Mobility Function and Aperiodic EEG in Younger and Older Adults

Charlotte R. DeVol

charlotte.caskey@ufl.edu

J. Crayton Pruitt Family Department of Biomedical Engineering

Department of Health Outcomes and Biomedical Informatics

University of Florida

Abstract: Mobility function declines with age to the extent that walking speed is often considered the sixth vital sign. Currently, there are no clear neurological mechanisms behind this decline, which limits early diagnosis and intervention. Measures of electrocortical dynamics using electroencephalography (EEG) may provide insight into mobility decline with aging. Prior work focuses on oscillatory EEG, but recent research has shown a differentiation in the aperiodic EEG (exponent and offset) across different age groups, cognitive abilities, and populations with neurological injury. The purpose of this study is to 1) compare aperiodic EEG in older and younger adults at rest and while walking and 2) determine if oscillatory and aperiodic EEG in the sensorimotor regions are predictors of declining mobility in older adults. We analyzed EEG collected at rest and while walking on a treadmill at a subject-specific speed for 31 (age: 24 ± 4) younger adults and 59 (age: 74 ± 6) older adults. Age-related decreases in aperiodic exponent and offset found at rest were maintained during walking. We also saw that only a subset of brain regions showed age-related decreases in aperiodic EEG. Using machine learning methods, we found that between the oscillatory and aperiodic EEG metrics in the left and right sensorimotor areas, left sensorimotor offset and right sensorimotor alpha had the largest effect on predicting individualized walking speed. These results suggest aperiodic EEG may give additional insights into brain health and function beyond oscillatory EEG. Future work should consider if interventions for older adults are able to modulate aperiodic EEG and if this affects mobility.

Key Terms: electrocochleography, Bayesian Additive Regression Trees, walking, brain dynamics, sensorimotor

I. Introduction

Many older adults decline in mobility with age. This decline in mobility often includes walking at slower speeds, increased movement variability, and greater reliance on cognitive than automatic control [1], [2]. With aging comes changes in the recruitment of brain regions that can be a contributing factor to declining mobility [3], [4], [5]. Mobility with aging is associated with changes in activity in the basal ganglia, cerebellum, frontal and parietal cortices [3], [6], [7]. However, the neural correlates driving a decline in mobility in older adults remains unknown. Understanding how changes in brain health relate to a decline in mobility with aging is beneficial for designing timely and effective interventions.

Developments in mobile brain imaging with electroencephalography (EEG) allow for direct, non-invasive measurement of electrocortical activity during whole-body tasks, such as walking [8], [9], [10]. Mobile EEG has primarily been used to measure changes in oscillatory (i.e. periodic) EEG signal. For example, prior work has observed changes in alpha (8-13 Hz) and beta (13-30 Hz) spectral power when walking on a balance beam, uneven grass terrain and at different speeds [11], [12], [13], [14]. The EEG power in specific frequency bands represents dynamic communication across populations of neurons [15]. There are also broadband shifts in EEG that affect all frequencies [16]. Failure to separate the oscillatory from the broadband EEG, also known as aperiodic EEG, can result in inaccurate interpretation of oscillatory EEG [17], [18]. However, aperiodic EEG remains less studied.

For many years aperiodic EEG, also known as neural noise or 1/f behavior, was thought to be a result of filtering of the cortical signal as it passed from the brain up to

the EEG electrode on the scalp. While filtering may occur, more recent studies have shown that shifts in broadband neural activity can occur with changes in population-level synchrony of neural networks [19], [20], [21], the release of neurotransmitters for excitation and inhibition in the brain [22], [23], and neuronal firing rates [20].

Evidence for aperiodic EEG to represent underlying brain health is also present in studies across clinical populations. Aperiodic EEG has shown to decrease with age [17], [24], [25], [26], differ in adolescents with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder compared to their peers [27], and be a strong predictor of schizophrenia [28]. Aperiodic EEG is also related to the variability of visual and cognitive processing speed and performance [29], [30], [31] and explains age-related declines in visual working memory [16]. Decline in cognition with aging, especially working memory, is largely related to declines in mobility, such as walking speed [32], [33], [34]. However, it remains unclear how aperiodic components of EEG signals relate to decline in mobility with aging. Quantifying aperiodic EEG in young and older adults and its effect on mobility may be a crucial component for understanding mobility decline with aging.

The purpose of this paper is to 1) compare the aperiodic EEG in older and younger adults at rest and while walking, and 2) determine whether oscillatory or aperiodic EEG in the sensorimotor regions is stronger predictor of declining mobility in older adults. We hypothesized that older adults would have lower aperiodic offsets and exponents than younger adults during both rest and walking conditions across brain regions. We based this hypothesis on prior work that found aperiodic EEG differences across age groups persisted across memory tasks [16]. We tested this hypothesis by comparing differences in aperiodic exponent and offset between younger and older

adults during rest and walking at a individualized treadmill speeds. We further hypothesized that aperiodic EEG would be a predictor of individualized walking speed after controlling for differences in age and cognition and other EEG metrics. This hypothesis is based on evidence that aperiodic EEG can be a predictor of age-related decline in working memory performance [24] and differentiate people with neurological disorders [27], [28]. We developed a Bayesian Additive Regression Trees (BART) model to test this hypothesis [35]. BART can model nonlinear relationships and handle missing data using Bayesian methods, making it ideal for datasets form human subjects with unknown distributions [36]. We quantified the relationship between each model predictor (age, cognition, and aperiodic and oscillatory EEG metrics parameters in each the left and right sensorimotor regions) on participants' mobility (walking speed) using Accumulated Local Effects (ALE) plots [37]. From the ALE plots, we calculated the net effect of each predictor on walking speed, which indicated which predictors have the largest effect on speed relative to other model inputs. The results from this study will improve our understanding of how to interpret aperiodic EEG data and whether it should be considered in future studies on mobility and aging to measure brain health.

II. Methods

This study is part of a larger study investigating walking and mobility decline in older adults across brain imaging modalities (NIH U01AG061389) [38]. In this manuscript, we analyzed cross-sectional aperiodic EEG data collected on younger and older adults. The experimental protocol and findings from the oscillatory, or periodic, EEG data have been reported elsewhere [10], [14], [39]. Here we provide a summary of overlapping methods included in prior work.

