the plateau began, was identified at 8.48 sessions and the slope of the learning phase was -0.758 minutes per session. The curve plateaued at 4.53 minutes. Therapists completed the Therapist Perceived Usefulness Questionnaire on whether they would implement synergy-based MFES+HIGT into their own clinical practice, rating between -5 ("Very Unlikely") and 5 ("Very Likely"). Therapists reported a mean score of +3.6±0.48. Therapist feedback included ease of use to don and doff the device and update stimulation parameters throughout training. For the Implementation Outcome Measures,(54) which ranges from 1 to 5 and measures feasibility, appropriateness, and acceptability of intervention, therapists reported an average score of 3.9±0.13, 4.1±0.13, and 4±0.00, respectively. Lastly, on the 10-item System Usability Scale, measured on a 5-point Likert scale with a total

score out of 100, average therapist score for synergy-based MFES was 72.15±7.5 indicating an "OK" rating bordering "Good".



Figure 6: Preparation Time vs Number of Sessions. The time to don the sleeve and set parameters was recorded for each session for each of the four therapists, who are each depicted with a different color as specified in the legend. An inflection point analysis was conducted to identify the learning region and the plateau region. The slope of the learning region was -0.7578 minutes per session as depicted by the solid line. The preparation time plateaued at 8.48 sessions at a value of 4.53 minutes.

Discussion

In this study, we investigated the use of muscle synergy-based MFES paired with HIGT in a six-week chronic stroke gait rehabilitation compared to standard of care, HIGT, and the feasibility of implementing this intervention into the clinical setting. At baseline, clinical assessments were

positively correlated with synergy metrics, suggesting a strong relationship between muscle synergy organization and timing with gait function. The addition of synergy-based MFES did not hinder the ability of the therapists to challenge participants to reach the training metrics set for standard HIGT, and training metrics did not differ between groups. Only the MFES+HIGT group demonstrated sustained improvements in fast walking speed and endurance, with fast walking speed greater at follow-up in MFES+HIGT compared to HIGT. Furthermore, while both groups improved impaired limb step length, MFES+HIGT also led to reduced step width, suggesting more stable gait, while HIGT led to worse dorsiflexion during swing. Muscle synergy average circular cross correlation coefficient to normative data in only the MFES+HIGT group improved while other synergy metrics did not change in either group. Participant rating of the perceived effects of MFES+HIGT were positive, with a perception of improved confidence and reduced reliance on assistive devices after training. Therapists administering MFES+HIGT (n=4) rated the intervention highly with respect to its feasibility, appropriateness, acceptability, and usability. Therapist comfort with the device improved rapidly, requiring only nine sessions to plateau in preparation time to an average of 4.53 minutes, which is feasible for clinical implementation. We recognize that statistical analysis is limited due to the small and highly variable population recruited in this study. Despite this limitation, we believe that these positive preliminary results support the need to extend this intervention into a larger randomized controlled clinical trial, stratified for individuals with diverse baseline functions and time since stroke to effectively identify responders and non-responders, and potentially investigate a greater number of sessions to produce greater clinically meaningful differences.

Training

On average, each group was able to achieve the target HR zone (70-85%) for 50% of each session. This was consistent with prior studies,(55) where participants maintained the 70-85% HR zone for at least 30% of a training session. Two participants (both in MFES+HIGT) were unable to achieve the target HR zone for at least 30% despite adjustments to speed and incline of the treadmill, leading to a non-significant but large difference between groups in time spent in target HR zone (HIGT: 72.6±30.2%; MFES+HIGT: 49.2±37.6%). These participants were both household ambulators with much lower SSV and greater levels of gait impairment who were unable to achieve faster speeds and inclines on the treadmill, limiting their intensity. However, RPE rating indicated that they were significantly challenged, with all ratings above 13. The two household ambulators in the MFES+HIGT group compared to the one in the HIGT group likely brought down the average time spent in target HR zone.

Clinical Outcomes

The present study found that while both groups improved SSV, only the MFES+HIGT group demonstrated a significant and sustained improvement in FV and endurance, with the improvement in FV at follow-up significantly greater for the MFES+HIGT group than HIGT group. The HIGT group did significantly improve in BBS and to a greater extent than the MFES+HIGT group at the midpoint, but this was not maintained after training or at follow-up, and no changes in average daily number of steps were observed. FV relies heavily on the strength of the hip flexors and extensors.(56, 57) Therefore, the greater improvement in fast walking speed observed in the MFES+HIGT group may be attributed to enhanced power generation at the paretic hip, likely facilitated by stimulation of gluteus medius, quadriceps, and hamstrings. While HIGT has been shown to elicit improvements in walking speed, endurance, balance, and steps per day through

