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.

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, only MFES+HIGT led to reduced double support percent improved hip extension during stance while HIGT led to improved step length but reduced ankle dorsiflexion during swing and a greater degree of hip external rotation. Finally, average similarity of muscle synergy activation profiles to normative data, measured through 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 this personalized intervention.

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 of 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: stance control, knee flexion, propulsion, swing.[2-4] After stroke, a reduction in the complexity of the synergies (i.e., number of synergies required to explain muscle activity) and similarity of muscle activation (i.e., muscle weights) and timing of activation (i.e., 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 in this condition 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 also 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 into 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 and use of FES. 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, four were unenrolled due to drop out or not meeting criteria upon in-person assessment. 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.

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.[32] 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, which was determined during the 10 Meter Walk Test (10MWT) at their baseline assessment. Regardless of group, therapists were instructed to challenge participants during the training session to reach 70-85% of their maximum heart rate (HR),[32] which was measured using a Polar OH1 sensor over the wrist extensors or biceps for real time feedback.[33,34] Maximum HR was calculated using the following equation[35]:

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

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.[36-38] For those unable to achieve the required intensity in their HR range (N=2), the Borg Rating of Perceived Exertion (RPE) scale, 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 the 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 intensity 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 modified if needed at subsequent visits. Participants received personalized stimulation (see next section) only during the HIGT 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-B).

Participant EMG Processing and Muscle Synergies

Participant EMG was recorded at baseline during treadmill walking at self-selected velocity, 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.

Normative muscle synergy weights ($\boldsymbol{W}$) and activation profiles ($\boldsymbol{H}$) were computed as the average of fourteen neurologically intact individuals walking at ten speeds ranging from 0.45 m/s to 1.8 m/s using nonnegative matrix factorization (NNMF).[39] 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 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}) by fixing the normative activation profiles 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 were computed by fixing the normative synergy weights 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.

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 ***W***, circular cross correlation coefficient of activation profiles ***H***, and circular cross correlation time lag of activation profiles ***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 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.

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 (ranging from zero if no synergies are impaired to four if all synergies are impaired) 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 amplitude set by the therapist through the interface.

Gait Event Detection

Time length of each gait cycle was updated for each stride with an exponential moving average. Since participants may experience elongated phases of the gait cycle, only triggering stimulation based on heel strike may result in inappropriately timed stimulation. Therefore, the following gait events using the sagittal IMU angle of the shank and thigh were identified: 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 shank (91%). The closest gait event to the ramp up phase of the personalized stimulation trajectory was used as the trigger.

A. Steps for Personalized Stimulation

1. At baseline, record EMG and compute ***participant synergies*** with nonnegative matrix factorization
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***



B. Example Personalized Stimulation



C. Cionic Neural Sleeve



Figure 1: Personalized Synergy-Based Stimulation. A) The steps for identifying impaired synergies and computing personalized stimulation based on the identified impaired synergies. B) Example of personalized stimulation profiles for two participants with varying impairments. C) Cionic Neural Sleeve with electrode placement, how the sleeve fits, 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 pre, mid (after completing nine training sessions), post (after completing all training sessions), and one month after completing the training (follow-up). 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)[40-42] 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 evaluations: the 10-Meter Walk Test (10MWT) at both self-selected velocity (SSV) and fast velocity (FV), the 6-Minute Walk Test (6MWT), and the Berg Balance Scale (BBS). The 10MWT at both speeds was repeated twice while participants were recorded using a markerless motion capture system developed by our team,[43] 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, all participants donned the Neural Sleeve on both limbs with the gluteus medius 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.

Clinical Outcome Measures

The 10MWT average speed at SSV and FV were computed across the two trials. The 6MWT distance was computed for a single trial. The BBS score was recorded out of 56 total points. Additionally, the number of steps taken per day over a week prior to the first training and after the last training were computed to assess participation.

Gait Biomechanics Outcome Measures

Markerless motion capture data was processed according to Cotton et al.[43,44] Video was collected from multiple calibrated and synchronized cameras. Participant tracking using EasyMocap[45] and 2D joint location estimation using MeTRAbs-ACAE[46] was facilitated using PosePipe.[47] 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.[44] From these biomechanical reconstructions, we extracted gait event timings[48,49] and calculated the following spatiotemporal measures: step length, step length asymmetry, step width, single support percent, and double support percent. Step length asymmetry was computed as the difference between impaired and unimpaired step length divided by unimpaired step length. Kinematic analysis was focused on joint movements and phases specific to stroke impairment on the impaired limb: peak ankle dorsiflexion during swing, peak hip abduction during swing, hip extension during stance,

total peak hip external rotation, and knee flexion during swing. Four participant visits were excluded due to kinematic reconstruction failure.

