

1 **Self-selected step length asymmetry is not explained by energy cost minimization in**
2 **individuals with chronic stroke.**

3

4 Authors: Thu M. Nguyen¹, Rachel W. Jackson², Yashar Aucie³, Digna de Kam³, Steven H. Collins¹, Gelsy Torres-
5 Oviedo^{3,*}

6 Affiliations ¹Department of Mechanical Engineering, Stanford University

7 ²Department of Bioengineering, Stanford University

8 ³Department of Bioengineering, University of Pittsburgh

9 * Corresponding author; email: gelsyto@pitt.edu

10 **Abstract**

11 **Background** Asymmetric gait post-stroke is associated with decreased mobility, yet individuals with chronic stroke
12 often self-select an asymmetric gait despite being capable of walking more symmetrically. The purpose of this study
13 was to test whether self-selected asymmetry could be explained by energy cost minimization. We hypothesized that
14 short-term deviations from self-selected asymmetry would result in increased metabolic energy consumption,
15 despite being associated with long-term rehabilitation benefits. Other studies have found no difference in metabolic
16 rate across different levels of enforced asymmetry among individuals with chronic stroke, but used methods that left
17 some uncertainty to be resolved.

18 **Methods** In this study, ten individuals with chronic stroke walked on a treadmill at participant-specific speeds while
19 voluntarily modulating step length asymmetry. We included only participants with significant self-selected
20 asymmetry who were able to significantly alter asymmetry using visual biofeedback. Conditions included targeting
21 zero asymmetry, self-selected asymmetry, and double the self-selected asymmetry. Participants were trained with
22 the biofeedback system in one session, and data were collected in three subsequent sessions with repeated measures.
23 Self-selected asymmetry was consistent across sessions. A similar protocol was conducted among unimpaired
24 participants.

25 **Results** Participants with chronic stroke substantially altered step length asymmetry using biofeedback, but this did
26 not affect metabolic rate (ANOVA, $p = 0.8$). In unimpaired participants, self-selected step length asymmetry was
27 close to zero and corresponded to the lowest energy cost (ANOVA, $p = 6e-4$). While the symmetry of unimpaired
28 gait may be the result of energy cost minimization, self-selected step length asymmetry in individuals with chronic
29 stroke cannot be explained by a similar least-effort drive.

30 **Conclusions** Interventions that encourage changes in step length asymmetry by manipulating metabolic energy
31 consumption may be effective because these therapies would not have to overcome a metabolic penalty for altering
32 asymmetry.

33

34 **Keywords**

35 stroke, asymmetry, biofeedback, metabolic cost, gait

36

37 **Background**

38 Stroke often results in hemiparesis and gait asymmetries, such as spatial, temporal, or kinematic differences
39 between the paretic and nonparetic legs(1–3). Asymmetric gait post-stroke has been associated with slower walking
40 speeds(4) and higher metabolic energy consumption(5,6) compared to unimpaired walking. Conventional gait
41 retraining by physical therapists can reduce gait asymmetries, particularly step length asymmetry, and improve
42 speed and energy economy, but sessions are costly, limiting access. More automated rehabilitation techniques to
43 reduce step length asymmetry have been developed using split-belt treadmills(7–9) or rehabilitation robots(10,11).
44 These interventions, however, have not been more effective than conventional physiotherapy for individuals with
45 chronic stroke(8,11–15). A better understanding of the mechanisms driving step length asymmetry in individuals
46 with chronic stroke could allow for the development of more targeted, effective, and accessible gait interventions.

47 Unimpaired individuals self-select many gait parameters, such as step frequency(16), step width(17), and
48 even arm swinging characteristics(18), to minimize their energy cost of walking, a strategy that might also explain
49 self-selected asymmetries in post-stroke gait. Deviations from self-selected gait tend to lead to an increase in energy
50 expenditure, creating bowl-like relationships, or cost landscapes, between energy cost and gait parameters, with the
51 energy minimum at the self-selected parameter value(19). The relationship between step length asymmetry and
52 metabolic rate has not yet been characterized in unimpaired individuals, but studies that enforce absolute differences
53 in step length(20) or asymmetry in step time(21) suggest that they self-select nearly symmetric step lengths that
54 correspond to a lower energy cost than asymmetric gait. Because stroke often leads to physical asymmetries, such as
55 paretic leg muscle weakness(22), muscle spasticity(23), or reduced paretic-leg push-off force(24,25), an asymmetric
56 gait could be metabolically optimal for individuals with chronic stroke. On the other hand, factors other than effort
57 minimization, such as perceived effort, avoidance of fatigue, comfort, or stability, could be primarily responsible for
58 the observed step length asymmetry in this population.

59 The effects of acutely changing step length asymmetry may differ from those of slowly changing step
60 length asymmetry through the process of rehabilitation. Long-term rehabilitation interventions that decrease gait
61 asymmetry have shown that cost of transport often improves concurrently(26). However, other effects of long-term
62 rehabilitation, such as increased muscle strength(27) or improved motor control, may enable individuals to walk
63 with reduced asymmetry more efficiently. Therefore, acute reductions in gait asymmetry that are not accompanied
64 by the neuro-musculoskeletal changes often seen in long-term rehabilitation may not correlate with improvements in

65 walking economy. Even for individuals who walk with highly asymmetric gaits, their self-selected asymmetry may
66 be the most energy efficient one, and acute changes in gait asymmetry could still lead to increased energy
67 consumption.

68 Step length asymmetry is changed acutely during split-belt walking, but this task change may also change
69 the optimal step length asymmetry. When belt speeds are matched immediately following split-belt training, step
70 length asymmetry is acutely changed, but this washout effect does not persist long enough to collect steady-state
71 metabolic rate measurements(28). To determine whether self-selected gait asymmetry minimizes energy cost, gait
72 asymmetry would need to be varied independently from other factors affecting metabolic energy consumption,
73 within an individual participant, while metabolic rate is measured.