A. Participants

We recruited 35 younger adults (aged 20 to 40 years) and 96 older adults (aged 65 and above) to participate in the study. To be included, potential participants must be able to complete a 400-meter walk test in under 15 minutes without assistance. Potential participants were excluded if they had a mild cognitive impairment quantified as a Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA) score below 26 or other existing medical conditions such as severe cardiovascular disorders, terminal illness, visual impairment that cannot be corrected, and implants with contraindications to Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI). Full inclusion and exclusion criteria have been described previously [38]. A total of 28 participants were excluded from data analysis because of missing an MRI scan (N = 8), inability to complete walking tasks (N = 17), or other technical issues (N = 3). All participants provided written informed consent before joining the study. This study was approved by the University of Florida Institutional Review Board (IRB 201802227).

B. Experimental Protocol

Participants walked on a customized slat-belt treadmill for a total of approximately 48 minutes (PPS 70 Bari-Mill, Woodway, Waukesha, WI, USA; 70 cm x 173 cm walking surface) (Fig. 1). They either walked at a subject-specific speed based off preferred walking speed on four different levels of uneven terrain (flat, low, medium, or high) or at one of four set speeds on a flat surface (0.25, 0.5, 0.75, and 1.0 m/s). Each condition was performed twice for three minutes. Subject-specific walking speeds were set at 75% of the slowest speed the participant used when walking overground on a three-meter walkway on each of the uneven terrains unless they requested a slower

treadmill speed. During walking trials, all participants wore a non-body weight supported safety harness. Participants also completed a seated rest trial for three minutes. Conditions analyzed in this manuscript only include the rest and flat walking at the subject-specific walking speeds.

C. Data Acquisition

To record electrocortical activity during each task, participants wore a custom-made dual-layer EEG cap (ActiCAP snap; Brain Products GmbH, Germany). The electrode layout consisted of 120 electrodes facing the scalp following a 10-05 electrode system, 120 noise electrodes mechanically coupled to the scalp electrodes facing away from the head, and 8 electrodes (originally TP9, P9, PO9, O9, O10, PO10, P10, and TP10) repurposed to recorded the electromyography (EMG) of the bilateral sternocleidomastoid and trapezius muscles [40], [41]. During cap set-up, the impedance of all scalp electrodes was kept below 15 kΩ and below 5 kΩ for the ground and reference electrodes, Fpz and CPz, respectively. The EEG cap was covered with a custom-made cap of conductive graphene doped fabric (Eeontex LTT-PI-100, Marktek Inc., USA) to act as an artificial skin surface for the noise electrodes recording motion

All participants participated in a structural MRI scan from a T1-weighted scanner on separate day than the EEG data collections. The visits were within 30 days of each other (standard deviation = 91). Imaging parameters for the MRI scanner included: repetition time = 2000 ms, echo time = 2.99 ms, flip angle = 8°, voxel resolution = 0.8 mm^3, and field of view = 256 × 256 × 167 mm^2 using a 64-channel coil array (3T Siemens MAGNETOM Prisma MR scanner).



Fig. 1. Experimental set-up and data analysis pipeline. (A) Participants complete one 3-minute trial seated at rest and two 3-minute trials walking on a slat-belt treadmill. Participants wore a custom dual-layer electroencephalography (EEG) cap with 120 recording cortical EEG mechanically coupled to 120 noise EEG. Noise electrodes faced away from the head into a conduction cap to bridge the electrodes. Eight electrodes were repurposed to record electromyography (EMG) of the bilateral sternocleidomastoid and trapezius muscles. (B) Steps for processing EEG data, including noise removal, adaptive mixture independent component analysis (ICA), source localization, identifying brain components, and separating aperiodic and oscillatory EEG. An example of shifts in aperiodic exponent and offset are provided in the far-right graph.

We used a subset of tests from the NIH Toolbox Cognition Battery to assess cognition in our participants [32], [43]. We included only the List Sorting Working Memory in our analysis because working memory is known to be related to both aperiodic EEG and walking speed [25]. The test uses an iPad to evaluate recall of a series of visual and auditory stimuli (Apple Inc., Cupertino, CA). Each stimulus was displayed on the screen for two seconds and the name of the image was read aloud by a computerized voice off the iPad (i.e. a bird appeared on the screen followed by a voice saying “bird”). We instructed participants to remember each stimulus, organize them by size, then verbally list them in size order. The score of the List Sorting Working Memory Test from the NIH Toolbox Cognition Battery ranges from 0 to 26, where a higher score indicates better working memory. We reported these raw scores, instead of

age-corrected standard scores, aligning with the NIH Toolbox Scoring and Interpretation guide's recommendations.

D. Data Analysis

We processed all EEG data in MATLAB scripts (R2022b) including custom scripts, EEGLab (v 2021.0) [44], and BeMoBIL pipeline (v2.0.0) [45] (Fig. 1). We first high-pass filtered raw EEG and EMG data at 1 Hz to remove drift using *eegfiltnew*. We applied a 20-Hz lowpass filter to the EMG channels to remove high frequency noise. We used the EEGLAB plugin *CleanLine* to remove powerline noise at 60 and 120 Hz. Then, we removed channels with a standard deviation 3-times greater than the mean of each of each subset of data (EEG, noise, and EMG) and performed average referencing [10], [39], [41], [46], [47].

We next used iCanClean to remove noise and muscle artifacts in the cortical EEG electrodes [8], [9], [10]. To perform iCanClean, we used a 4-second moving window with an R^2 threshold of 0.4 and 0.65 for the EMG and noise channels, respectively. After iCanClean, we did not use the noise and EMG signals for any further analysis. We used the *clean_artifacts* function in EEGLAB to remove noisy channels based on the default parameters, except: chan_crit1 = 0.7, win_crit1 = 0.4, winTol = [-Inf, 10] [10]. Parameters were chosen based on what maximized the number of brain components determined by IClabel while minimizing the number of channels that had to be rejected [10], [48]. EEG data were referenced a final time before we performed adaptive mixture independent component analysis (AMICA) to take the data from individual channels into statistically independent components [49].

We used the MRI of each participant to create custom electrical finite element models with *Fieldtrip* (v. 20210910). We then performed tissue segmentation using *headreco* from the *SimNIBS* toolbox (v 3.2) to segment the scans into six tissue layers (scalp, skull, air, cerebrospinal fluid, gray matter, and white matter) [50]. As described in [10], we generated finite element hexahedral meshes of each participant's head and co-registered fiducial locations at the left and right helix-tragus junction and nasion from the MRI scan with the structural scan of the EEG electrodes. We then used dipole fitting to model electrocortical activity propagation to the scalp from brain sources using the *ft_dipolefitting* function in the Fieldtrip Toolbox (v20221005). We warped dipole locations to the Montreal Neurological Institute (MNI) template for younger and older adults with Advanced Normalization Tools (ANTs, https://github.com/ANTsX/ANTs) [51]. We identified independent components as brain sources based on a set of established criteria [10]: residual variance < 15%, IClabel identifying the probability of the component being a brain source > 50% [48], negative slope of the power density spectrum from 2-40 Hz, and dipoles located inside the brain. At this stage, we removed an additional ten participants from further analysis because they had less than five brain components and three participants because they had no rest trial. In the remaining participants, we observed 15±5 brain components in younger adults and 12±5 brain components in older adults.