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,[50] 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,[50] 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 at the same time: Brooke System Usability Scale[51] and Weiner Acceptability, Appropriateness and Feasibility of Intervention Measure.[52] All therapist forms were collected after completing at least six training sessions.

Statistics

SPSS 26.0.0.1 was used for statistical analysis. Because of the small and variable sample collected in this study, statistical analysis 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) 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 BBS (p=0.909), nor baseline 10MWT SSV (p=0.625). Only one individual (who had been assigned to the HIGT group) dropped out of the study due to pre-existing medical issues.

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, BBS = Berg Balance Scale, 10MWT SSV = 10 Meter Walk Test Self-Selected Velocity*. To compare participant demographics between groups, a linear mixed model was used with group (HIGT, MFES+HIGT) as a fixed effect and Participant, Ambulation Level (household, limited community, community), and Years Since Stroke as random effects. There were no differences detected between groups.**

Training Measures

Training and cardiovascular intensity details are displayed in Table 2. Results demonstrate that, on average, both groups were able to maintain HR intensities of 70-85% of maximum HR for at least 50% of each session, which is consistent with other HIGT studies.[53] 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, or 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). **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, and Years Since Stroke as random effects.**

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 only 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 and 6MWT with cosine similarity and circular cross correlation coefficient, respectively.

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.***



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.

Clinical Assessments

Clinical assessments are displayed in Figure 3. No differences were identified between groups at baseline. 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, p=0.005) and follow-up (0.74±0.32, p=0.011) compared to baseline (pre: 0.66±0.26). In the MFES+HIGT group, there was a main effect of time (p=0.004), with SSV higher at mid (0.64±0.44, p=0.022), post (0.67±0.45, p=0.003), and follow-up (0.69±0.50, p=0.001) compared to baseline (0.57±0.43). 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, 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, p=0.015) and follow-up (0.87±0.61, p=0.004) compared to baseline (0.71±0.53). 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) compared to baseline (pre: 245±102, 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, p=0.049), post (264±187, p=0.004) and follow-up (259±188, 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 (48.86±3.89) compared to baseline (pre: 45.86±4.91, p=0.005), while the MFES+HIGT group exhibited no effect of time (avg=45.14±7.77, 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). 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 Pre-Assessment. The 10 Meter Walk Test (10MWT) was conducted at self-selected velocity (SSV) and fast velocity (FV), and then the 6 Minute Walk Test (6MWT) was conducted. 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 where $p < 0.05$ with the color of the * matching the group. ╪ represents a difference between groups at a specific time point.

Gait Spatiotemporal Metrics and Biomechanics

Spatiotemporal metrics and joint kinematics mean and standard deviations during SSV are reported in Table 4 and Figure 4. No differences were identified between groups at baseline for spatiotemporal metrics and joint angles. For step length, within the HIGT group, a main effect of

time was found (p=0.007), with an increase from pre to post (p=0.012), pre to follow-up (p=0.003), mid to post (p=0.032), and mid to follow-up (p=0.011). No main effect of time was identified for the MFES+HIGT group (p=0.091) and no difference in changes from baseline between groups were identified (all p>0.05). For step width, within the HIGT group, no main effect of time was found (p=0.368), but a main effect of time was identified in the MFES+HIGT group (p=0.030), with a significant reduction from baseline to mid (p=0.050) and follow-up (p=0.005). For double support percent, within the HIGT group, no main effect of time was identified (p=0.621), but in the MFES+HIGT group, there was a main effect of time (p=0.007), with a reduction from pre to post (p=0.01) and mid to post (p=0.027). No difference in changes from baseline between groups were identified (all p>0.05). For step length asymmetry and single support percent, neither group had a main effect of time, nor no difference in changes from baseline between groups were identified (all p>0.05).