task repetition for chronic stroke rehabilitation,(58) it is not as effective as in the subacute phase post-stroke,(55) and long-term recovery remains uncertain for chronic stroke.(59) Furthermore, single-channel FES to the TA does not consistently improve gait speed and endurance compared to HIGT,(60) while greater improvements can be elicited by stimulating an additional muscle (e.g., gluteus medius(21, 22), gastrocnemius(19, 20)) or by stimulating all major muscle groups.(25, 27) Importantly, our results highlight the maintenance of improvements in FV and endurance at one month following the completion of only MFES+HIGT. Therefore, addressing impairments to coordination of the entire leg may be the key to enhancing gait rehabilitation, but further investigation of the long-term effects is necessary.

We hypothesize that MFES+HIGT may elicit more efficient neuromuscular control by optimizing muscle coordination, minimizing compensatory strategies, and reducing energy expenditure, thus facilitating the improved endurance found in this study. This interpretation is supported by previous work combining FES with task-specific training, which has been shown to preserve muscle mass in patients with moderate to severe acute stroke.(61) Furthermore, administering FES to the TA and gastrocnemius during FV has been shown to reduce energy expenditure post-stroke,(19, 20) and a study comparing synergy-based multichannel FES to other approaches in the upper limb found that synergy-based stimulation elicits reduced fatigue during training.(26) Endurance remains a critical challenge in stroke rehabilitation,(62) and greater walking endurance has been linked to better community reintegration outcomes.(63) Together, these findings suggest that while both groups gained from repetitive, high-intensity walking, the added sensorimotor stimulation in the MFES+HIGT group may have yielded more efficient, fatigue-resistant gait, thereby improving FV and endurance.

Biomechanics

Biomechanical gait analysis identified an increase in impaired limb step length for the both groups while only the MFES+HIGT group exhibited a reduction in step width, suggesting improved dynamic balance.(64, 65) However, MFES+HIGT also led to reduced impaired limb stance percent, which suggests that participants are spending less time in stance on their impaired limb. This could be a result of decreased hip extension, compromising the propulsive phase of stance and leading to reduced propulsive force, a common impairment post-stroke.(17, 66) The reduced torques produced to propel an individual post-stroke during gait are suggested to be a result of abnormal muscle coordination.(67) Reduced stance percent may also be due to greater knee hyperextension, which can reduce walking speed, decrease gait efficiency, and increase energy expenditure.(68) However, participants in the MFES+HIGT group exhibited non-significant, yet moderate improvement in hip extension during stance and no change in knee extension during stance (Figure 4) in addition to the improvements in walking speed and endurance, suggesting that joint kinematic compensations were not driving the reduction in stance phase.

HIGT also led to a negative effect, with participants exhibiting reduced ankle dorsiflexion during swing after training compared to baseline while no change was found after MFES+HIGT. Lack of dorsiflexion during swing phase leads to foot drop, which can often result in compensatory movements, such as hip circumduction and hip hiking.(16, 17) Therefore, we hypothesize that HIGT may have reinforced compensatory mechanisms at the cost of improving gait speed, leading to worse foot drop. The goal of HIGT is to challenge patients to reach a target HR zone by increasing speed and incline, forcing the individual to devise a strategy to achieve the task. In an unguided kinematic space, this could include compensatory mechanisms that may not be optimal due to stress on other joints or less efficient movement patterns. Pairing HIGT with FES to the TA

has been shown to improve dorsiflexion during swing, the target of the stimulation.(16) However, its limited ability to improve broader coordination across joints combined with improved spatiotemporal metrics after stimulation to both gluteus medius and TA(22) provides the rationale for extending stimulation to multiple muscles and personalizing stimulation to the individual's impairment. In this study, while the MFES+HIGT group did not significantly improve any joint kinematic metrics, they at least maintained baseline function and, in the case of hip extension during stance, exhibited moderate improvements. Therefore, individuals undergoing targeted training to address abnormal muscle synergies may better facilitate changes that not only improve propulsion, which would enable faster walking speeds with decreased energy expenditure, but also avoid compensatory joint kinematics. The stimulation strategy may have guided movement within a kinematic space that promotes muscle coordination patterns more similar to normative recruitment (as discussed in the next section), thereby limiting the emergence of abnormal patterns. Ultimately, joint kinematic improvements were limited in both interventions. Additional investigation of comparison to normative data, inter-joint coordination, and inter-limb coordination may provide a deeper understanding of the altered kinematic strategies used to achieve the improvements in fast walking speed and endurance.