We used a k-means clustering algorithm to determine brain components that were present across participants. Clusters with at least half of the younger adults (n >= 16) and half of the older adults (n >= 30) were retained for group analysis. We established 11 clusters. If a participant had multiple components in a cluster, the

component with the maximum likelihood to be a brain component according to ICLabel was used and the other component dropped. To further correct for muscle artifact in power spectral density plots (PSDs), we used spectral principal component analysis (sPCA) following the methods and scripts provided in [13], [52].

For each cluster, we computed the log PSD using *spectopo* from EEGLAB during each walking condition. We then used the Fitting Oscillations & One Over F (FOOOF) toolbox to separate the aperiodic and oscillatory components of the PSD curve [53]. Default parameters were used for separation: range of power spectra set to 3 to 40 Hz; peak width limits of 1 to 8; minimum peak height of 0.05; and maximum number of peaks at 2. The equation to describe the aperiodic EEG was defined as

$$L(F) = b - \log(F^x) \quad (1)$$

Where b is the broadband offset, x is the exponent, and F is the range of frequency values. A lower value for x indicates a flattening of the curve (Fig. 1). The model fit of the extracted aperiodic and periodic components after FOOOF to the to the original PSD is reported as R^2. A participants' aperiodic fit data for a singular brain region was removed if the aperiodic exponent was negative during any of the rest or walking conditions.

E. Statistical Analysis

We performed all statistical analysis in R (Version 4.4.3 2025-02-28 UCRT). For our first hypothesis, we use linear mixed effects models with fixed effects for age (young vs. old), task (rest vs. walk), and the interaction of age and task. We further included a random intercept for subject differences. We made separate models for each brain region and the aperiodic exponent and offset. We checked model reliability and normal

distributions of residuals using QQ-plots. If significance was found with the linear mixed effect model, post-hoc pairwise comparisons were made only of the fixed effects that were significant (*emmeans* package in R). At most, the following pairwise comparisons were made: younger rest v. younger walk, older rest v. older walk, younger rest v. older rest, and younger walk v. older walk. We corrected for multiple comparisons using the Benjamini-Hochberg procedure to control the false discovery rate. We report the estimates (β), standard errors (SE), and p-values (p) from each model and post-hoc test where significant. We present adjusted p-values in the results ($\alpha = 0.05$).

For our second hypothesis, we developed a BART model to determine predictors of subject-specific walking speed, measured walking overground on a three-meter walkway, as described in B. Experimental Protocol. BART uses decision trees to model non-linear relationships between a set of predictors and a response variable [35]. Using a Bayesian framework, it works well with non-parametric data and missing data, determining the best model architecture while preventing overfitting of data [36], [54]. BART has been previously used to understand the biomechanical factors that predict human response to an intervention and track individual rehabilitation progression [55], [56], [57], [58]. We generated a BART model with the following predictors: participant age, NIH memory score, and EEG components for the left and right sensorimotor regions. The EEG metrics included: aperiodic offset and aperiodic exponent, average theta power, average alpha power, and average beta power. As a result, the data the model was generated from a dataset of 90 observations (one for each participant) and 12 predictors. The response variable in the BAT model was each person's subject-specific speed in meters/second (m/s).

We performed hyperparameter tuning using 10-fold cross validation with the *BARTmachineCV* function to generate our BART model (Parameters: *k = 3, q = 0.9, nu = 3, num_trees = 125, seed, = 18*) (*bartMachine* package in R) [54]. We reported Pseudo R^2 and root-mean-squared error (RMSE) as measures of model fit. Given not every participant had data from all brain regions, there was an average of 22% missing values across the dataset. Thus, the BART model was set to use missing data (*use_missing_data = TRUE*) as a node in the regression trees [54].

We used accumulated local effect (ALE) plots to interpret model outcomes [37]. ALE plots visualize the effect of each model predictor on the response variable while controlling for all other model predictors. We selected ALE plots over other common machine learning visualization techniques, such as partial dependence plots, because they can handle highly correlated data that we expect in a biological dataset [37]. ALE plots do not extrapolate to information not included in the data but only model the relationship between each predictor and the response variable based on the values provided in the data set. We calculated the covariance matrix of our model predictors to aid in interpreting the ALE plots when variables were highly correlated. ALE plots are not able to use an observation in their calculations if any single predictor is missing from an observation (i.e. one subject not having data from the occipital region). Thus, we fill missing data with the median of the data set before computing the ALE plots, which may reduced the net effecton walking speed but will not change the overall relationship between a predictor and walking speed.

We created ALE plots using a bootstrapping procedure of 50 iterations where for each run only 75% of the data was used [55]. We binned each predictor's ALE plot into

equally spaced intervals to further smooth the data. ALE plots include lines that connect bins next to each other that have at least one participant in that bin, error bars at each bin indicating one standard deviation from the mean of the 50 iterations of ALE plots, and the data point at the location of each bin is sized to the number of participants in the bin. We then calculated the effect of each predictor on the response variable as the difference between the 90th and 10th percentile of the ALE plot. Thus, the net effect indicates the effect changing that predictor has on the response variable: individualized walking speed.

III. Results

A total of 90 participants, N = 31 younger and N = 59 older adults, were included in the final analysis (Table 1). Older adults walked at significantly slower speeds ($p < 0.001$) and scored significantly lower on the List Sorting Working Memory Test from the NIH Toolbox Cognition Battery ($p < 0.001$).

A. EEG Source Analysis and FOOOF Performance

We found eight brain source clusters that were present in more than half of younger and older adults: left presupplementary, right premotor, left and right posterior parietal, left and right sensorimotor, occipital, and mid cingulate. The FOOOF model produced excellent fits for both younger and older adults (younger R^2: 0.99 ± 0.02; older R^2: 0.99 ± 0.02).