For peak ankle dorsiflexion angle during swing, within the HIGT group, a main effect of time was found (p=0.024) with baseline exhibiting a greater angle than mid (p=0.032) and post (p=0.005), while no main effect of time was found in the MFES+HIGT group (p=0.477). No differences in changes from baseline were identified between groups (all p>0.05). For peak hip abduction angle during swing, there was no effect of time in either group (HIGT: p=0.219, MFES: p=0.270), and no differences from baseline were identified between groups (all p>0.05). For peak hip extension during stance, within the HIGT group, no main effect of time was found (p=0.228), but there was in the MFES+HIGT group (p=0.039), with greater flexion at post compared to baseline (p=0.006) and mid (p=0.047). No differences in changes from baseline were identified between groups (all p>0.05). For peak hip external rotation throughout the entire gait cycle, within the HIGT group, there was a main effect of time (p=0.026), with increased external rotation at mid (p=0.017), post

(p=0.006), and follow-up (p=0.013), while no effect of time was detected in the MFES+HIGT group (p=0.734). A change from baseline between groups was identified at follow-up (p=0.035), with a greater degree of external rotation in the HIGT group and less external rotation in the MFES+HIGT group at follow-up compared to baseline. For peak knee flexion during swing, no main effect of time was found in either group (HIGT: p=0.0648, MFES+HIGT: p=0.532), and no differences in changes from baseline were identified between groups (all p>0.05).



Figure 4: Change in Biomechanics. Top panel: change in double support percent, impaired limb step length, and step width. Bottom panel: change in peak ankle dorsiflexion angle during swing, peak hip extension during stance, and peak hip external rotation throughout the entirety of the gait cycle. 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 where $p < 0.05$ with the color of the * matching the group. ╪ represents a difference

between groups at a specific time point. DF = Dorsiflexion, PF = Plantarflexion, Flex = Flexion, Ext = Extension.

Table 4: Gait Biomechanics

	HIGT				MFES+HIGT			
	Pre	**Mid**	**Post**	**Follow-up**	**Pre**	**Mid**	**Post**	**Follow-up**
Step Length (m)	0.46±0.11	0.46±0.11	0.51±0.12 *** p=0.012**	0.51±0.13 *** p=-.003**	0.42±0.21	0.43±0.20	0.45±0.20	0.51±0.15
Step Length Asymmetry	-0.04±0.14	0.12±0.43	0.12±0.26	0.18±0.33	-0.01±0.41	-0.08±0.25	-0.06±0.20	0.69±1.46
Step Width (m)	0.23±0.05	0.21±0.07	0.22±0.05	0.22±0.05	0.25±0.04	0.23±0.04 *** p=0.050**	0.23±0.04	0.22±0.05 *** p=0.005**
Single Support Percent (%)	31.96±4.44	31.10±4.85	31.69±3.62	32.15±4.59	28.92±5.15	28.23±5.56	29.08±5.83	33.16±2.86
Double Support Percent (%)	35.26±8.16	35.33±7.50	34.80±8.15	35.67±9.85	39.97±10.48	38.69±9.14	36.80±8.34 *** p=0.010**	35.87±10.64
Ankle DF During Swing (°)	-4.45±6.46	-7.54±4.88 *** p=0.032**	-8.18±3.55 *** p=0.005**	-5.53±2.66	-8.75±3.79	-8.37±4.17	-9.97±2.88	-9.86±2.47
Hip Abd During Swing (°)	-9.85±2.51	-7.87±3.07	-8.12±3.59	-8.25±3.32	-10.23±4.66	-9.31±2.78	-9.09±3.51	-9.80±4.46
Hip Ext During Stance (°)	-14.54±5.52	-15.17±7.90	-14.82±7.48	-16.55±7.36	-10.09±12.86	-11.47±9.49	-14.44±10.55 *** p=0.006**	-15.45±9.04
Hip External Rotation (°)	-12.89±3.26	-15.86±3.98 *** p=0.017**	-16.03±2.62 *** p=0.006**	-15.76±2.82 *** p=0.013** **╪ p=0.035**	-17.90±6.27	-17.72±4.84	-18.71±4.61	-19.23±6.37 **╪ p=0.035**
Knee Flex During Swing (°)	-40.36±15.39	-33.96±16.79	-37.61±18.91	-36.16±20.48	-30.35±17.68	-32.49±15.88	-32.97±17.81	-36.26±17.10

All spatiotemporal metrics and joint angles except for step width and double support percent are reported for the impaired limb. For joint angles, the peak value was reported. For ankle angle, dorsiflexion is positive. For hip abduction/adduction, abduction is negative. For hip flexion/extension, flexion is positive. For hip rotation, internal rotation is positive. For knee angle, extension is positive. DF = Dorsiflexion, Abd = Abduction, Ext = Extension, Flex = Flexion. * signifies a significant improvement from baseline within group and ╪ signifies a between group difference at that assessment point. P < 0.05 is significant.