74 Previous studies measured metabolic rate while individuals with chronic stroke acutely altered step length
75 asymmetry and step length difference using biofeedback(20,29). These studies found no difference in metabolic rate
76 between self-selected and altered step length asymmetries in stroke survivors. However, some uncertainty remains
77 to be resolved. Each prior study included participants with self-selected step length asymmetry values close to zero.
78 This makes differentiating between the potential optimality of self-selected asymmetry and that of absolute
79 symmetry difficult. Prior studies also included some participants who were unable to reliably alter step length
80 asymmetry, so asymmetry values in different conditions could have been similar. This can reduce the power of a
81 numerical analysis intended to identify an effect of step length asymmetry on metabolic rate. In prior studies,
82 participants were instructed to hold onto the treadmill handrails to help with stability and minimize fall risk.
83 However, participants could have relied more heavily on the handrails during more difficult conditions to improve
84 stability or to help maintain the correct speed. Both improved balance(30,31) and handrail holding(32) during
85 treadmill walking have been shown to reduce metabolic energy consumption. To minimize the amount of walking
86 and number of experimental sessions for participants with chronic stroke, participants in these studies were
87 familiarized with the biofeedback on the same day as the data collection. However, motor learning can have an
88 effect on metabolic rate during a novel task; as individuals learn a new task, metabolic power(33,34) and muscle
89 activity(35) typically decrease, with steady state reached after hours or days of practice. For example, Sánchez et al.
90 recently showed that split-belt treadmill training takes longer than originally thought(36), and training over multiple
91 sessions can facilitate better learning because memory consolidation occurs during sleep(37).

92 The purpose of this study was to characterize the relationship between step length asymmetry and
93 metabolic energy consumption during walking in individuals with chronic stroke and unimpaired individuals. We
94 screened for individuals with chronic stroke who exhibited clinically meaningful self-selected step length
95 asymmetry, so as to differentiate between the potential optimality of self-selected asymmetry and perfect symmetry.
96 Only participants who could substantially alter their asymmetry with biofeedback were included, which ensured that
97 the effects of changes in asymmetry could be robustly analyzed. We disallowed participants from using handrails
98 during all conditions to avoid uncertainty related to the potential benefits of improved balance or forward pulling
99 during more difficult conditions. Participants with chronic stroke received training on the biofeedback system during
100 the first session to facilitate task learning and ensure that all participants could alter their baseline asymmetry with
101 biofeedback. Data were collected in three subsequent sessions. During each collection session, conditions were
102 presented in a different order to avoid ordering effects, and the first condition of the session was repeated to reduce
103 within-session training effects. We hypothesized that individuals with chronic stroke would self-select the step
104 length asymmetry that minimized their metabolic energy consumption during walking, and that more symmetric or
105 asymmetric gaits would result in a higher metabolic cost. We hypothesized that unimpaired individuals would self-
106 select the step length asymmetry, near symmetric, that minimized their metabolic cost, and more asymmetric gaits
107 would increase metabolic cost. The results from this study were expected to improve our understanding of the
108 mechanisms driving self-selected step length asymmetry and influence the development of new gait retraining
109 techniques.

110

111 **Methods**

112 We conducted an experiment in which we asked individuals with chronic stroke and unimpaired participants to alter
113 their step length asymmetry using biofeedback while walking on an instrumented treadmill at a participant specific
114 speed. Participants were first familiarized with the biofeedback system and practiced walking in conditions targeting
115 a variety of asymmetry levels. Data collection trials followed familiarization. Participants walked in each
116 biofeedback condition for six minutes, and metabolic rate measurements were collected. Rest breaks were given
117 between each walking bout. Participants wore a safety harness that did not provide body weight support. Participants
118 were instructed not to hold onto the treadmill handrail unless they felt like they might lose their balance. All


119 participants provided written informed consent before participating. The experimental protocol was approved by the
120 University of Pittsburgh Institutional Review Board.

121


122 ***Biofeedback***

123 Biofeedback was used to enforce various step length asymmetries (Figure 1A). Participants were provided with a
124 visual representation of the step length targets (Figure 1B). Bars on the screen grew in proportion to the forward
125 position of the lateral malleolus of the swing leg with respect to the ankle of the standing leg. Participants were
126 asked to heel strike onto the treadmill when the bar reached the target. Each target allowed for 2.5 cm of error either
127 ahead of or behind the targeted step length value. As an incentive, the step length target would explode when the
128 participant hit it (Figure 1C). If the participant missed the target, the target would turn red (Figure 1D). In both
129 cases, a yellow line would appear to show the participant's step length as additional feedback for the next step.
130 During the last three minutes, the number of targets hit was displayed to further motivate participants. Different step
131 length asymmetries were achieved by adjusting the step length targets while keeping the summation of paretic and
132 nonparetic step lengths (or left and right step lengths for the unimpaired participants) constant to enforce a fixed
133 stride length across conditions.


A. Experimental setup




B. Experimental asymmetry conditions



C. Target hit with right leg



D. Target missed with left leg



134 Step length targets Swing ankle marker location Previous step length Hit target Missed target

135 **Figure 1 Biofeedback system.** (A) Participants walked on an instrumented treadmill with a thin divider to more
 136 accurately detect left and right heel strikes. Reflective markers were attached to the ankles to measure step length at
 137 heel strike. (B) Example asymmetry conditions for individuals with chronic stroke. Both left and right step length
 138 targets were adjusted to achieve the correct step length asymmetry while keeping the summation of left and right
 139 step lengths constant. (C) An example of a step that hit the target. As the right leg moved forward, the gray bar grew
 140 proportionally. The participant's heel strike occurred when the gray bar reached the step length target, and the target
 141 exploded to indicate correct step length. The yellow bar for the right leg changed position to show where the step
 142 length occurred for the next right step length. (D) An example of a step that missed the target. As the participant
 143 moved the left leg forward, the left gray bar grew proportionally. The participant's heel strike was before the target,
 144 and the target turned red. The yellow bar was adjusted to show the left step length, indicating to the participant to
 145 take a longer left step.

146

147 *Demographics of participants with chronic stroke*

148 Twenty-eight individuals with chronic stroke (>6 months) were enrolled in this study, of which ten met the inclusion
 149 criteria (Table 1). To participate in this study, individuals had to: be capable of walking unassisted, aside from the

150 use of an ankle foot orthosis; have sustained only one previous stroke; and have no other neurological disorders. We
151 were interested in identifying the relationship between step length asymmetry and metabolic cost in individuals with
152 chronic stroke who self-selected a clinically relevant step length asymmetry when they had the capacity to
153 voluntarily alter asymmetry. Therefore, participants were excluded from the study if: they did not have a clinically
154 meaningful step length asymmetry, defined as at least 4%, which is greater than the average step length asymmetry
155 of unimpaired individuals(2); they were unable to alter step length asymmetry with biofeedback; they felt
156 uncomfortable walking on the treadmill; or they were unable to walk without holding the treadmill handrail.

157

158 *Demographics of unimpaired participants*

159 Ten unimpaired individuals participated in the study as the control group (Table 2). To be included in the study,
160 participants had to have no history of neurological disorders and be comfortable walking on a treadmill without
161 holding the handrails.