Muscle Synergies

At baseline, we observed a significant relationship between clinical assessments and muscle synergy metrics, particularly, for cosine similarity and circular cross correlation coefficient, providing support for an intervention that drives changes in muscle synergies to elicit changes in gait function. While, there were no changes in the spatial organization of muscle synergies (i.e., cosine similarity) or the number of impaired synergies for either group, MFES+HIGT improved average similarity of the activation profile to normative data (i.e., circular cross correlation

coefficient) and maintained this improvement at follow-up. The improvement in physiological timing of muscle activation may have been induced by the enhanced afferent feedback provided by FES during MFES+HIGT.(9-13) These findings align with previous literature demonstrating that muscle synergy analysis can quantify neuromuscular impairment of individuals with chronic stroke, and that these impairments relate to functional capacity. In the lower limb, post-stroke gait is characterized by a reduction in number of synergies in the impaired limb, which correlates with impairments in gait speed, step length, and propulsion.(5) Prior work from our group has shown that combining muscle synergy and biomechanical features improves the prediction of walking function post-stroke.(69)

Moreover, stroke gait rehabilitation has been shown to increase the number of synergies and enhance the timing of impaired synergies, resulting in improved biomechanics and gait outcomes.(6, 7) Two pilot studies (one by our group) on two individuals each receiving four weeks of synergy-based MFES gait training resulted in moderate improvements in number of synergies and similarity of synergies to normative data, which were accompanied by moderate improvements in walking outcomes and gait metrics.(25, 27) We have also demonstrated that cycling training combined with FES for individuals post-stroke can improve clinical outcomes, gait spatiotemporal metrics, and similarity of gait synergies to normative patterns.(70) Although no changes emerged with respect to the spatial organization of synergies (i.e., cosine similarity), the improvements in similarity of the synergy activation timing to normative data highlight the ability of this targeted intervention to modify neural control. Furthermore, the lack of changes in both joint kinematics and cosine similarity may reflect the relatively low intervention dosage (18 sessions of 20 minutes) and high variability in baseline impairment and synergy composition. A larger sample and a higher

training dose (e.g., more or longer sessions) may be required to elicit group-level effects on synergy structure and kinematics.

Feasibility

Training with MFES+HIGT resulted in no dropouts, while only one dropout occurred in the HIGT group (due to preexisting medical conditions), with no adverse reactions in either group. Participants rated both interventions equally well with a score of 3.14 (HIGT) and 3.43 (MFES+HIGT) on a scale of -5 to 5. Participants in the MFES+HIGT group reported that after training, they had improved endurance, increased confidence, and reduced reliance on assistive devices, with some stating that they no longer use their ankle foot orthosis. Qualitatively, this is a very promising finding, which should be systematically investigated in future studies.

This study also aimed to assess the usability and clinical feasibility of the novel MFES+HIGT protocol amongst practicing physical therapists. With two hours of training and after approximately nine sessions to administer the protocol, therapists were able to don the Cionic Neural Sleeve and set FES parameters in 4.53 minutes on average. These therapists were experienced with post-stroke gait training for at least three years and had some level of experience with single-channel FES for foot drop. Although there is not current data to compare these results to other FES devices, this appears to be a very feasible intervention for clinical implementation. In practice, an individual receiving outpatient physical therapy will typically be scheduled for 45 minutes, two to three times per week. Therapy sessions include time for subjective report, objective measures, monitoring vitals, and set up for intervention. With limited time for direct administration of HIGT interventions, it is imperative that technology-assisted interventions do not take away from the time administering an intervention in order for therapists to be able to achieve at least 20 minutes of HIGT per session.(33) Upon further evaluation of the System Usability Scores,

therapists addressed a concern in the following question: “I think that I would need the support of a technical person to be able to use this system,” with two agreeing with this statement and two neutral on the topic. Modifications to the sleeve to include the external channels that allow stimulation and recording of gluteus medius led to greater setup times, lack of confidence when manually placing electrodes, and a few disconnects between the system and the external unit, which is when a researcher would provide technical support.

Feedback from therapists administering the MFES+HIGT protocol overall indicated that the intervention was usable. The System Usability Scale score on average was 71.5, passing the threshold for acceptable usability (68/100).(71, 72) In addition, the average response from the therapists on the Perceived Usefulness questionnaire was 3.6 indicating that they were likely to implement the intervention into their clinical practice. Notably, all therapists were practicing in an inpatient acute rehabilitation setting and primarily treated individuals in the subacute phase of stroke recovery. Their responses may have been cautious, as they observed positive outcomes using the intervention with chronic stroke participants but were uncertain about its feasibility in their current clinical environment. Further research is needed to determine whether synergy-based MFES could enhance HIGT during the acute inpatient phase and whether it can be feasibly implemented in that setting.