Muscle Synergies

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. 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 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 was observed (p=0.038), with increases at post-training (0.82±0.04, p=0.036) and follow-up (0.81±0.04, p=0.027) compared to baseline (0.79±0.05). Additionally, the improvement from mid to post was significant (p=0.048). The absolute time lag of the circular cross-correlation showed no significant changes 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 did not significantly change 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 normative data. 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 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 to …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 nine 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,[52] 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. While both groups demonstrated improvements from baseline in self-selected gait speed, only the MFES+HIGT group demonstrated sustained and greater improvements in fast walking speed and 6MWT. Furthermore, MFES+HIGT led to reduced step width, decreased double support, and increased hip extension during stance while HIGT led to increased impaired limb step length, worse ankle dorsiflexion during swing, and a greater overall degree of external rotation. Muscle synergy average circular cross correlation coefficient to normative data in only the MFES+HIGT group improved at post and follow-up, 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 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 a least 50% of each session. This was consistent with prior studies,[53] where participants maintained the 70-85% HR zone for at least 30% of a training session. Some participants were unable to achieve the HR zone despite adjustments to speed and incline of the treadmill. These participants tended to have much lower self-selected velocity and greater levels of gait impairment. Therefore, these participants were unable to achieve faster speeds and inclines on the treadmill, limiting their intensity. However, they did rate the RPE between 15 and 17 out of 20, indicating that they were significantly challenged. Furthermore, while there was no significant difference between groups on any training metrics, the percentage of time in the HR zone did vary between groups considerably (HIGT: 72.6±30.2%; MFES+HIGT: 49.2±37.6%). This may be explained by the presence of two household-level ambulators in the MFES+HIGT group, compared to only one in the HIGT group. These three individuals were among the bottom four in terms of time spent within the target heart rate zone, yet all reported average perceived exertion (RPE) ratings above 13.

Clinical Outcomes

The present study found that while both the HIGT and MFES+HIGT groups improved SSV, only the MFES+HIGT group demonstrated a significant and sustained improvement in FV and endurance, with the improvement in fast walking speed from baseline at follow-up significantly greater for the MFES+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 number of steps were observed. FV relies heavily on the strength of the hip flexors and extensors.[54,55] 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 the 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,[56] it is not as effective as in the subacute phase post-stroke,[53] and long-term recovery remains uncertain for chronic stroke.[57] Furthermore, single-channel FES to the TA for foot drop is effective at improving ankle dorsiflexion but does not consistently improve gait speed and endurance compared to HIGT,[58] 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.[59] Furthermore, two separate studies administering FES to the TA and gastrocnemius during FV resulted in reduced energy expenditure,[19,20] and a study comparing synergy-based multichannel FES in the upper limb to other approaches found that synergy-based stimulation elicits reduced fatigue during training.[26]

Endurance remains a critical challenge in stroke rehabilitation,[60] and greater walking endurance has been linked to better community reintegration outcomes.[61] In this study, while no significant improvement or difference was detected, participants in the MFES+HIGT group showed a slight average increase in step count from baseline to post-assessment, whereas those in the HIGT group showed a slight average decrease, further suggesting more sustainable gait improvements in the MFES+HIGT group. 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 with better activation of proximal leg muscles, thereby improving FV and endurance.

Biomechanics

Spatiotemporal gait analysis identified an increase in step length for the HIGT group while the MFES+HIGT group exhibited a reduction in step width and double support percent. HIGT has been shown to improve gait spatiotemporal parameters, such as impaired limb step length, cadence, impaired limb propulsion, and single support time.[62,63] Cleland et al. suggest that to improve spatiotemporal parameters of gait, HIGT should be paired with an additional intervention, such as FES.[64] Single-channel FES gait training for foot drop has demonstrated significant improvement in ankle dorsiflexion, the direct target of the stimulation.[16] However, its limited ability to improve broader coordination across joints provides the rationale for extending stimulation to multiple muscles and personalizing stimulation to the individual's impairment. Chung et al. added stimulation to the gluteus medius in addition to the TA and found improved gait speed and increased step length.[22] Reduction in step width and double support percent suggest that participants in the MFES+HIGT group exhibited improved stability on their impaired limb.