162

163 *Testing Paradigm for participants with chronic stroke.*

164 Individuals with chronic stroke participated in four experimental sessions over four days. The first session included
165 treadmill and biofeedback familiarization, exclusion criteria implementation, and clinical testing (Figure 2 S1).
166 Sessions two through four consisted of refamiliarization with the biofeedback system and data collection (Figure 2
167 S2-S4). Individuals with chronic stroke experienced three biofeedback conditions which targeted self-selected
168 asymmetry, zero asymmetry, and exaggerated asymmetry, defined as twice their self-selected asymmetry. Rest
169 breaks were given between every walking bout until blood pressure and heart rate returned to baseline
170 measurements, typically about five minutes.

171

172 *Familiarization and speed selection (Session 1).* The first session involved selecting an appropriate speed for each
173 participant and familiarizing participants with treadmill walking and the biofeedback system. Participants first
174 completed a six-minute walk test to determine their maximum average over-ground walking speed(38,39).
175 Participants were then familiarized with treadmill walking. During treadmill familiarization (TM familiar. in Figure
176 2 S1), participants first walked at 25% of their maximum over-ground speed. The speed was then increased to 50%
177 of their over-ground speed, and then gradually increased to 100% in 10% increments, with each speed held for about

178 **Table 1 Demographics for participants with chronic stroke**

Participant	Sex	Age	Mass (kg)	Height (m)	Months since stroke	Lesion Type	Affected Side	Dominant Leg	LEFM	Mini-mental (Max 30)	TUG (s)	Maximum Overground Speed (m/s)	Selected Speed (m/s)	Criterion for Speed Selection	Self-selected Asymmetry (%±STDEV)	AFO
P09	Male	61	90	1.76	17	Left MCA	R	R	32	14	11.3	1.28	0.96	RER	8.1 ± 1.1	N
P12	Female	67	54	1.61	62	Left MCA, frontal, parietal lobe and Basal Ganglia	R	R	21	30	10.0	0.86	0.35	RER	18.4 ± 5.5	N
P14	Male	52	98	1.75	254	Frontotemporal parietal	R	R	31	25	11.7	0.83	0.37	Pain	-11.6 ± 3.7	N
P16	Male	53	100	1.74	209	Left Thalamus AVM	R	R	17	24	12.4	0.84	0.41	RER	9.8*	Y
P19	Male	47	121	2.03	370	Left frontal temporal	R	R	32	23	7.2	1.74	1.2	Handrail holding	-8.3 ± 1.1	N
P22	Male	51	74.5	176.5	61	Discarotid artery, right MCA/ACA	L	R	18	21	22.9	0.54	0.22	RER	-46.5 ± 3.5	Y
P24	Male	77	93	1.79	35	Left periventricular, temporal and Basal Ganglia	R	R	33	26	8.6	1.24	0.51**	RER	5.3 ± 0.8	N
P26	Female	62	66	1.61	467	Left frontal	R	L	26	24	9.3	1.01	0.76	RER = 0.8	-7.8 ± 0.4	N
P27	Female	56	84	1.63	76	Left N/A	R	R	18	25	22.2	0.39	0.13	RER	-43.4 ± 7.2	Y
P28	Female	55	72	1.655	86	Left MCA	R	R	26	28	12.2	0.83	0.45	RER = 0.8	14.2 ± 2.4	N

179 * Participant only attended one testing session

180 ** Experimenter error in speed; calculated speed was 0.64 m/s

181

182 **Table 2 Demographics for unimpaired participants**

Participant	Sex	Age	Mass (kg)	Height (m)	Dominant Leg	Self-selected Asymmetry (%)	Repeat Condition
U1	Male	25	93	1.82	R	1.1	+12%
U2	Male	38	83	1.85	R	0.5	-12%
U3	Female	25	59	1.70	R	0.4	0%
U4	Female	31	66	1.63	R	0.8	-6%
U5	Female	23	61	1.71	R	-0.5	0%
U6	Female	24	48	1.64	L	1.6	-12%
U7	Female	23	53	1.65	R	0.9	+6%
U8	Male	24	91	1.88	R	-0.4	-6%
U9	Male	24	72	1.71	R	-0.3	No BF
U10	Male	23	83	1.87	L	-0.0	+6%

183

184 1 minute or until the participant was comfortable with increasing the speed, indicated through verbal consent. The
185 speed selection protocol (described in the section “Speed selection for participants with chronic stroke”) was then
186 conducted to identify a speed that was comfortable and sustainable, based on biological measurements, and at which
187 participants could still alter step length asymmetry.

188 Self-selected asymmetry was then measured at the selected speed. Participants walked on the treadmill at
189 the selected speed for six minutes. To reduce the effects of outlier steps, the median asymmetry of the last three
190 minutes of walking was used as the self-selected step length asymmetry. Participants who did not exhibit a self-
191 selected step length asymmetry of at least 4% at the selected speed were excluded from the rest of the study.

192 Asymmetric participants were then trained on the biofeedback system. A slide presentation explaining the
193 task was given to participants. To translate the instructions to the actual task, participants were first exposed to two
194 minutes of walking while targeting their self-selected asymmetry using the biofeedback system described
195 previously. Participants then trained for six minutes in each biofeedback condition (zero, self-selected, and
196 exaggerated) presented in a randomized order. Participants were encouraged to ask questions throughout training.
197 Verbal reinforcement and coaching were provided to participants to help improve accuracy and motivation. No
198 metabolic data were collected during training to allow for easier communication. If participants were unable to alter
199 their step length asymmetry with biofeedback, they were excluded from the rest of the experiment.

200 Clinical tests were also applied during the first session to determine the level of neurological impairment. A
201 mini-mental cognitive test was conducted following speed selection. A timed up and go test (TUG) and a lower
202 extremity Fugl-Meyer (LEFM) assessment were conducted at the end of the session.