Variability of Baseline Ambulatory Function

Gait speed is a valuable predictor of ambulation ability and has been shown to be a reliable method for classification of patients post-stroke.(32) In the HIGT group, there was one household ambulator (<0.4 m/s), four limited community ambulators (0.4-0.8 m/s), and two community ambulators (>0.8 m/s). In the MFES+HIGT group, there were two household ambulators, three limited community ambulators, and two community ambulators. Baseline ambulatory category

was included as a random effect in statistical testing, as the groups had different limitations in training and outcomes, but the following comparisons between groups are purely qualitative, especially for the HIGT household ambulation category which only had one participant. The two household-level ambulators in the MFES+HIGT group did not on average reach their target HR zone for at least 30% of their training session, as therapists were limited in how much they could challenge these participants with speed and incline. As noted, these participants still provided the rating of perceived exertion as challenging. Clinical assessments revealed that household ambulators, which had lower scores on speed and endurance at baseline, also tended to have smaller improvements in these metrics, which were not retained at follow-up. The changes in biomechanics did not appear to follow any trends in ambulation level. For the synergy metrics, the HIGT household ambulator exhibited marked reductions in scores whereas the MFES+HIGT household ambulators exhibited improvements similar to the group average. With only one participant in HIGT group, no conclusions can be made, but this poses the question of which ambulation category may respond best to which treatment. Furthermore, household ambulators tended to have lower cosine similarity and correlation coefficients than community ambulators, while limited community ambulators exhibited a wide range of cosine similarity. We highlight these differences among groups to emphasize the need to better characterize how differences in baseline ambulatory function impact recovery potential and response to MFES+HIGT.

Limitations and Future Directions

A major limitation of this study is the small sample size (N=7 per group) with individuals post-stroke of highly variable baseline function, ranging from baseline walking speed of 0.11 m/s to 1.35 m/s, despite all exhibiting some level of gait impairment. Furthermore, the years since stroke onset ranged from two to 21, which can impact the ability of participants to improve. Due to this

small sample size, a comprehensive model could not be used to quantify impairments between groups and across time. A larger sample size is required to run this statistical analysis with sufficient power and to identify which ambulation category may benefit most from the intervention. This study also did not include blinded assessors, and only individuals in the MFES+HIGT group wore the sleeve during training, potentially leading to confounding effects of improvements due to wearing the sleeve. However, these preliminary results still support the pursuit of a larger study comparing this novel personalized intervention–synergy-based MFES+HIGT—in a single-blinded randomized controlled trial, accounting for individuals with varying baseline function and years since stroke. This follow-up study may also explore changing the participant stimulation profiles as the participant recovers and may investigate a longer rehabilitation program and greater dosage, as no plateau effect was observed. It may also be more impactful to target individuals sooner after the stroke, in the acute/subacute phase (< 6 months), which is often described as the neuroplastic window. Furthermore, this study is limited to analysis of the final output of the nervous system at the periphery, but we suspect that MFES+HIGT is driving changes to neural coordination and activation at the central level through afferent feedback of MFES.(9-13) Therefore, investigation of the central mechanisms governing these changes in muscle coordination at the spinal, subcortical, and cortical levels will be essential to a deeper understanding of the mechanisms of recovery and could potentially provide rationale behind responders and non-responders to treatment. Additionally, combining strategies like synergy-based MFES with soft robotics in a hybrid solution may further enhance muscle coordination and joint kinematics with training.(73-75) Finally, FES is not the only approach to modify muscle synergies. Recent advancements in real time extraction of synergies have demonstrated the ability to modulate synergies with operant conditioning and visual feedback through control of a cursor

and game play, providing another avenue for personalized, precision interventions for driving neuromuscular changes to impaired muscle synergies.(76-81) For clinical translation, ongoing assessment of product usability should be considered to keep setup time acceptable within the clinical workflow.

Conclusion

In a small, variable sample of individuals living with lasting gait impairments due to chronic stroke, a personalized stimulation approach–muscle synergy-based multichannel functional electrical stimulation–paired with high-intensity gait training resulted in improved fast walking speed, endurance, gait biomechanics, and similarity of the timing of muscle synergies to normative data. Furthermore, this intervention was highly rated by both participants and clinicians, and the learning curve for the setup time plateaued after nine visits to 4.53 minutes, a feasible amount of time for clinical implementation. The results of this study support the pursuit of a larger clinical trial of synergy-based multichannel functional electrical stimulation with high-intensity gait training to identify responders and non-responders based on time since stroke and baseline ambulatory function, which we observed to have differences in our small sample size.