Joint kinematic analysis demonstrated that MFES+HIGT elicited a significant improvement in hip extension during stance phase at the post assessment compared to baseline. During terminal stance phase just prior to toe off, hip extension is critical to producing the necessary force for forward propulsion.[65] Reduced hip extension during terminal stance is common of individuals post-stroke and, along with decreased plantarflexion, contributes to reduced propulsive force.[17] Furthermore, patients post-stroke often compensate for lack of hip extension through compensatory mechanisms, such as anterior pelvic tilt, which can lead to low back pain or put increased strain on hamstring muscles.[17] The reduced torques produced to propel an individual post-stroke during gait are suggested to be a result of abnormal muscle coordination.[66] Therefore, individuals undergoing targeted training to address abnormal muscle synergies may better facilitate kinematic changes that not only improve propulsion, which would enable faster walking speeds with decreased energy expenditure, but also avoid compensatory mechanisms that may put unnecessary stress on the body. While not the primary hip extensor, timely stimulation to the hamstring muscles may have modulated abnormal synergy patterns that facilitated the improved hip extension. Participants in the HIGT group, however, demonstrated poorer ankle dorsiflexion angle during swing at midpoint and post assessments and a greater degree of hip external rotation at all time points compared to baseline. While the MFES+HIGT group did not improve in these metrics, they maintained their baseline function. 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] Blazkiewicz and Wit postulate through simulation that external hip rotation may be a compensatory mechanism to increase force generation with proximal musculature and facilitate foot clearance to compensate for reduced dorsiflexor strength.[67] Therefore, we hypothesize that HIGT may have reinforced compensatory mechanisms at the cost of improving gait speed. 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 unconstrained kinematic space, this could include compensatory mechanisms that may not be optimal due to stress on other joints or less efficient movement patterns. While MFES+HIGT did not lead to improved dorsiflexion or external rotation, the constrained kinematic space through synergy-based stimulation may have limited the extent to which abnormal patterns could arise. It is noteworthy that, while highly variable and not significantly different, the MFES+HIGT group had worse dorsiflexion and a greater degree of external rotation at baseline. Ultimately, joint kinematic improvements were limited in both interventions despite a previous pilot study demonstrating that synergy-based MFES in two participants led to moderately improved similarity of ankle joint angle to normative data after training.[27] Therefore, while comparison to normative data and inter-joint/ inter-limb kinematics were not investigated in this study, they 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) for either group, only MFES+HIGT improved average similarity of the activation profile to normative data (i.e., circular cross correlation coefficient) from baseline to post and follow-up. A significant difference in change in number of impaired synergies at follow-up was detected, with HIGT reducing this number to a greater extent, but this may be explained

by one participant who started with one impaired synergy at baseline and at every following assessment visit exhibited four impaired synergies despite having some of the greatest improvement in gait speed and endurance among all participants. These findings align with previous literature demonstrating that muscle synergy analysis can quantify neuromuscular impairment in both upper and lower limbs of individuals with chronic stroke, and that these impairments relate to functional capacity. In the upper limb of individuals with chronic stroke, a merging of synergies has been associated with more severe motor impairments, while a fractionation of synergies was associated with greater time since stroke onset (rationale for including time since stroke as a random effect), potentially representing a compensatory adaptation.[68] In the lower limb, post-stroke gait is characterized by a reduction in number of synergies in the impaired limb (e.g., merging), 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] in line with our findings that synergy metrics were positively correlated with endurance and gait speed at baseline.

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 associated with 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] Finally, synergy-based FES is not

limited to the lower limb, and prior studies have demonstrated improvements in similarity of synergies to normative data during a five-day reaching rehabilitation in combination with improved Fugl-Meyer and movement kinematics.[71,72] Here we present the first study to compare how two different gait interventions elicit changes in muscle synergy composition and timing of individuals post-stroke, and although no changes emerged with respect to the spatial organization of the synergies (i.e., cosine similarity), the improvements in circular cross correlation coefficient highlight the ability to modify neural control. Furthermore, the lack of changes in 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. It may also be more impactful to target individuals sooner after the stroke, in the 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.

Feasibility

Training with MFES+HIGT resulted in no dropouts, while only one occurred in the HIGT group, 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, therapist were able to don the Cionic Neural Sleeve and set FES parameters in than 4.5 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. 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.[32] 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 out of the four agreeing with this statement while two were 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).[73,74] 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 subacute 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.[75] 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. Due to the small sample of participants in each category, 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 participants 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 improved gait kinematics for MFES+HIGT and worse gait kinematics for HIGT were potentially limited by physical limitations in strength by these individuals. 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 poses the question of which ambulation category may respond to which treatment better. 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 difference in baseline ambulatory function impacts recovery potential and response to MFES+HIGT.