203
204 *Refamiliarization and data collection trials (Sessions 2-4).* Once individuals were familiarized with the task in the
205 first session, metabolic rate and kinematic data were collected over three sessions. Asymmetry conditions were
206 presented in pseudorandom order (Figure 2 S2-S4) to reduce potential ordering effects on metabolic cost. All
207 walking bouts were on the treadmill at the speed selected during the first session. Each session began with a four-
208 minute quiet standing trial to measure resting metabolic rate. Participants then walked for six minutes without
209 biofeedback while their self-selected asymmetry and baseline metabolic rate for the session were measured.
210 Participants were subsequently given two minutes of familiarization in each of the three biofeedback conditions in
211 the experimental order of the session. Following familiarization, participants walked in each asymmetry condition,

212 with biofeedback, for six minutes. Metabolic rate, kinematic, and kinetic data were measured simultaneously. The
213 order of the three biofeedback conditions was randomized during session two, and the first condition was repeated to
214 assess whether trial order had an effect during the course of the session. Only data from the second exposure were
215 included in the analysis. The randomized order of conditions during session two was labeled as A-B-C-A. During
216 sessions three and four, the order of the conditions was reordered to B-C-A-B and C-A-B-C, respectively, so that all
217 conditions would be presented first to ensure equal exposure to all conditions and reduce potential ordering effects
218 on metabolic cost.

219

220 *Testing paradigm for unimpaired participants*

221 Unimpaired individuals participated in one session which included biofeedback familiarization and data collection
222 (Figure 2 U1). One session was used because unimpaired individuals exhibited consistent trends over multiple days
223 during pilot testing. Unimpaired participants completed symmetric and exaggerated walking conditions using the
224 same biofeedback system as the participants with chronic stroke. Exaggerated asymmetries were based on the
225 measured step length asymmetry in participants with chronic stroke. Short breaks were given between each
226 condition to reset the equipment.

227

228 *Familiarization and speed selection.* Unimpaired individuals were familiarized with the biofeedback system but did
229 not require treadmill familiarization given their experience walking on a treadmill. All participants walked at 1.25
230 m/s, a comfortable speed for unimpaired individuals walking on a treadmill(40). The experiment began with a four-
231 minute quiet standing trial to measure resting metabolic rate. Unimpaired participants then walked for three minutes
232 without biofeedback to calculate self-selected step lengths for the biofeedback system. Self-selected step lengths for
233 the right and left legs were taken as the median values from the last minute of the trial.


234 Unimpaired participants were then familiarized with the biofeedback system. Participants were first given a
235 slide presentation. Participants were then exposed to each of the five biofeedback conditions for two minutes in
236 random order. They were encouraged to ask questions during the familiarization period.

237 Different target asymmetries were used in the unimpaired group because self-selected asymmetry was
238 typically close to 0%. Target asymmetries were based on the step length asymmetries measured among the
239 participants with chronic stroke. To select target asymmetries, we first found the absolute change in measured step

240 length asymmetry between the self-selected with biofeedback condition and both the zero and exaggerated
241 conditions for participants with chronic stroke. The smaller of the two changes in asymmetry for each experimental
242 session was used for analysis. The median of this change across all participants and sessions was about 6%. We
243 therefore selected -12%, -6%, 0, +6%, +12% asymmetry conditions for the unimpaired participants.

244
245 *Data collection trials.* Unimpaired participants walked for six minutes in each of the five biofeedback conditions
246 and in one no biofeedback condition. Conditions were presented in random order. The first condition they were
247 exposed to was repeated at the end of the session. Only data from the second exposure were included in the analysis.
248 Metabolic rate, kinematic, and kinetic data were measured during each trial.

249



250

251 **Figure 2 Testing paradigm.** S1-S4 depict the sessions for participants with chronic stroke. U1 depicts the session
 252 for unimpaired participants. (S1) The first session for individuals with chronic stroke included treadmill
 253 familiarization, speed selection based on biological measurements, biofeedback training, and clinical testing. (S2)
 254 Resting metabolic rate was measured in quiet standing. Participants walked with no biofeedback initially to find left
 255 and right step lengths. The order of conditions was randomized, and participants were refamiliarized in the
 256 experimental order. Participants then walked in each condition for six minutes, and metabolic rate was measured.
 257 The first condition was repeated to reduce the effects of continued learning in the first condition. (S3 and S4) The
 258 same experimental protocol was conducted as S2, except the conditions were reordered. (U1) Experimental session
 259 for unimpaired participants. Resting metabolic rate was measured in quiet standing. Initial no biofeedback condition
 260 was used to find left and right step lengths for biofeedback. Participants were then trained in each condition. The
 261 order of conditions was randomized, and the first condition was repeated.

262 *Speed selection for participants with chronic stroke*


263 We developed and applied an elaborate protocol to identify the speed at which each participant with chronic stroke
264 could walk for six minutes while modulating step length asymmetry without exceeding limits on heart rate or
265 respiratory exchange ratio (RER). Participants walked on a treadmill for a maximum of nine minutes during the
266 speed selection protocol. Metabolic rate, heart rate, and respiratory exchange ratio (the ratio of carbon dioxide
267 production to oxygen consumption) were collected. We then performed calculations to determine the speeds at
268 which heart rate exceeded a safe value or respiratory exchange ratio indicated the potential for anaerobic energy
269 consumption (Figure 3).

270 In the first three minutes, participants walked at 25% of the over-ground speed measured in the six-minute
271 walk test to collect their baseline biological measurements. Treadmill speed was then linearly increased to 100% of
272 their over-ground speed during the next three minutes. For the final three minutes, speed was held constant at the
273 participant's over-ground speed to test whether the participant could sustain that speed. The speed selection was
274 stopped if: the participant's heart rate exceeded 90% of their maximum heart rate; their respiratory exchange ratio
275 reached 1.1 indicating anaerobic respiration; they could not walk without holding the handrail; or they requested to
276 stop because of pain.

277 We then calculated the delay in metabolic response to the increasing treadmill speed (Figure 3A). The
278 baseline metabolic cost of walking was computed as the average cost during minutes two and three. As treadmill
279 speed linearly increased, metabolic rate also increased, but with a time delay(28). This time delay was approximated
280 by fitting a linear regression to the metabolic cost during minutes four to six. The delay was quantified as the time
281 difference between the onset of the speed increase at minute three and the time when the linear regression reached a
282 5% increase from the average baseline metabolic rate.