References

1. Strilciuc S, Grad DA, Radu C, Chira D, Stan A, Ungureanu M, et al. The economic burden of stroke: a systematic review of cost of illness studies. J Med Life. 2021;14(5):606-19.

2. Neptune RR, Clark DJ, Kautz SA. Modular control of human walking: A simulation study. Journal of Biomechanics. 2009;42(9):1282-7.

3. Ting H, Lena, Chiel J, Hillel, Trumbower D, Randy, Allen L, Jessica, Mckay L, J., Hackney E, Madeleine, et al. Neuromechanical Principles Underlying Movement Modularity and Their Implications for Rehabilitation. Neuron. 2015;86(1):38-54.

4. Gonzalez-Vargas J, Sartori M, Dosen S, Torricelli D, Pons JL, Farina D. A predictive model of muscle excitations based on muscle modularity for a large repertoire of human locomotion conditions. Frontiers in Computational Neuroscience. 2015;9.

5. Clark DJ, Ting LH, Zajac FE, Neptune RR, Kautz SA. Merging of healthy motor modules predicts reduced locomotor performance and muscle coordination complexity post-stroke. J Neurophysiol. 2010;103(2):844-57.

6. Routson RL, Clark DJ, Bowden MG, Kautz SA, Neptune RR. The influence of locomotor rehabilitation on module quality and post-stroke hemiparetic walking performance. Gait & Posture. 2013;38(3):511-7.

7. Tan CK, Kadone H, Watanabe H, Marushima A, Yamazaki M, Sankai Y, et al. Corrigendum: Lateral Symmetry of Synergies in Lower Limb Muscles of Acute Post-stroke Patients After Robotic Intervention. Front Neurosci. 2020;14:113.

8. Houghton PE, Campbell KE, Fraser CH, Harris C, Keast DH, Potter PJ, et al. Electrical stimulation therapy increases rate of healing of pressure ulcers in community-dwelling people with spinal cord injury. Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 2010;91(5):669-78.

9. Gandolla M, Ward NS, Molteni F, Guanziroli E, Ferrigno G, Pedrocchi A. The Neural Correlates of Long-Term Carryover following Functional Electrical Stimulation for Stroke. Neural Plast. 2016;2016:4192718.

10. Gandolla M, Niero L, Molteni F, Guanziroli E, Ward NS, Pedrocchi A. Brain Plasticity Mechanisms Underlying Motor Control Reorganization: Pilot Longitudinal Study on Post-Stroke Subjects. Brain Sci. 2021;11(3).

11. Barsi GI, Popovic DB, Tarkka IM, Sinkjaer T, Grey MJ. Cortical excitability changes following grasping exercise augmented with electrical stimulation. Exp Brain Res. 2008;191(1):57-66.

12. Iftime-Nielsen SD, Christensen MS, Vingborg RJ, Sinkjær T, Roepstorff A, Grey MJ. Interaction of electrical stimulation and voluntary hand movement in SII and the cerebellum during simulated therapeutic functional electrical stimulation in healthy adults. Human Brain Mapping. 2012;33(1):40-9.

13. Milosevic M, Masugi Y, Obata H, Sasaki A, Popovic MR, Nakazawa K. Short-term inhibition of spinal reflexes in multiple lower limb muscles after neuromuscular electrical stimulation of ankle plantar flexors. Exp Brain Res. 2019;237(2):467-76.

14. Marquez-Chin C, Popovic MR. Functional electrical stimulation therapy for restoration of motor function after spinal cord injury and stroke: a review. BioMedical Engineering OnLine. 2020;19(1).

15. Shin HE, Kim M, Lee D, Jang JY, Soh Y, Yun DH, et al. Therapeutic Effects of Functional Electrical Stimulation on Physical Performance and Muscle Strength in Post-stroke Older Adults: A Review. Ann Geriatr Med Res. 2022;26(1):16-24.

16. Allen JL, Ting LH, Kesar TM. Gait Rehabilitation Using Functional Electrical Stimulation Induces Changes in Ankle Muscle Coordination in Stroke Survivors: A Preliminary Study. Front Neurol. 2018;9:1127.

17. Chen CL, Chen HC, Tang SF, Wu CY, Cheng PT, Hong WH. Gait performance with compensatory adaptations in stroke patients with different degrees of motor recovery. Am J Phys Med Rehabil. 2003;82(12):925-35.

18. Pereira S, Mehta S, McIntyre A, Lobo L, Teasell RW. Functional electrical stimulation for improving gait in persons with chronic stroke. Top Stroke Rehabil. 2012;19(6):491-8.