Limitations and Future Directions

A major limitation of this study is the small sample size with individuals post-stroke (N=7 per group) 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 time since stroke onset ranged from two years to 21 years, 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. 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 improvement in endurance 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 time 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 seen in clinical outcomes. For clinical translation, ongoing assessment of product usability should be considered to keep setup time acceptable within the clinical workflow. Additional future iterations of this intervention personalized to the individual's neuromuscular impairment may include updated personalized stimulation profiles throughout recovery and alternative approaches to designing stimulation based on neuromusculoskeletal models of synergy impairment. 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]

Conclusion

In a small, variable sample of individuals living with lasting gait impairments due to chronic stroke, a personalized approach to gait training – muscle synergy-based multichannel functional electrical stimulation – paired with high-intensity gait training resulted in increased 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 4.5 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, et al. The economic burden of stroke: a systematic review of cost of illness studies. *J Med Life*. 2021;14(5):606-619. doi:10.25122/jml-2021-0361

2. Neptune RR, Clark DJ, Kautz SA. Modular control of human walking: A simulation study. *Journal of Biomechanics*. 2009-06-01 2009;42(9):1282-1287. doi:10.1016/j.jbiomech.2009.03.009

3. Ting H, Lena, Chiel J, Hillel, Trumbower D, Randy, et al. Neuromechanical Principles Underlying Movement Modularity and Their Implications for Rehabilitation. *Neuron*. 2015-04-01 2015;86(1):38-54. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2015.02.042

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*. 2015-09-17 2015;9doi:10.3389/fncom.2015.00114

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*. Feb 2010;103(2):844-57. doi:10.1152/jn.00825.2009

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*. 2013-07-01 2013;38(3):511-517. doi:10.1016/j.gaitpost.2013.01.020

7. Tan CK, Kadone H, Watanabe H, et al. Corrigendum: Lateral Symmetry of Synergies in Lower Limb Muscles of Acute Post-stroke Patients After Robotic Intervention. *Front Neurosci*. 2020;14:113. doi:10.3389/fnins.2020.00113

8. Houghton PE, Campbell KE, Fraser CH, et al. Electrical stimulation therapy increases rate of healing of pressure ulcers in community-dwelling people with spinal cord injury. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. May 2010;91(5):669-78. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2009.12.026

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. doi:10.1155/2016/4192718

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*. Mar 05 2021;11(3)doi:10.3390/brainsci11030329

11. Barsi GI, Popovic DB, Tarkka IM, Sinkjaer T, Grey MJ. Cortical excitability changes following grasping exercise augmented with electrical stimulation. *Exp Brain Res*. Oct 2008;191(1):57-66. doi:10.1007/s00221-008-1495-5

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*. 2012-01-01 2012;33(1):40-49. doi:10.1002/hbm.21191

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*. Feb 2019;237(2):467-476. doi:10.1007/s00221-018-5437-6

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*. 2020-12-01 2020;19(1)doi:10.1186/s12938-020-00773-4

15. Shin HE, Kim M, Lee D, 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*. Mar 2022;26(1):16-24. doi:10.4235/agmr.22.0006

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. doi:10.3389/fneur.2018.01127

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*. Dec 2003;82(12):925-35. doi:10.1097/01.PHM.0000098040.13355.B5

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. doi:10.1310/tsr1906-491

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*. Aug 2016;30(7):661-70. doi:10.1177/1545968315619696

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*. Mar 2011;35(3):217-20. doi:10.1111/j.1525-1594.2011.01215.x

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):73-78. doi:10.1016/j.gaitpost.2015.04.009

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):471-475. doi:10.1016/j.gaitpost.2014.06.002

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*. 2021-02-01 2021;35(2):131-144. doi:10.1177/1545968320981942

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*. 2021-03-18 2021;21(6):2134. doi:10.3390/s21062134

25. Ferrante S, Chia Bejarano N, Ambrosini E, et al. A Personalized Multi-Channel FES Controller Based on Muscle Synergies to Support Gait Rehabilitation after Stroke. *Frontiers in neuroscience*. 2016;10doi:10.3389/fnins.2016.00425

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;31:2858-2871. doi:10.1109/TNSRE.2023.3290293

27. Lim J, Lim T, Lee J, 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. 2021-05-01 2021;49(5):030006052110167. doi:10.1177/03000605211016782

28. Cionic. Cionic Neural Sleeve. https://cionic.com

29. Administration USFaD. 510(k) Premarket Notification: Cionic Neural Sleeve (K211651). 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. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory; 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*. 2024-12-01 2024;27(12):S534. doi:10.1016/j.jval.2024.10.3388

32. Hornby TG, Reisman DS, Ward IG, et al. Clinical Practice Guideline to Improve Locomotor Function Following Chronic Stroke, Incomplete Spinal Cord Injury, and Brain Injury. *Journal of Neurologic Physical Therapy*. 2020-01-01 2020;44(1):49-100. doi:10.1097/npt.0000000000000303