283 The maximum sustainable speed was determined using thresholds on heart rate and respiratory exchange
284 ratio. Linear regressions were fit to the heart rate data between minutes four to six and seven to nine because of the
285 different speed profiles (Figure 3B). Based on pilot testing, we set the threshold for heart rate at 78% of the
286 participants' maximum heart rate, defined as 220 bpm minus their age in years. An exponential curve was fit to the
287 respiratory exchange ratio data between minutes two and the end of the trial (Figure 3C). The baseline respiratory
288 exchange ratio was calculated as the average of the exponential curve between minutes two and three. The threshold
289 for respiratory exchange ratio was the larger of either a 5% increase from the baseline respiratory exchange ratio or a

290 respiratory exchange ratio of 0.8. The times when the fits of heart rate and respiratory exchange ratio reached the
 291 thresholds were calculated, and the metabolic time delay was subtracted. Treadmill speed at the earlier of the two
 292 times was determined (Figure 3D). Based on pilot tests, we found that an additional 25% decrease in speed was
 293 required to allow for increased exertion when modulating step length asymmetry.
 294



295
 296 **Figure 3 Example speed selection protocol for participants with chronic stroke.** (A) Metabolic rate used to find
 297 time delay in body's response time. The baseline metabolic rate was the average rate between minutes two and
 298 three. Data were fit with linear regression between minutes four to six. The time the regression crossed the 5%
 299 increase in metabolic rate was found. The time delay was the difference between the threshold crossing and the
 300 onset of the treadmill speed increase. (B) Linear regressions on heart rate data to find time when heart rate reaches
 301 the 78% maximum heart rate threshold. The time delay was subtracted from the time the heart rate regression
 302 crossed the threshold. The heart rate did not cross the threshold in this participant. (C) Exponential model fit
 303 between minutes two to nine on respiratory exchange ratio. The threshold for respiratory exchange ratio was the
 304 larger of 0.8 respiratory exchange ratio or a 5% increase from baseline respiratory exchange ratio. The time delay
 305 was subtracted from the time the exponential fit crossed the threshold. (D) Normalized treadmill speed throughout
 306 the protocol to map threshold times to speed. 75% of the lower speed between respiratory exchange ratio and heart
 307 rate was the speed selected for participants with chronic stroke.
 308

309 ***Measurements collected***

310 *Kinematic and kinetic data.* Ankle locations were collected by tracking reflective markers attached to the lateral
311 malleoli with a passive motion analysis system sampling at 100 Hz (Vicon Motion Systems, Oxford, UK). Vertical
312 ground reaction forces measured by the instrumented treadmill at 1000 Hz (Bertec Corporation, Columbus, OH)
313 were used to detect heel strike ($F_z > 10\text{N}$) and toe-off ($F_z < 10\text{N}$).

314

315 *Metabolic rate and heart rate.* Metabolic rate was indirectly calculated by measuring the rate of oxygen consumed
316 and rate of carbon dioxide produced using a mobile respirometry system (Oxycon Mobile; CareFusion, San Diego,
317 CA or Cosmed K4b2, Rome, Italy) and applying a standard equation(41). Respiratory exchange ratio was also
318 calculated using these data. Heart rate was measured using a transmitting electrocardiogram (T31 Coded
319 Transmitter; Polar, Kempele, Finland).

320

321 ***Data processing and analysis***

322 *Step length asymmetry.* Step length asymmetry was calculated using the location of the ankles at each heel strike.
323 Step length was defined as the distance between the leading- and trailing-leg ankle markers at heel strike. Paretic
324 and nonparetic step lengths were defined when the respective leg was leading at heel strike.

325 Step length asymmetry was calculated as the normalized difference between the step lengths of the paretic
326 and nonparetic limb(42,43):

327
$$SLA = \frac{SL_{NP} - SL_P}{SL_{NP} + SL_P} \cdot 100\%$$

328 where SLA is step length asymmetry, SL_P is the step length of the paretic leg, and SL_{NP} is the step length of the non-
329 paretic leg. For unimpaired controls, left and right step lengths were used instead of paretic and nonparetic step
330 lengths. Step length asymmetry was measured by averaging the step length asymmetries over the last three minutes
331 of each walking bout.

332

333 *Metabolic cost.* Volumetric flow rates were measured breath-by-breath and averaged over ten second intervals. We
334 used the average metabolic rate of the last three minutes of each condition. Net metabolic rate was calculated by
335 subtracting the average metabolic rate during quiet standing from the average metabolic rate during each walking
336 condition.

337

338 *Normalization of data and statistical analysis.* For the population with chronic stroke, step length asymmetry was
339 normalized to self-selected asymmetry without biofeedback. Step length asymmetry was not normalized for the
340 unimpaired controls because their self-selected asymmetry was close to 0%. Metabolic rate was normalized to body
341 mass for each participant. Percent change in metabolic rate was calculated by comparing the average metabolic rate
342 measured during each biofeedback condition to the average metabolic rate of the self-selected asymmetry without
343 biofeedback condition. Each session was normalized separately. In all statistical analyses, only the biofeedback
344 conditions were compared.

345 Statistical comparisons were made for step length asymmetry and metabolic rate across biofeedback
346 conditions. Average percent change in metabolic rate and measured step length asymmetry for each condition were
347 tested for normality using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. To test whether measured step length asymmetry and
348 metabolic rate differed across biofeedback conditions, we performed three-way ANOVA (random effects:
349 participant and session; fixed effect: biofeedback condition, treated as categorical). If significance was found, paired
350 t-tests were performed to compare biofeedback conditions. We also tested whether metabolic rate was correlated
351 with measured step length asymmetry according to a quadratic model, using regression analysis. Significance for
352 comparisons was set at $\alpha = 0.05$.

353

354 **Results**

355 Participants in both groups significantly altered their step length asymmetry with biofeedback. Metabolic rate was
356 not different across conditions in individuals with chronic stroke. Metabolic rate significantly changed across step
357 length asymmetry conditions in unimpaired controls.

358

359 *Step length asymmetry modulation*

360 *Participants with chronic stroke.* Significant changes in step length asymmetry were observed across biofeedback
361 conditions for participants with chronic stroke (ANOVA; $F_{2,70} = 173$, $p = 8e-28$; Figure 4A). Across the group,
362 individuals with chronic stroke significantly altered their step length asymmetry with biofeedback from an average
363 normalized asymmetry of 1.0 (average absolute asymmetry $18\% \pm 17\%$) in the self-selected condition to 0.4 (7.3%
364 $\pm 9.7\%$) in the symmetry condition and 1.5 ($27\% \pm 22\%$) in the exaggerated condition (paired t-tests, $n = 10$, $p = 4e-$

365 14 and $p = 6e-11$, respectively). Large standard deviations in absolute asymmetry were due primarily to inter-subject
366 variability.

367

368 *Unimpaired participants.* Unimpaired participants significantly altered step length asymmetry across biofeedback
369 conditions (ANOVA; $F_{4,36} = 6.19$, $p = 7e-4$; Figure 4B). Step length asymmetry differed between the -12% and -6%
370 conditions (absolute difference of 5.6%, paired t-test, $n = 10$, $p = 5e-10$), -6% and 0% conditions (5.4%, $p = 4e-9$),
371 0% and 6% conditions (5.7%, $p = 2e-8$), and 6% and 12% conditions (5.5%, $p = 5e-9$).