19. Awad LN, Reisman DS, Pohlig RT, Binder-Macleod SA. Reducing The Cost of Transport and Increasing Walking Distance After Stroke: A Randomized Controlled Trial on Fast Locomotor Training Combined With Functional Electrical Stimulation. Neurorehabil Neural Repair. 2016;30(7):661-70.

20. Hakansson NA, Kesar T, Reisman D, Binder-Macleod S, Higginson JS. Effects of fast functional electrical stimulation gait training on mechanical recovery in poststroke gait. Artif Organs. 2011;35(3):217-20.

21. Cho M-K, Kim J-H, Chung Y, Hwang S. Treadmill gait training combined with functional electrical stimulation on hip abductor and ankle dorsiflexor muscles for chronic hemiparesis. Gait & posture. 2015;42(1):73-8.

22. Chung Y, Kim J-H, Cha Y, Hwang S. Therapeutic effect of functional electrical stimulation-triggered gait training corresponding gait cycle for stroke. Gait & posture. 2014;40(3):471-5.

23. Van Bloemendaal M, Bus SA, Nollet F, Geurts ACH, Beelen A. Feasibility and Preliminary Efficacy of Gait Training Assisted by Multichannel Functional Electrical Stimulation in Early Stroke Rehabilitation: A Pilot Randomized Controlled Trial. Neurorehabilitation and Neural Repair. 2021;35(2):131-44.

24. Sijobert B, Azevedo C, Pontier J, Graf S, Fattal C. A Sensor-Based Multichannel FES System to Control Knee Joint and Reduce Stance Phase Asymmetry in Post-Stroke Gait. Sensors. 2021;21(6):2134.

25. Ferrante S, Chia Bejarano N, Ambrosini E, Nardone A, Turcato AM, Monticone M, et al. A Personalized Multi-Channel FES Controller Based on Muscle Synergies to Support Gait Rehabilitation after Stroke. Frontiers in neuroscience. 2016;10.

26. Bala S, Vishnu VY, Joshi D. Muscle Synergy-Based Functional Electrical Stimulation Reduces Muscular Fatigue in Post-Stroke Patients: A Systematic Comparison. IEEE Trans Neural Syst Rehabil Eng. 2023;31:2858-71.

27. Lim J, Lim T, Lee J, Sim J, Chang H, Yoon B, et al. Patient-specific functional electrical stimulation strategy based on muscle synergy and walking posture analysis for gait rehabilitation of stroke patients. Journal of International Medical Research. 2021;49(5):030006052110167.

28. Cionic. Cionic Neural Sleeve 2023 [Available from: https://cionic.com.

29. Administration USFaD. 510(k) Premarket Notification: Cionic Neural Sleeve (K211651) 2022 [Available from: https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfpmn/pmn.cfm?ID=K211651.

30. Robison J, Gibbons R, Achelis D, Bent B, Wajda D, Webster R. Augmenting gait in a population exhibiting foot drop with adaptive functional electrical stimulation. 2022.

31. Wang B, Wajda D, Sakai J, Yee J, Webster R. PCR145 Evaluating the Impact of the Cionic Neural Sleeve™ on Quality of Life in Multiple Sclerosis Patients: A Pilot Study. Value in Health. 2024;27(12):S534.

32. Bowden MG, Balasubramanian CK, Behrman AL, Kautz SA. Validation of a speed-based classification system using quantitative measures of walking performance poststroke. Neurorehabil Neural Repair. 2008;22(6):672-5.

33. Hornby TG, Reisman DS, Ward IG, Scheets PL, Miller A, Haddad D, 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.

34. Navalta JW, Davis DW, Malek EM, Carrier B, Bodell NG, Manning JW, et al. Heart rate processing algorithms and exercise duration on reliability and validity decisions in biceps-worn Polar Verity Sense and OH1 wearables. Sci Rep. 2023;13(1):11736.

35. Oy PE. Polar OH1 Optical Heart Rate Sensor Kempele, Finland: Polar Electro Oy; [Available from: https://www.polar.com/en/products/accessories/oh1-optical-heart-rate-sensor.

36. Tanaka H, Monahan KD, Seals DR. Age-predicted maximal heart rate revisited. Journal of the American College of Cardiology. 2001;37(1):153-6.

37. 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. Neurorehabilitation and Neural Repair. 2014;28(7):643-51.

38. Hornby TG, Holleran CL, Hennessy PW, Leddy AL, Connolly M, Camardo J, et al. Variable Intensive Early Walking Poststroke (VIEWS). Neurorehabilitation and Neural Repair. 2016;30(5):440-50.