Table 1. Participant Characteristics

	Younger	Older	p-value
Sample Size (N)	31	59	n.a.
Age (years)	24 ± 4	74 ± 6	n.a.
Sex (M/F)	15/16	23/36	n.a.
Individualized Treadmill Speed (m/s)	0.70 ± 0.17	0.40 ± 0.21	< 0.001
NIH Memory Score	20 ± 3	16 ± 3	< 0.001

NIH Memory Score = raw score from the List Sorting Working Memory Test from the NIH Toolbox Cognition Battery

B. Age Group and Task Comparison

The effect of age and task (rest v. walk) on aperiodic exponent and offset differed between brain regions (Fig. 2). In the right premotor area, we observed a significant effect of age on both exponent ($\beta = -0.231$, SE = 0.073, $p = 0.002$) and offset ($\beta = -0.457$, SE = 0.163, $p = 0.007$). Both at rest and walking, older adults had lower exponents (rest: $p = 0.004$; walk: $p = 0.005$) and offsets (rest: $p = 0.007$; walk: $p = 0.007$). In the left presupplementary motor area, we observed a significant effect of task on both the exponent ($\beta = 0.116$, SE = 0.035, $p = 0.002$) and offset ($\beta = 0.129$, SE = 0.046, $p = 0.007$). Post-hoc tests indicated that walking had higher values for both the exponent ($p = 0.003$) and offset ($p = 0.014$) only in younger adults.

In both sensorimotor areas, significant differences were observed with the aperiodic exponent but not the offset. In the right sensorimotor region, we only observed a significant effect of age ($\beta = -0.221$, SE = 0.019, $p = 0.018$), but not task, on aperiodic exponent. Older adults had a lower aperiodic exponent both at rest ($p = 0.018$) and during walking ($p = 0.003$). In the left sensorimotor area, there was a significant effect of age ($\beta = -.164$, SE = 0.076, $p = 0.034$) and task ($\beta = 0.091$, SE = 0.035, $p = 0.012$) on the exponent, but no significant effect of the interaction of age and task. Older adults had significantly lower exponents in the left sensorimotor area both at rest ($p = 0.036$) and while walking ($p = 0.023$). Also in the left sensorimotor area, both older and younger



Fig. 2. Violin plots comparing the aperiodic offset during seated rest and walking on a treadmill at a preferred speed in older and younger adults. Asterisks indicate adjusted p-value less than 0.05. Within each plot, the violin plots with a light grey outline are during rest and the bold black outline are while walking, while the plots with a while background are the younger adults and the grey background are older adults.

adults had higher exponents while walking compared to rest: $p = 0.036$; younger adults: $p = 0.023$).

We only observed an age effect in both the left and right posterior parietal areas on the aperiodic exponent (left: $\beta = -0.175$, $SE = 0.069$, $p = 0.014$; right: $\beta = -0.343$, $SE = 0.107$, $p = 0.002$) and aperiodic offset (left: $\beta = -0.331$, $SE = 0.144$, $p = 0.024$; right: $\beta = -0.748$, $SE = 0.184$, $p = 0.0001$). In the left posterior parietal area, we observed significantly lower exponents in the older adults compared to younger adults when at

rest ($p = 0.021$) and during walking ($p = 0.021$). However, the offset was only significantly lower for the older adults during rest in the left posterior parietal area ($p = 0.048$). During both tasks in the right posterior parietal area, older adults had a lower aperiodic exponent (rest: $p = 0.004$; walk: $p = 0.004$) and offset (rest: $p < 0.001$: walk: $p< 0.001$).

Only in the occipital area did we find interactions between age and task for both the aperiodic exponent ($\beta = 0.132$, SE = 0.063, $p = 0.038$) and offset ($\beta = 0.227$, SE = 0.093, $p = 0.016$). Older adults had significantly higher aperiodic exponents ($p < 0.001$) and offsets ($p = 0.002$) during walking compared to at rest, but older adults had no differences between rest and walk. There were no significant effects of age, task, or their interaction in either the aperiodic exponents or offsets in the mid cingulate.

C. Aperiodic Fit as a Predictor of Walking Speed

The BART model ($R^2 = 0.62$, RMSE = 0.15 m/s) identified which predictors (age, NIH memory score, or aperiodic offset, aperiodic exponent, average alpha power, average beta power, or average theta power in the left and right sensorimotor regions) had the largest effect on walking speed. As expected, some model predictors were highly correlated. We found that the correlation between aperiodic exponent and offset was high ($0.7 <$ correlations < 0.9) within the same brain region (Supplemental Fig. 1).

Age had the largest net effect on walking speed at 0.27 m/s, with older adults walking at a slower speed than younger adults (Fig. 3 and



Fig. 3. Effect of each parameter on walking speed in meters/second (m/s) when controlling for all other model predictors. L and R denote left and right sides, respectively.

Fig. 4). The left sensorimotor offset and right sensorimotor alpha had the next largest net effects on walking speed at 0.11 m/s each. The left sensorimotor offset decreased with an increase in walking speed, while right sensorimotor alpha increased with an increase in walking speed (Fig. 5). The right sensorimotor offset (net effect = 0.08 m/s) and left sensorimotor beta (net effect = 0.06 m/s) decreased with increased walking speed, similar to the left sensorimotor offset but with a smaller net effect. These aperiodic parameters had a larger net effect on walking speed than the NIH memory score, which had a net effect of 0.04 m/s, similar to the left and right sensorimotor exponent and left sensorimotor theta. The NIH memory score and both left and right sensorimotor exponents were slightly higher for participants with faster walking speeds, while left sensorimotor theta generally decreased at faster speeds (Fig. 4 and Fig. 5).

The remaining brain region aperiodic parameters had a net effect below the NIH memory score (Fig. 5). These parameters included the right sensorimotor beta and theta and left sensorimotor alpha. Right sensorimotor theta decreases at faster walking



Fig. 4. The accumulated local effects (ALE) plots of age and NIH memory score. ALE plots demonstrate the effect of each model predictor on the response variable, individualized walking speed, while controlling for all other model predictors. A positive number indicates an increase in speed from the adjusted average after controlling for all other model predictors, while a negative number represents a decrease. Vertical bars indicate ±1 standard deviation form 50 ALE plot iterations and the size for each point represents the number of subjects in that bin.

speeds, while left sensorimotor alpha and right sensorimotor beta had a non-monotonic relationship with walking speed.

IV. Discussion

We found that age-related differences in aperiodic EEG were present both at seated rest and during walking. However, not all aperiodic metrics in all brain regions were significantly different between younger and older adults. There are differences in how aging affects each brain area's aperiodic EEG. We also quantified which EEG metrics in the left and right sensorimotor regions were the largest predictors of walking speed after controlling for age and memory. We found that left sensorimotor aperiodic offset and right sensorimotor alpha power were the largest predictors of walking speed after age.