372


373 *Metabolic rate comparisons*

374 *Participants with chronic stroke.* Percent change in metabolic rate was not found to be different across targeted
375 biofeedback conditions (ANOVA, $F_{2,70} = 0.39$, $p = 0.68$; Figure 4C). The quadratic regression between percent
376 change in metabolic rate and measured asymmetry was not significant ($p = 0.27$, $R^2 = 0.03$; Figure 4E).

377

378 *Unimpaired participants.* Percent change in metabolic rate was different across targeted biofeedback conditions
379 (ANOVA, $F_{4,36} = 6.25$, $p = 6e-4$; Figure 4D). Post hoc analysis revealed that higher asymmetry resulted in higher
380 metabolic rate comparing the -12% and -6% conditions (5.6% greater, $p = 0.028$), the -6% and 0% conditions (6.1%
381 greater, $p = 0.078$), 6% and 0% (6.1% greater, $p = 0.012$), and 12% and 6% (5.6% greater, $p = 0.04$). The quadratic
382 regression between percent change in metabolic rate and measured asymmetry was significant ($p=0.008$, $R^2=0.18$;
383 Figure 4F).

384



385

** p < 1e-8 * p < 0.05

386 **Figure 4 Step length asymmetry modulation and metabolic rate results.** Results for participants with chronic
 387 stroke are on the left and those for unimpaired participants are on the right. (A) Average measured step length
 388 asymmetry across participants with chronic stroke. Asymmetry was normalized to self-selected without
 389 biofeedback. (B) Average measured step length asymmetry for unimpaired participants. Participants in both groups
 390 significantly altered step length asymmetry from self-selected as a result of study design. (C) Average percent
 391 change in metabolic rate compared to the self-selected without biofeedback condition. Metabolic rate was
 392 unchanged across conditions among participants with chronic stroke. (D) Metabolic rate increased with increases in
 393 absolute step length asymmetry among unimpaired participants. (E) Metabolic rate versus measured step length
 394 asymmetry for all trials among individuals with chronic stroke. Very little of the change in metabolic rate was
 395 explained by step length asymmetry. Different colors represent different participants, and different shapes represent
 396 different experimental sessions. (F) A significant trend between metabolic rate and measured step length asymmetry
 397 was found for unimpaired participants. Different colors represent different participants.

398 **Discussion**

399 The purpose of this study was to test whether minimizing metabolic rate could explain self-selected step
400 length asymmetry in individuals with chronic stroke. We conducted a study in which we asked participants to alter
401 their step length asymmetry while measuring their metabolic cost. We found that minimizing metabolic cost does
402 not seem to explain self-selected step length asymmetry in participants with chronic stroke; no differences in
403 metabolic rate were seen across asymmetry levels. To test whether the lack of relationship between step length
404 asymmetry and metabolic rate was related to stroke, we performed a similar experiment on unimpaired individuals.
405 Unimpaired participants self-selected a low step length asymmetry which corresponded to their energy minimum.
406 These findings suggest that, after a stroke, factors other than metabolic rate minimization drive self-selected step
407 length asymmetry.

408

409 *Metabolic rate*

410 Previous studies have shown that changing gait parameters affects metabolic rate in unimpaired
411 participants. People will usually self-select a gait near their energy minimum, and small changes in their gait
412 typically lead to increases in metabolic cost(19). In this study, unimpaired participants exhibited the expected
413 change in metabolic rate with changing step length asymmetries, where changes in asymmetry led to increases in
414 metabolic rate. The participants with chronic stroke included in this study were able to change their step length
415 asymmetry but exhibited a qualitatively different metabolic response. As a group, participants with chronic stroke
416 had similar metabolic cost across step length asymmetry conditions, consistent with previous studies(20,29).

417 Some gait parameters, such as walking speed(44), have energetic cost of transport landscapes with a
418 shallow slope near the energy minimum. In part because the metabolic penalty for walking at speeds near the
419 minimum is small, unimpaired individuals walk with a large variation in self-selected speed(45). While we did not
420 find a significant relationship between metabolic rate and asymmetry in individuals with chronic stroke, a shallow
421 energy landscape might exist. This would be difficult to identify given the high variability in kinematics(46) and
422 energy cost exhibited by individual participants walking under the same asymmetry conditions. If a shallow
423 landscape does exist, we do not expect metabolic cost to be the main factor driving step length asymmetry in
424 participants with chronic stroke. If participants with chronic stroke can walk with a wide range of asymmetries
425 without substantially affecting metabolic rate, other optimization goals could dominate, such as increasing

426 stability(47), avoiding fatigue(48,49), or reducing single-support time on their paretic limb(3), resulting in the
427 observed self-selected step length asymmetry.

428 Muscle fatigue avoidance has been shown in simulation to explain some gait patterns in older adults(49),
429 and it might explain self-selected step length asymmetry in individuals with chronic stroke. Previous studies have
430 shown that to reduce step length asymmetry, individuals with chronic stroke increase paretic ankle plantarflexor
431 activation(50,51). Paretic plantarflexors might fatigue faster than the nonparetic muscles, so participants could be
432 walking asymmetrically to reduce muscle fatigue.

433 Other forms of asymmetry contribute to step length asymmetry, such as asymmetries in paretic
434 propulsion(25), step position(42), or step timing(21,42). Individuals could have altered step length asymmetry by
435 changing any of these factors, some of which could affect metabolic cost(21). Future studies providing specific
436 feedback to isolate other asymmetries are necessary to examine their correlation with metabolic cost.

437 The metabolic penalty for deviating from self-selected step length asymmetry is larger for unimpaired
438 participants than for participants with chronic stroke. Differences in energy landscape could be due to the
439 differences in speed between these populations. If participants with chronic stroke walked faster, a steeper energy
440 landscape might be found. However, none of the participants with chronic stroke, including two that walked at a
441 speed similar to the walking speed of the unimpaired participants, exhibited a consistent energy landscape.