39. Straube DD, Holleran CL, Kinnaird CR, Leddy AL, Hennessy PW, Hornby TG. Effects of dynamic stepping training on nonlocomotor tasks in individuals poststroke. Phys Ther. 2014;94(7):921-33.

40. Borg G. Borg's Perceived Exertion and Pain Scales. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics; 1998.

41. Rabbi MF, Pizzolato C, Lloyd DG, Carty CP, Devaprakash D, Diamond LE. Non-negative matrix factorisation is the most appropriate method for extraction of muscle synergies in walking and running. Scientific Reports. 2020;10(1).

42. Corp A. ActiGraph GT9X Link Activity Monitor Pensacola, FL, USA: ActiGraph Corp; [Available from: https://www.actigraphcorp.com/.

43. Ngueleu AM, Barthod C, Best KL, Routhier F, Otis M, Batcho CS. Criterion validity of ActiGraph monitoring devices for step counting and distance measurement in adults and older adults: a systematic review. J Neuroeng Rehabil. 2022;19(1):112.

44. Suau Q, Bianchini E, Bellier A, Chardon M, Milane T, Hansen C, et al. Current Knowledge about ActiGraph GT9X Link Activity Monitor Accuracy and Validity in Measuring Steps and Energy Expenditure: A Systematic Review. Sensors (Basel). 2024;24(3).

45. Cotton JR, DeLillo A, Cimorelli A, Shah K, Peiffer JD, Anarwala S, et al. Markerless Motion Capture and Biomechanical Analysis Pipeline. arxiv. 2023.

46. Cotton RJ. Differentiable Biomechanics Unlocks Opportunities for Markerless Motion Capture arXiv preprint. 2024.

47. EasyMocap: Make human motion capture easier: Github; 2021 [Available from: https://github.com/zju3dv/EasyMocap.

48. Sárándi I, Hermans A, Leibe B, editors. Learning 3D Human Pose Estimation from Dozens of Datasets using a Geometry-Aware Autoencoder to Bridge Between Skeleton Formats. IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision (WACV); 2023: IEEE.

49. Cotton RJ. PosePipe: Open-Source Human Pose Estimation Pipeline for Rehabilitation Research. Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation. 2022;103(12):e161-e2.

50. Cotton RJ, Mcclerklin E, Cimorelli A, Patel A, Karakostas T, editors. Transforming Gait: Video-Based Spatiotemporal Gait Analysis. 2022 44th Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine & Biology Society (EMBC); 2022 2022-07-11: IEEE.

51. Cimorelli A, Patel A, Karakostas T, Cotton RJ. Validation of portable in-clinic video-based gait analysis for prosthesis users. Scientific Reports. 2024;14(1).

52. Kamper SJ, Maher CG, Mackay G. Global Rating of Change Scales: A Review of Strengths and Weaknesses and Considerations for Design. Journal of Manual & Manipulative Therapy. 2009;17(3):163-70.

53. Brooke J. SUS—A Quick and Dirty Usability Scale. Usability Evaluation in Industry. 1996;189:4-7.

54. Weiner BJ, Lewis CC, Stanick C, Powell BJ, Dorsey CN, Clary AS, et al. Psychometric assessment of three newly developed implementation outcome measures. Implementation Science. 2017;12(1).

55. Moore JL, Nordvik JE, Erichsen A, Rosseland I, Bø E, Hornby TG, et al. Implementation of High-Intensity Stepping Training During Inpatient Stroke Rehabilitation Improves Functional Outcomes. Stroke. 2020;51(2):563-70.

56. Milot MH, Nadeau S, Gravel D. Muscular utilization of the plantarflexors, hip flexors and extensors in persons with hemiparesis walking at self-selected and maximal speeds. J Electromyogr Kinesiol. 2007;17(2):184-93.

57. Jonkers I, Delp S, Patten C. Capacity to increase walking speed is limited by impaired hip and ankle power generation in lower functioning persons post-stroke. Gait Posture. 2009;29(1):129-37.

58. 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. Phys Ther. 2022;102(8).

59. Kireyev IV ZN, Andriukhin DA, Sydorchuk MY, Tsemenko KV, Liashok AL. Efficiency of High-Intensity Gait Training in the Rehabilitation of Post-Stroke Patients. Acta Balneologica. 2023;65(5):271-5.

60. Jaqueline da Cunha M, Rech KD, Salazar AP, Pagnussat AS. Functional electrical stimulation of the peroneal nerve improves post-stroke gait speed when combined with physiotherapy. A systematic review and meta-analysis. Ann Phys Rehabil Med. 2021;64(1):101388.