Our findings support prior research that aperiodic exponent and offset are lower in older adults compared to younger adults [17], [24], [25], [26], [53]. We observed lower aperiodic exponent and offset in five of eight and three of eight brain regions in older

adults, respectively. For all brain regions where exponent and offset were lower in older adults during rest, they were also lower during walking. No other studies have reported aperiodic EEG during a movement task. But age-related shifts in aperiodic EEG have shown to be present during different cognitive tasks performed at a seated rest [16]. The group differences in aperiodic EEG persisting between tasks supports the evidence that aperiodic EEG may be stable enough to serve as biomarkers between different clinical groups [59].

Despite this consistency across tasks, aperiodic EEG has been shown to differ across channels [25], [29]. Furthermore, the correlation between aperiodic EEG and age differs at different EEG channels [24], [29]. Our findings suggest that age-related shifts in aperiodic EEG may be driven by only a subset of brain regions. Signals from one brain region can propagate to many EEG channels, likely causing the aperiodic



Fig. 5. ALE plots of the EEG outcomes (aperiodic exponent, aperiodic offset, average theta power, average alpha power, and average beta power) for the left and right sensorimotor area. Vertical bars indicate ±1 standard deviation form 50 ALE plot iterations and the size for each point represents the number of subjects in that bin.

activity to differ across EEG channels [60]. This phenomenon likely explains why Donoghue et al., 2020 reports significantly lower aperiodic exponent and offset in older adults from just a single electrode over the occipital lobe, while we did not detect differences in age in the occipital lobe aperiodic EEG when we used source localization [53]. Changes in aperiodic EEG in some brain areas may be large enough to drive significant differences in aperiodic exponent and offset across several EEG channels. We also observed no age-related differences in aperiodic EEG in the left presupplementary cortex or the mid cingulate, suggesting the age-effects in these regions are different than the other.

The occipital, left presupplementary, and left sensorimotor regions all had higher aperiodic exponents during walking for either the young adults, older adults, or both. It is possible that the brain reduces excitation or increases inhibition in these areas during walking compared to rest, which can cause a higher exponent [22], [23]. Adjustment of the excitation:inhibition ratio in these areas of the brain would suggest they are being relied on differently during seated rest and walking. Only in the left presupplementary cortex did younger adults have a higher offset, while only in the occipital lobe did older adults have a higher offset while walking. Increased neuronal firing rates in these brain regions could be driving the increased aperiodic offset [20], [21]. In the occipital lobe only did we observe a significant interaction between age and task, with older adults having a higher exponent and offset during walking where younger adults did not. Previous work has shown that older adults rely more on visual information for sensory feedback during walking than younger adults [61], [62]. This greater reliance on vision during walking may lead to a modulation of the aperiodic EEG that we observed here.

While aperiodic exponent and offset increased during walking in some brain areas, it was never enough to mask the age-related differences.

We found that age had the largest effect on walking speed among model predictors in our BART model. This finding was not surprising given that walking speed is known to decline with age [63], [64]. Many factors may mediate this relationship that were not quantified in this study, such as reduced somatosensory function, muscle weakness, and reduced balance control [62], [65]. However, by including age in the BART model, we were able to control for its effects on walking speed to evaluate how cortical changes relate to subject-specific walking speed. Left sensorimotor offset had the next largest net effect on walking speed. Despite aperiodic offset decreasing with age, in both the left and right sensorimotor regions aperiodic offset decreased at faster walking speeds. This suggests that decreasing aperiodic offset could be a way to counteract decreasing walking speed with age. However, future work will need to be done to assess possible neural compensation and its effects on walking speed. Right sensorimotor alpha had a comparable net effect as left sensorimotor offset, but the direction was the opposite. Right sensorimotor alpha was higher in those with a higher individualized walking speed. Previous work found that older adults grouped by their slower and faster preferred speeds did not have significant differences in their alpha power [14]. It is understood that different EEG metrics can influence each other [59], so using the BART model with ALE plots may reveal relationships not apparent in group statistical analysis by controlling for other variables included in the model.

The effect of left sensorimotor offset and right sensorimotor alpha power on walking speed were comparable to the minimal clinically important difference (MCID) of

walking speed for older adults with a pathology (0.1 m/s) [66], [67]. MCID represents how much improvement in walking speed results in a meaningful outcome on daily life. Future work should consider if there is a causal effect between aperiodic offset and exponent and walking speed. Studies in other populations indicate that certain interventions may be able to change the aperiodic EEG, but this has not been studied in older adults [59]. Our findings give insight into what brain regions to target for an intervention, such as electrical stimulation, to elicit mobility changes. Such interventions could have a clinically meaningful impact on daily life for older adults, if modulating aperiodic EEG changes walking function.

Cognition, such as working memory, is known to correlate with walking speed [32], [33], [34]. In our BART model, we observed several EEG parameters that had a larger effect on walking speed than working memory. This suggests that EEG can give additional insight into why someone has a decreased walking speed that clinical assessments of cognition do not capture.

This study presents exciting results for how aperiodic EEG may provide insight into mobility decline in older adults. However, there are several limitations that should be considered in the evaluation of this work. First, the brain regions included in the analysis are based off what brain sources were present in at least half of younger adults and half of older adults. Thus, the findings are not representative of every brain region's aperiodic EEG. This study also had strict inclusion and exclusion criteria to prevent covariates in the study population, which have been reported extensively elsewhere [38]. As a result, the range of individualized treadmill speeds presented here may not be representative of older adults who walked at slower speeds as a result of cofounding

diagnoses. Additionally, this study focused on the relationship between aperiodic EEG and behavioral measures. For this reason, it is unable to give insight into what exact neurological mechanisms are responsible for the differences in aperiodic EEG in our population. However, understanding that aperiodic EEG can give different information on brain function and mobility decline than oscillatory EEG can be valuable for justifying future studies aiming to predict decline in mobility in older adults before it occurs. There are also some limitations to consider for the BART model specifically. The BART model fit (R^2 = 0.62) is only a moderate model fit. Adding additional model predictors hypothesized to impact walking speed, such as other brain regions EEG, could likely improve model fit. However, prior work indicates that the ALE plots remain accurate, even with a lower R^2 value caused high variability in the dataset not captured by a BART model [58]. We used a small number of model predictors based on prior knowledge of the sensorimotor areas involvment in walking to maintain interpretability of our results. Future work could include larger sample sizes, or additional methods to reduce the number of model predictors when more want to be considered [68], [69], [70].