33. Navalta JW, Davis DW, Malek EM, 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*. Jul 20 2023;13(1):11736. doi:10.1038/s41598-023-38329-w

34. Oy PE. Polar OH1 Optical Heart Rate Sensor. Polar Electro Oy. Accessed May 17, 2025. https://www.polar.com/en/products/accessories/oh1-optical-heart-rate-sensor

35. Tanaka H, Monahan KD, Seals DR. Age-predicted maximal heart rate revisited. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*. 2001;37(1):153-156. doi:10.1016/S0735-1097(00)01054-8

36. 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*. 2014-09-01 2014;28(7):643-651. doi:10.1177/1545968314521001

37. Hornby TG, Holleran CL, Hennessy PW, et al. Variable Intensive Early Walking Poststroke (VIEWS). *Neurorehabilitation and Neural Repair*. 2016-06-01 2016;30(5):440-450. doi:10.1177/1545968315604396

38. 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*. Jul 2014;94(7):921-33. doi:10.2522/ptj.20130544

39. 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*. 2020-05-19 2020;10(1)doi:10.1038/s41598-020-65257-w

40. Corp A. ActiGraph GT9X Link Activity Monitor. ActiGraph Corp. Accessed May 17, 2025. https://www.actigraphcorp.com/

41. 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*. Oct 17 2022;19(1):112. doi:10.1186/s12984-022-01085-5

42. Suau Q, Bianchini E, Bellier A, et al. Current Knowledge about ActiGraph GT9X Link Activity Monitor Accuracy and Validity in Measuring Steps and Energy Expenditure: A Systematic Review. *Sensors (Basel)*. Jan 26 2024;24(3)doi:10.3390/s24030825

43. Cotton JR, DeLillo A, Cimorelli A, et al. Markerless Motion Capture and Biomechanical Analysis Pipeline. *arxiv*. 2023;doi:/doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2303.10654<button aria-describedby="more-info-desc-1" class="more-info" style="background-image: initial; background-position: initial; background-size: initial; background-repeat: initial; background-attachment: initial; background-origin: initial; background-clip: initial; border-width: initial; border-style: none; border-color: initial; box-shadow: none; position: relative; padding: 0px 0px 0px 6px;"> Focus to learn more

44. Cotton RJ. Differentiable Biomechanics Unlocks Opportunities for Markerless Motion Capture *arXiv preprint*. 2024;

45. EasyMocap: Make human motion capture easier. Github. https://github.com/zju3dv/EasyMocap

46. Sárándi I, Hermans A, Leibe B. Learning 3D Human Pose Estimation from Dozens of Datasets using a Geometry-Aware Autoencoder to Bridge Between Skeleton Formats. IEEE; 2023:297-306.

47. Cotton RJ. PosePipe: Open-Source Human Pose Estimation Pipeline for Rehabilitation Research. *Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation*. 2022;103(12):e161-e162. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2022.08.868

48. Cotton RJ, Mcclerklin E, Cimorelli A, Patel A, Karakostas T. Transforming Gait: Video-Based Spatiotemporal Gait Analysis. IEEE; 2022:115-120.

49. Cimorelli A, Patel A, Karakostas T, Cotton RJ. Validation of portable in-clinic video-based gait analysis for prosthesis users. *Scientific Reports*. 2024-02-15 2024;14(1)doi:10.1038/s41598-024-53217-7

50. 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*. 2009-07-01 2009;17(3):163-170. doi:10.1179/jmt.2009.17.3.163

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

52. Weiner BJ, Lewis CC, Stanick C, et al. Psychometric assessment of three newly developed implementation outcome measures. *Implementation Science*. 2017-12-01 2017;12(1)doi:10.1186/s13012-017-0635-3

53. Moore JL, Nordvik JE, Erichsen A, et al. Implementation of High-Intensity Stepping Training During Inpatient Stroke Rehabilitation Improves Functional Outcomes. *Stroke*. 02 2020;51(2):563-570. doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.119.027450

54. 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*. Apr 2007;17(2):184-93. doi:10.1016/j.jelekin.2006.01.001

55. 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*. Jan 2009;29(1):129-37. doi:10.1016/j.gaitpost.2008.07.010

56. 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*. Aug 04 2022;102(8)doi:10.1093/ptj/pzac073

57. 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):271-275. doi:10.36740/ABAL202305102

58. 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*. Jan 2021;64(1):101388. doi:10.1016/j.rehab.2020.03.012