61. Nozoe M, Kanai M, Kubo H, Takeuchi Y, Kobayashi M, Yamamoto M, et al. Efficacy of neuromuscular electrical stimulation for preventing quadriceps muscle wasting in patients with moderate or severe acute stroke: A pilot study. NeuroRehabilitation. 2017;41(1):143-9.

62. Mayo NE, Wood-Dauphinee S, Ahmed S, Gordon C, Higgins J, McEwen S, et al. Disablement following stroke. Disabil Rehabil. 1999;21(5-6):258-68.

63. Pang MY, Eng JJ, Miller WC. Determinants of satisfaction with community reintegration in older adults with chronic stroke: role of balance self-efficacy. Phys Ther. 2007;87(3):282-91.

64. Donlin MC, Ray NT, Higginson JS. User-driven treadmill walking promotes healthy step width after stroke. Gait Posture. 2021;86:256-9.

65. Chen G, Patten C, Kothari DH, Zajac FE. Gait differences between individuals with post-stroke hemiparesis and non-disabled controls at matched speeds. Gait Posture. 2005;22(1):51-6.

66. Arnold AS, Anderson FC, Pandy MG, Delp SL. Muscular contributions to hip and knee extension during the single limb stance phase of normal gait: a framework for investigating the causes of crouch gait. Journal of biomechanics. 2005;38(11):2181-9.

67. Cruz TH, Dhaher YY. Evidence of abnormal lower-limb torque coupling after stroke: an isometric study. Stroke. 2008;39(1):139-47.

68. Geerars M, Minnaar-van der Feen N, Huisstede BMA. Treatment of knee hyperextension in post-stroke gait. A systematic review. Gait & posture. 2022;91:137-48.

69. Barroso FO, Torricelli D, Molina-Rueda F, Alguacil-Diego IM, Cano-de-la-Cuerda R, Santos C, et al. Combining muscle synergies and biomechanical analysis to assess gait in stroke patients. J Biomech. 2017;63:98-103.

70. Ambrosini E, Parati M, Peri E, De Marchis C, Nava C, Pedrocchi A, et al. Changes in leg cycling muscle synergies after training augmented by functional electrical stimulation in subacute stroke survivors: a pilot study. Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation. 2020;17(1).

71. Bangor A, Kortum PT, Miller JT. An Empirical Evaluation of the System Usability Scale. International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction. 2008;24(6):574-94.

72. Bangor A, Kortum P, Miller J. Determining what individual SUS scores mean: Adding an adjective rating scale. Journal of Usability Studies. 2009;4(3):114-23.

73. Dell'Eva F, Dalla Gasperina S, Gandolla M, Pedrocchi A, Ambrosini E, editors. A hybrid FES-motor cooperative control over a knee joint movement: A feasibility study International Functional Electrical Stimulation Society 2022; 2022; Rotterdam, Netherlands.

74. Tricomi E, Missiroli F, Xiloyannis M, Lotti N, Zhang X, Stefanakis M, et al. Soft robotic shorts improve outdoor walking efficiency in older adults. Nature Machine Intelligence. 2024;6(10):1145-55.

75. Ambrosini E, Dell'Eva F, Guanziroli E, Camerini V, Gandolla M, Brignole L, et al. A Multifaceted Hybrid ES-Robotic Device for Gait Training in Individuals with Neurological Disorders. 2024.

76. Ghassemi M, Triandafilou K, Barry A, Stoykov ME, Roth E, Mussa-Ivaldi FA, et al. Development of an EMG-Controlled Serious Game for Rehabilitation. IEEE Trans Neural Syst Rehabil Eng. 2019;27(2):283-92.

77. Berger DJ, d'Avella A. Effective force control by muscle synergies. Front Comput Neurosci. 2014;8:46.

78. Berger DJ, D'Avella A. Towards a Myoelectrically Controlled Virtual Reality Interface for Synergy-Based Stroke Rehabilitation. Biosystems & Biorobotics: Springer International Publishing; 2017. p. 965-9.

79. Seo G, Kishta A, Mugler E, Slutzky MW, Roh J. Myoelectric interface training enables targeted reduction in abnormal muscle co-activation. J Neuroeng Rehabil. 2022;19(1):67.

80. Hong YNG, Ballekere AN, Fregly BJ, Roh J. Are muscle synergies useful for stroke rehabilitation? Current opinion in biomedical engineering. 2021;19:100315.

81. Torricelli D, De Marchis C, D'Avella A, Tobaruela DN, Barroso FO, Pons JL. Reorganization of Muscle Coordination Underlying Motor Learning in Cycling Tasks. Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology. 2020;8.