V. Conclusion

This is the first study to quantify aperiodic EEG during walking in both older and younger adults. We found age-related decreases in aperiodic EEG are present in only some brain regions but remain present during both rest and walking tasks. We also found that walking can sometimes increase aperiodic EEG compared to rest. We further applied machine learning techniques to model the non-linear and highly variable relationship between walking speed, age, working memory, and several EEG metrics in

the sensorimotor brain regions. We found that left sensorimotor aperiodic offset and right sensorimotor alpha power had the largest effect on walking speed compared to other aperiodic and oscillatory EEG outcomes. These results suggest that aperiodic EEG may give insight into mobility decline in addition to oscillatory EEG. Future studies should consider both aperiodic and oscillatory EEG in their analyses and determine if there is the possibility to target these EEG metrics with interventions supporting mobility in older adults.

References

[1] R. J. Downey *et al.*, “Uneven terrain treadmill walking in younger and older adults,” *PLoS One*, vol. 17, no. 12 December, pp. 1–21, 2022, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0278646.

[2] D. J. Clark, “Automaticity of walking: Functional significance, mechanisms, measurement and rehabilitation strategies,” *Front Hum Neurosci*, vol. 9, no. 246, pp. 1–13, May 2015, doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2015.00246.

[3] R. D. Seidler *et al.*, “Motor control and aging: Links to age-related brain structural, functional, and biochemical effects,” Apr. 2010. doi: 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2009.10.005.

[4] R. Cabeza, N. D. Anderson, J. K. Locantore, and A. R. McIntosh, “Aging Gracefully: Compensatory Brain Activity in High-Performing Older Adults,” *Neuroimage*, vol. 17, pp. 1394–1402, 2002.

[5] P. A. Reuter-Lorenz and K. A. Cappell, “Neurocognitive Aging and the Compensation Hypothesis,” 2008.

[6] R. Holtzer, N. Epstein, J. R. Mahoney, M. Izzetoglu, and H. M. Blumen, “Neuroimaging of Mobility in Aging: A Targeted Review,” *Journal of Gerontology: Medical Science*, vol. 69, no. 11, pp. 1375–1388, Nov. 2014.

[7] J. Hwang *et al.*, “Prefrontal cortical activity during uneven terrain walking in younger and older adults,” *Front Aging Neurosci*, vol. 16, 2024, doi: 10.3389/fnagi.2024.1389488.

[8] R. J. Downey and D. P. Ferris, “iCanClean removes motion, muscle, eye, and line-noise artifacts from phantom EEG,” *Sensors*, vol. 23, no. 8214, pp. 1–24, Oct. 2023, doi: 10.3390/s23198214.

[9] C. B. Gonsisko, D. P. Ferris, and R. J. Downey, “iCanClean improves independent component analysis of mobile brain imaging with EEG,” *Sensors*, vol. 23, no. 928, pp. 1–13, Jan. 2023, doi: 10.3390/s23020928.

[10] C. Liu *et al.*, “Comparison of EEG source localization using simplified and anatomically accurate head models in younger and older adults,” *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, vol. 31, pp. 2591–2602, Jun. 2023, doi: 10.1109/TNSRE.2023.3281356.

[11] A. R. Sipp, J. T. Gwin, S. Makeig, and D. P. Ferris, “Loss of balance during balance beam walking elicits a multifocal theta band electrocortical response,” *J Neurophysiol*, vol. 110, pp. 2050–2060, Nov. 2013, doi: 10.1152/jn.00744.2012.

[12] N. A. Jacobsen and D. P. Ferris, “Electrocortical theta activity may reflect sensory prediction errors during adaptation to a gradual gait perturbation,” *PeerJ*, vol. 12, no. e17451, Jun. 2024.

[13] N. S. J. Jacobsen, S. Blum, J. E. M. Scanlon, K. Witt, and S. Debener, “Mobile electroencephalography captures differences of walking over even and uneven terrain but not of single and dual-task gait,” *Front Sports Act Living*, vol. 4, 2022, doi: 10.3389/fspor.2022.945341.

[14] J. Salminen *et al.*, “Gait Speed Related Changes in Electrocortical Activity in Younger and Older Adult,” *J Neurophysiol*, vol. 166, no. 6, Apr. 2025, doi: https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00544.2024.

[15] M. X. Cohen, “Where does EEG come from and what does it mean?,” *Trends Neurosci*, vol. 40, no. 4, pp. 208–218, Apr. 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.tins.2017.02.004.

[16] S. Dave, T. A. Brothers, and T. Y. Swaab, “1/f neural noise and electrophysiological indices of contextual prediction in aging,” *Brain Res*, no. 1691, pp. 34–43, Jul. 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.brainres/2018.04.007.

[17] A. Merkin *et al.*, “Do age-related differences in aperiodic neural activity explain differences in resting EEG alpha?,” *Neurobiol Aging*, vol. 121, pp. 78–87, Jan. 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2022.09.003.

[18] T. Donoghue, J. Dominguez, and B. Voytek, “Electrophysiological frequency band ratio measures conflate periodic and aperiodic neural activity,” *eNeuro*, vol. 7, no. 6, pp. 1–14, Sep. 2020, doi: 10.1523/ENEURO.0192-20.2020.

[19] W. J. Freeman and J. Zhai, “Simulated power spectral density (PSD) of background electrocorticogram (ECoG),” *Cogn Neurodyn*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 97–103, 2009, doi: 10.1007/s11571-008-9064-y.

[20] J. R. Manning, J. Jacobs, I. Fried, and M. J. Kahana, “Broadband shifts in local field potential power spectra are correlated with single-neuron spiking in humans,” *Journal of Neuroscience*, vol. 29, no. 43, pp. 13613–13620, Oct. 2009, doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2041-09.2009.

[21] K. J. Miller, “Broadband spectral change: Evidence for a macroscale correlate of population firing rate?,” May 12, 2010. doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.6401-09.2010.

[22] R. Gao, E. J. Peterson, and B. Voytek, “Inferring synaptic excitation/inhibition balance from field potentials,” *Neuroimage*, vol. 158, pp. 70–78, Sep. 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2017.06.078.

[23] A. A. Sheldon *et al.*, “Aperiodic slope reflects glutamatergic tone in the human brain,” May 20, 2025. doi: 10.1101/2025.05.15.654118.

[24] B. Voytek *et al.*, “Age-related changes in 1/f neural electrophysiological noise,” *Journal of Neuroscience*, vol. 35, no. 38, pp. 13257–13265, Sep. 2015, doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2332-14.2015.