59. Nozoe M, Kanai M, Kubo H, 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):143-149. doi:10.3233/NRE-171466

60. Mayo NE, Wood-Dauphinee S, Ahmed S, et al. Disablement following stroke. *Disabil Rehabil*. 1999;21(5-6):258-68. doi:10.1080/096382899297684

61. 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*. Mar 2007;87(3):282-91. doi:10.2522/ptj.20060142

62. Ardestani MM, Henderson CE, Mahtani G, Connolly M, Hornby TG. Locomotor Kinematics and Kinetics Following High-Intensity Stepping Training in Variable Contexts Poststroke. *Neurorehabilitation and Neural Repair*. 2020-07-01 2020;34(7):652-660. doi:10.1177/1545968320929675

63. Pressler D, Schwab-Farrell SM, Reisman DS, Billinger SA, Boyne P. Effects of maximal speed locomotor training on spatiotemporal gait changes in individuals with chronic stroke: A secondary analysis of a randomized controlled trial. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory; 2024.

64. Cleland B, Madhavan S. Changes in Walking Speed After High-Intensity Treadmill Training Are Independent of Changes in Spatiotemporal Symmetry After Stroke. *Frontiers in Neurology*. 2021-04-01 2021;12doi:10.3389/fneur.2021.647338

65. 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):2181-2189. doi:10.1016/j.jbiomech.2004.09.036

66. Cruz TH, Dhaher YY. Evidence of abnormal lower-limb torque coupling after stroke: an isometric study. *Stroke*. Jan 2008;39(1):139-47. doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.107.492413

67. Błażkiewicz M, Wiszomirska I, Kaczmarczyk K, Brzuszkiewicz-Kuźmicka G, Wit A. Mechanisms of compensation in the gait of patients with drop foot. *Clin Biomech (Bristol)*. Feb 2017;42:14-19. doi:10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2016.12.014

68. Cheung VC, Turolla A, Agostini M, et al. Muscle synergy patterns as physiological markers of motor cortical damage. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. Sep 04 2012;109(36):14652-6. doi:10.1073/pnas.1212056109

69. Barroso FO, Torricelli D, Molina-Rueda F, et al. Combining muscle synergies and biomechanical analysis to assess gait in stroke patients. *J Biomech*. Oct 03 2017;63:98-103. doi:10.1016/j.jbiomech.2017.08.006

70. Ambrosini E, Parati M, Peri E, 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*. 2020-12-01 2020;17(1)doi:10.1186/s12984-020-00662-w

71. Niu CM, Bao Y, Zhuang C, et al. Synergy-Based FES for Post-Stroke Rehabilitation of Upper-Limb Motor Functions. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*. 2019-02-01 2019;27(2):256-264. doi:10.1109/tnsre.2019.2891004

72. Niu CM, Chou C-H, Bao Y, et al. A pilot study of synergy-based FES for upper-extremity poststroke rehabilitation. *Neuroscience letters*. 2022;780:136621. doi:10.1016/j.neulet.2022.136621

73. Bangor A, Kortum PT, Miller JT. An Empirical Evaluation of the System Usability Scale. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*. 2008-07-29 2008;24(6):574-594. doi:10.1080/10447310802205776

74. Bangor A, Kortum P, Miller J. Determining what individual SUS scores mean: Adding an adjective rating scale. *Journal of Usability Studies*. 2009;4(3):114-123.

75. 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. doi:10.1177/1545968308318837

76. Ghassemi M, Triandafilou K, Barry A, et al. Development of an EMG-Controlled Serious Game for Rehabilitation. *IEEE Trans Neural Syst Rehabil Eng*. Feb 2019;27(2):283-292. doi:10.1109/TNSRE.2019.2894102

77. Berger DJ, d'Avella A. Effective force control by muscle synergies. *Front Comput Neurosci*. 2014;8:46. doi:10.3389/fncom.2014.00046

78. Berger DJ, D’Avella A. Towards a Myoelectrically Controlled Virtual Reality Interface for Synergy-Based Stroke Rehabilitation. *Biosystems & Biorobotics*. Springer International Publishing; 2017:965-969.

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*. Jul 01 2022;19(1):67. doi:10.1186/s12984-022-01045-z

80. Hong YNG, Ballekere AN, Fregly BJ, Roh J. Are muscle synergies useful for stroke rehabilitation? *Current opinion in biomedical engineering*. 2021;19:100315. doi:10.1016/j.cobme.2021.100315

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*. 2020-07-15 2020;8doi:10.3389/fbioe.2020.00800