442

443 *Step-length asymmetry modulation*

444 While both populations in this study altered their self-selected step length asymmetry, participants with
445 chronic stroke did so to a lesser extent than we requested compared to unimpaired participants. Participants with
446 chronic stroke walked with step length asymmetries farther from the targeted values than the unimpaired
447 participants, suggesting that individuals with chronic stroke had more trouble modulating step length asymmetry.
448 This could be explained by the fact that individuals with chronic stroke have less complex coordination patterns than
449 their unimpaired counterparts(52). The decrease in complexity could reduce the number of coordination strategies
450 available to alter step length asymmetries as more neural signals have become coupled, leading to the observed
451 difficulties.

452 Participants with chronic stroke maintained consistent self-selected step length asymmetry across sessions.
453 Since consistent self-selected step length asymmetry in participants with chronic stroke cannot be explained by

454 energy cost minimization, other factors such as stability(47) muscle weakness(53), or fatigue avoidance(48,49) must
455 be responsible. For example, individuals with chronic stroke often experience diminished control(52), spasticity(23),
456 or muscle weakness(53) of the paretic limb which could cause them to rely less on their paretic leg, leading to the
457 observed consistent self-selected asymmetry. Additional studies should be conducted to identify which of these
458 factors are most important to self-selected step length asymmetry following stroke.

459 Unimpaired participants walked with a step length asymmetry closer to their self-selected asymmetry in all
460 biofeedback conditions, also indicating a step length asymmetry preference. In this case, trying to walk closer to
461 their self-selected asymmetry in the biofeedback conditions can be explained through energy minimization. The
462 more asymmetric unimpaired participants' step lengths were, the more energy they used. They appeared to have
463 tried to take advantage of the acceptable error allowed in the biofeedback task while still hitting the targets to
464 decrease the effort needed to walk in each asymmetry condition.

465

466 *Limitations*

467 A limitation of this study is that the unimpaired controls were not age, gender, or speed matched with their post-
468 stroke counterparts. Therefore, we could not isolate the effects that stroke had on changes in metabolic rate and step
469 length asymmetry. However, we wanted to understand if unimpaired adults self-select a step length asymmetry that
470 minimizes their energy cost at a speed they might self-select for themselves to better understand asymmetry in
471 unimpaired walking. The calculated speed for participants post-stroke was slower than their maximum over-ground
472 speed. At faster speeds, asymmetry could have had a larger effect on metabolic rate. However, many participants
473 with chronic stroke were unable to sustain altered step length asymmetry at faster speeds.

474 The biofeedback task might have been mentally challenging for individuals with chronic stroke, leading to
475 mental fatigue or loss in motivation. We wanted participants to voluntarily alter their step length asymmetry rather
476 than mechanically manipulate participants' asymmetry using the split-belt treadmill, since voluntary modulation
477 provided a better test of our hypothesis. When we noticed participants were frequently missing targets, we provided
478 verbal encouragement to help maintain motivation. The challenge of voluntarily modulating step lengths could have
479 increased variability in step length asymmetry and metabolic rate, thus reducing statistical power. Because we only
480 altered step length asymmetry in this study, we were unable to determine if a relationship exists between metabolic
481 energy consumption and other types of asymmetry, such as temporal, kinetic, or kinematic.

482

483 **Conclusions**

484 We provided biofeedback to participants to encourage them to voluntarily alter step length asymmetry, and we
485 measured their metabolic rate during each condition. We confirmed that unimpaired individuals self-select a near
486 symmetric step length asymmetry that minimizes metabolic cost. When unimpaired participants walked more
487 asymmetrically, their energy consumption increased. This is consistent with findings for many other parameters in
488 unimpaired gait. Minimizing energy cost seems to influence walking behavior in unimpaired individuals.

489 In this study, participants with chronic stroke were able to voluntarily alter their step length asymmetry. We
490 found that individuals with chronic stroke have a strong preference for their self-selected step length asymmetry, but
491 we could not explain this preference with energy cost minimization. Additional insights into how participants altered
492 their step length asymmetry could be gained from looking at changes in joint kinematics and muscle activity. To
493 better understand why individuals with chronic stroke walk with their self-selected step length asymmetry, future
494 studies should be conducted to examine other potential influences, such as balance enhancement or fatigue
495 avoidance.

496 While minimizing energy use did not explain self-selected step length asymmetry in individuals with
497 chronic stroke, altering metabolic energy consumption could still be a useful tool for rehabilitation. Our results
498 suggest that because metabolic cost does not increase with altered asymmetry, metabolic energy consumption
499 probably will not be a barrier to therapies involving practicing improved step length symmetry post-stroke. In fact,
500 manipulating the energy landscape(19) to encourage symmetric step length asymmetries could be more easily
501 accomplished. Rehabilitation methods that use changes in metabolic energy consumption to either incentivize a
502 desirable step length asymmetry or penalize an undesirable step length asymmetry might encourage individuals with
503 chronic stroke to self-select a more symmetric gait and improve long-term rehabilitation outcomes.

504

505 **Abbreviations**

506 LEFM – Lower extremity Fugl-Meyer

507 TUG – Timed up and go

508 RER – Respiratory exchange ratio

509 SLA – Step length asymmetry

510 SL – Step length

511 NP – Nonparetic

512 P - Paretic

513

514 **Declarations**

515 *Ethics approval, consent to participate, and consent for publication*

516 All participants provided written informed consent for participation and publication before participating. The
517 experimental protocol was approved by the University of Pittsburgh Institutional Review Board.

518

519 *Availability of data and materials*

520 The datasets from this study are available in the supplemental materials

521

522 *Competing interests*

523 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

524

525 *Funding*

526 This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under grant numbers IIS-1355716
527 and CMMI-1734449 (S.H.C.), AHA-15SDG25710041 (G.T.O.), and the NSF Graduate Research Fellowship
528 Program (T.M.N. and R.W.J.). No funding agency played a role in the design of the study and collection, analysis,
529 and interpretation of the data, and in writing the manuscript.

530

531 *Authors' contributions*

532 S.H.C. and G.T.O. conceived and oversaw the study; T.M.N., Y.A., R.W.J., and D.K. conducted data collections;
533 T.M.N. and Y.A. analyzed data; T.M.N. led manuscript preparation; all authors edited the manuscript and approved
534 the final manuscript.

535

536 *Acknowledgements*

537 The authors would like to thank William Anderton and Nicolas Velasquez for help with participant recruitment and
538 data collection. We thank to Bailey Patterson and Carly Sombric for help with data collection and Kirby Witte for
539 help with pilot testing and biofeedback development.