[25] K. Thuwal, A. Banerjee, and D. Roy, “Aperiodic and Periodic Components of Ongoing Oscillatory Brain Dynamics Link Distinct Functional Aspects of Cognition across Adult Lifespan,” *eNeuro*, vol. 8, no. 5, 2021, doi: 10.1523/ENEURO.0224-21.2021.

[26] B. Y. Angulo-Ruiz, E. I. Rodriguez-Martinez, V. Munoz, and C. M. Gomez, “Unveiling the hidden electroencephalographical rhythms during development: Aperiodic and Periodic activity in healthy subjects,” *Clinical Neurophysiology*, vol. 169, pp. 53–64, 2025, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2024.11.014.

[27] B. D. Ostlund, B. R. Alperin, T. Drew, and S. L. Karalunas, “Behavioral and cognitive correlates of the aperiodic (1/f-like) exponent of the EEG power spectrum in adolescents with and without ADHD,” *Dev Cogn Neurosci*, vol. 48, no. 100931, pp. 1–12, Apr. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.dcn.2021.100931.

[28] E. J. Peterson, B. Q. Rosen, A. Belger, B. Voytek, and A. M. Campbell, “Aperiodic Neural Activity is a Better Predictor of Schizophrenia than Neural Oscillations,” *Clin EEG Neurosci*, vol. 54, no. 4, pp. 434–445, Jul. 2023, doi: 10.1177/15500594231165589.

[29] M. Deodato and D. Melcher, “Aperiodic EEG Predicts Variability of Visual Temporal Processing,” *The Journal of Neuroscience*, vol. 44, no. 40, p. e2308232024, Oct. 2024, doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2308-23.2024.

[30] G. Ouyang, A. Hildebrandt, F. Schmitz, and C. S. Herrmann, “Decomposing alpha and 1/f brain activities reveals their differential associations with cognitive processing speed,” *Neuroimage*, vol. 205, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2019.116304.

[31] T. T. Tran, C. E. Rolle, A. Gazzaley, and B. Voytek, “Linked sources of neural noise contribute to age-related cognitive decline,” *J Cogn Neurosci*, vol. 32, no. 9, pp. 1813–1822, 2020, doi: 10.1162/jocn_a_01584.

[32] S. D. Sato *et al.*, “Resting state brain network segregation is associated with walking speed and working memory in older adults,” *Neuroimage*, p. 121155, Mar. 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2025.121155.

[33] N. M. Peel, L. J. Alapatt, L. V. Jones, and R. E. Hubbard, “The association between gait speed and cognitive status in community-dwelling older people: A

systematic review and meta-analysis," *Journals of Gerontology - Series A Biological Sciences and Medical Sciences*, vol. 74, no. 6, pp. 943–948, May 2019, doi: 10.1093/gerona/gly140.

[34] C. R. Gale, M. Allerhand, A. A. Sayer, C. Cooper, and I. J. Deary, "The dynamic relationship between cognitive function and walking speed: The English Longitudinal Study of Ageing," *Age (Omaha)*, vol. 36, no. 4, 2014, doi: 10.1007/s11357-014-9682-8.

[35] H. A. Chipman, E. I. George, and R. E. McCulloch, "BART: Bayesian additive regression trees," *Annals of Applied Statistics*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 266–298, 2010, doi: 10.1214/09-AOAS285.

[36] V. Dorie, J. Hill, U. Shalit, M. Scott, and D. Cervone, "Automated versus do-it-yourself methods for causal inference: Lessons learned from a data analysis competition," *Statistical Science*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 43–68, 2019, doi: 10.1214/18-STS667.

[37] D. W. Apley and J. Zhu, "Visualizing the effects of predictor variables in black box supervised learning models," *J R Stat Soc Series B Stat Methodol*, vol. 82, no. 4, pp. 1059–1086, 2020, doi: 10.1111/rssb.12377.

[38] D. J. Clark *et al.*, "Multimodal Imaging of Brain Activity to Investigate Walking and Mobility Decline in Older Adults (Mind in Motion Study): Hypothesis, Theory, and Methods," *Front Aging Neurosci*, vol. 11, no. January, pp. 1–13, 2020, doi: 10.3389/fnagi.2019.00358.

[39] C. Liu *et al.*, “Electrical brain activity during human walking with parametric variations in terrain unevenness and walking speed,” *Imaging Neuroscience*, vol. 2, pp. 1–33, Feb. 2024, doi: 10.1162/imag_a_00097.

[40] A. D. Nordin, W. D. Hairston, and D. P. Ferris, “Dual-electrode motion artifact cancellation for mobile electroencephalography,” *J Neural Eng*, vol. 15, no. 056024, pp. 1–9, Aug. 2018, doi: 10.1088/1741-2552/aad7d7.

[41] A. Studnicki, R. J. Downey, and D. P. Ferris, “Characterizing and Removing Artifacts Using Dual-Layer EEG during Table Tennis,” *Sensors*, vol. 22, no. 15, Aug. 2022, doi: 10.3390/s22155867.

[42] A. S. Oliveira, B. R. Schlink, W. D. Hairston, P. König, and D. P. Ferris, “Proposing metrics for benchmarking novel EEG technologies towards real-world measurements,” *Front Hum Neurosci*, vol. 10, no. 188, pp. 1–5, May 2016, doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2016.00188.

[43] D. S. Tulsky *et al.*, “NIH toolbox cognition battery (NIHTB-CB): List sorting test to measure working memory,” *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society*, vol. 20, no. 6, pp. 599–610, 2014, doi: 10.1017/S135561771400040X.

[44] A. Delorme and S. Makeig, “EEGLAB: An open source toolbox for analysis of single-trial EEG dynamics including independent component analysis,” *J Neurosci Methods*, vol. 134, no. 1, pp. 9–21, Mar. 2004, doi: 10.1016/j.jneumeth.2003.10.009.

[45] M. Klug *et al.*, “The BeMoBIL Pipeline for automated analyses of multimodal mobile brain and body imaging data,” *bioRxiv*, pp. 1–40, Sep. 2022, doi: 10.1101/2022.09.29.510051.

[46] H. Kim, J. Luo, S. Chu, C. Cannard, S. Hoffmann, and M. Miyakoshi, “ICA’s bug: How ghost ICs emerge from effective rank deficiency caused by EEG electrode interpolation and incorrect re-referencing,” *Frontiers in Signal Processing*, vol. 3, Apr. 2023, doi: 10.3389/frsip.2023.1064138.

[47] K. A. Ludwig, R. M. Miriani, N. B. Langhals, M. D. Joseph, D. J. Anderson, and D. R. Kipke, “Using a common average reference to improve cortical neuron recordings from microelectrode arrays,” *J Neurophysiol*, vol. 101, no. 3, pp. 1679–1689, Mar. 2009, doi: 10.1152/jn.90989.2008.

[48] L. Pion-Tonachini, K. Kreutz-Delgado, and S. Makeig, “ICLabel: An automated electroencephalographic independent component classifier, dataset, and website,” *Neuroimage*, no. 198, May 2019, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2019.05.026.

[49] J. A. Palmer, K. Kreutz-Delgado, and S. Makeig, “AMICA: An Adaptive Mixture of Independent Component Analyzers with Shared Components,” 2011.

[50] J. Vorwerk, R. Oostenveld, M. C. Piastra, L. Magyari, and C. H. Wolters, “The FieldTrip-SimBio pipeline for EEG forward solutions,” *Biomed Eng Online*, vol. 17, no. 37, pp. 1–17, Mar. 2018, doi: 10.1186/s12938-018-0463-y.

[51] B. B. Avants, N. J. Tustison, G. Song, P. A. Cook, A. Klein, and J. C. Gee, “A reproducible evaluation of ANTs similarity metric performance in brain image registration,” *Neuroimage*, vol. 54, no. 3, pp. 2033–2044, Feb. 2011, doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.09.025.

[52] M. Seeber, R. Scherer, J. Wagner, T. Solis-Escalante, and G. R. Mueller-Putz, “High and low gamma EEG oscillations in central sensorimotor areas are

conversely modulated during the human gait cycle," *Neuroimage*, vol. 112, pp. 318–326, May 2015.

[53] T. Donoghue *et al.*, "Parameterizing neural power spectra into periodic and aperiodic components," *Nat Neurosci*, vol. 23, no. 12, pp. 1655–1665, Dec. 2020, doi: 10.1038/s41593-020-00744-x.

[54] A. Kapelner and J. Bleich, "bartMachine: Machine learning with bayesian additive regression trees," *J Stat Softw*, vol. 70, no. 2013, 2016, doi: 10.18637/jss.v070.i04.

[55] B. C. Conner, A. M. Spomer, K. M. Steele, and Z. F. Lerner, "Factors influencing neuromuscular responses to gait training with a robotic ankle exoskeleton in cerebral palsy," *Assistive Technology*, vol. 36, no. 6, pp. 1–8, 2022, doi: 10.1080/10400435.2022.2121324.

[56] K. M. Steele and M. H. Schwartz, "Causal effects of motor control on gait kinematics after orthopedic surgery in cerebral palsy : a machine-learning approach," *Front Hum Neurosci*, vol. 16, no. 846205, pp. 1–18, 2022, doi: https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2022.846205.

[57] P. K. Gill, K. M. Steele, J. M. Donelan, and M. H. Schwartz, "Causal modelling demonstrates metabolic power is largely affected by gait kinematics and motor control in children with cerebral palsy," *PLoS One*, vol. 18, no. 5 May, pp. 1–15, 2023, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0285667.

[58] C. R. DeVol *et al.*, "Effects of interval treadmill training on spatiotemporal parameters in children with cerebral palsy: A machine learning approach," *J*

Biomech, vol. 177, no. 112397, pp. 1–8, Dec. 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.jbiomech.2024.112397.

[59] T. Donoghue, “A systematic review of aperiodic neural activity in clinical investigations,” *MedRxiv Preprint*, Oct. 2024, doi: 10.1101/2024.10.14.24314925.

[60] S. Y. Shirazi, J. Onton, and S. Makeig, “Simulating Scalp EEG from Ultrahigh-Density ECoG Data Illustrates Cortex to Scalp Projection Patterns,” *BioRxiv*, Jun. 2025, doi: 10.1101/2025.06.24.660870.

[61] J. R. Franz, C. A. Francis, M. S. Allen, S. M. O’Connor, and D. G. Thelen, “Advanced age brings a greater reliance on visual feedback to maintain balance during walking,” *Hum Mov Sci*, vol. 40, pp. 381–392, Apr. 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.humov.2015.01.012.

[62] M. Y. Osoba, A. K. Rao, S. K. Agrawal, and A. K. Lalwani, “Balance and gait in the elderly: A contemporary review,” Feb. 01, 2019, *John Wiley and Sons Inc*. doi: 10.1002/lio2.252.

[63] M. Schimpl *et al.*, “Association between walking speed and age in healthy, free-living individuals using mobile accelerometry-a cross-sectional study,” *PLoS One*, vol. 6, no. 8, 2011, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0023299.

[64] M. M. Lusardi, “Is walking speed a vital sign? Absolutely!,” *Top Geriatr Rehabil*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 67–76, 2012, doi: 10.1097/TGR.0b013e31824385a4.

[65] Y. J. Xie, E. Y. Liu, E. R. Anson, and Y. Agrawal, “Age-Related Imbalance Is Associated with Slower Walking Speed: An Analysis from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey,” *Journal of Geriatric Physical Therapy*, vol. 40, no. 4, pp. 183–189, 2017, doi: 10.1519/JPT.0000000000000093.

[66] S. Tamura, K. Miyata, T. Igarashi, T. Iizuka, T. Otani, and S. Usuda, “Minimal clinically important difference of the short physical performance battery and comfortable walking speed in old-old adults with acute cardiovascular disease: a multicenter, prospective, observational study,” *Disabil Rehabil*, vol. 45, no. 6, pp. 1079–1086, 2023, doi: 10.1080/09638288.2022.2052978.

[67] R. W. Bohannon and S. S. Glenney, “Minimal clinically important difference for change in comfortable gait speed of adults with pathology: A systematic review,” 2014, *Blackwell Publishing Ltd*. doi: 10.1111/jep.12158.

[68] A. R. Linero, “Bayesian Regression Trees for High-Dimensional Prediction and Variable Selection,” *J Am Stat Assoc*, vol. 113, no. 522, pp. 626–636, Apr. 2018, doi: 10.1080/01621459.2016.1264957.

[69] A. R. Linero and Y. Yang, “Bayesian regression tree ensembles that adapt to smoothness and sparsity,” 2018. [Online]. Available: https://academic.oup.com/jrsssb/article/80/5/1087/7048381

[70] J. Hill, A. Linero, and J. Murray, “Bayesian Additive Regression Trees: A Review and Look Forward,” *Annu Rev Stat Appl*, no. 7, pp. 151–278, 2020.

Supplemental Figures



Supplemental Fig. 1. Correlogram of model predictors used to generate the Bayesian Additive Regression Tree (BART) model.