540

541 **References**

- 542 1. Olney SJ, Richards C. Hemiparetic gait following stroke. Part I: Characteristics. *Gait Posture*.
543 1996;4(2):136–48.
- 544 2. Patterson KK, Parafianowicz I, Danells CJ, Closson V, Verrier MC, Staines WR, et al. Gait Asymmetry in
545 Community-Ambulating Stroke Survivors. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2008;89(2):304–10.
- 546 3. Chen G, Patten C, Kothari DH, Zajac FE. Gait differences between individuals with post-stroke hemiparesis
547 and non-disabled controls at matched speeds. 2005;22:51–6.
- 548 4. Waters RL, Mulroy S. The energy expenditure of normal and pathologic gait. *Gait Posture*. 1999;9(3):207–
549 31.
- 550 5. Detrembleur C, Dierick F, Stoquart G, Chantaine F, Lejeune T. Energy cost, mechanical work, and
551 efficiency of hemiparetic walking. *Gait Posture*. 2003;18(2):47–55.
- 552 6. Stoquart G, Detrembleur C, Lejeune TM. The reasons why stroke patients expend so much energy to walk
553 slowly. *Gait Posture* [Internet]. 2012 [cited 2019 Jul 3];36(3):409–13. Available from:
554 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2012.03.019>
- 555 7. Reisman DS, McLean H, Bastian AJ. Split-belt treadmill training poststroke: A case study. *J Neurol Phys*
556 *Ther*. 2010;34(4):202–7.
- 557 8. Reisman DS, McLean H, Keller J, Danks KA, Bastian AJ. Repeated split-belt treadmill training improves
558 poststroke step length asymmetry. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2013;27(5):460–8.
- 559 9. Lewek MD, Feasel J, Wentz E, Brooks FP, Whitton MC. Use of Visual and Proprioceptive Feedback to
560 Improve Gait Speed and Spatiotemporal Symmetry Following Chronic Stroke: A Case Series. *Phys Ther*
561 [Internet]. 2012;92(5):748–56. Available from: [https://academic.oup.com/ptj/article-](https://academic.oup.com/ptj/article-lookup/doi/10.2522/ptj.20110206)
562 [lookup/doi/10.2522/ptj.20110206](https://academic.oup.com/ptj/article-lookup/doi/10.2522/ptj.20110206)
- 563 10. Colombo G, Keller T. Robotic Orthosis Lokomat : A Rehabilitation and Research Tool. 2003;(3). Available
564 from: <https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.stanford.idm.oclc.org/doi/epdf/10.1046/j.1525-1403.2003.03017.x>
- 565 11. Louie DR, Eng JJ. Powered robotic exoskeletons in post-stroke rehabilitation of gait: A scoping review. *J*
566 *Neuroeng Rehabil* [Internet]. 2016;13(1):1–10. Available from: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12984-016-0162-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12984-016-0162-5)
567 [5](http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12984-016-0162-5)
- 568 12. Hidler J, Nichols D, Pelliccio M, Brady K, Campbell DD, Kahn JH, et al. Multicenter randomized clinical
569 trial evaluating the effectiveness of the Lokomat in subacute stroke. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*.
570 2009;23(1):5–13.
- 571 13. Hornby TG, Campbell DD, Kahn JH, Demott T, Moore JL, Roth HR. Enhanced gait-related improvements
572 after therapist- versus robotic-assisted locomotor training in subjects with chronic stroke: A randomized
573 controlled study. *Stroke*. 2008;39(6):1786–92.
- 574 14. Sczesny-Kaiser M, Trost R, Aach M, Schildhauer TA, Schwenkreis P, Tegenthoff M. A Randomized and
575 Controlled Crossover Study Investigating the Improvement of Walking and Posture Functions in Chronic
576 Stroke Patients Using HAL Exoskeleton – The HALESTRO Study (HAL-Exoskeleton STROKE Study).
577 *Front Neurosci* [Internet]. 2019;13(March):1–13. Available from:
578 <https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fnins.2019.00259/full>
- 579 15. Lewek MD, Braun CH, Wutzke C, Giuliani C. The role of movement errors in modifying spatiotemporal
580 gait asymmetry post stroke: a randomized controlled trial. *Clin Rehabil*. 2018;32(2):161–72.
- 581 16. Bertram JEA, Ruina A. Multiple walking speed-frequency relations are predicted by constrained
582 optimization. *J Theor Biol*. 2001;209(4):445–53.
- 583 17. Donelan JM, Kram R, Kuo AD. Mechanical and metabolic determinants of the preferred step width in
584 human walking. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci* [Internet]. 2001;268(1480):1985–92. Available from:
585 <http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/cgi/doi/10.1098/rspb.2001.1761>
- 586 18. Collins SH, Adamczyk PG, Kuo AD. Dynamic arm swinging in human walking. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci*
587 [Internet]. 2009;276(1673):3679–88. Available from:

- 588 <http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/cgi/doi/10.1098/rspb.2009.0664>
- 589 19. Collins SH, Jackson RW. Inducing self-selected human engagement in robotic locomotion training. *IEEE*
- 590 *Int Conf Rehabil Robot*. 2013;
- 591 20. Roemmich RT, Leech KA, Gonzalez AJ, Bastian AJ. Trading Symmetry for Energy Cost During Walking in
- 592 Healthy Adults and Persons Poststroke. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair* [Internet]. 2019 Jun 18 [cited 2019 Jun
- 593 24];154596831985502. Available from: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1545968319855028>
- 594 21. Ellis RG, Howard KC, Kram R. The metabolic and mechanical costs of step time asymmetry in walking.
- 595 *Proc Biol Sci* [Internet]. 2013;280(1756):20122784. Available from:
- 596 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23407831>
- 597 22. Nadeau S, Gravel D, Arseneault AB, Bourbonnais D. Plantarflexor weakness as a limiting factor of gait speed
- 598 in stroke subjects and the compensating role of hip flexors. *Clin Biomech*. 1999;14(2):125–35.
- 599 23. O’Dwyer NJ, Ada L, Neilson PD. Spasticity and muscle contracture following stroke. *Brain*.
- 600 1996;119(5):1737–49.
- 601 24. Bowden MG, Balasubramanian CK, Neptune RR, Kautz SA. Anterior-posterior ground reaction forces as a
- 602 measure of paretic leg contribution in hemiparetic walking. *Stroke*. 2006;37(3):872–6.
- 603 25. Allen JL, Kautz SA, Neptune RR. Step length asymmetry is representative of compensatory mechanisms
- 604 used in post-stroke hemiparetic walking. *Gait Posture*. 2011;33(4):538–43.
- 605 26. Awad LN, Palmer JA, Pohlrig RT, Binder-MacLeod SA, Reisman DS. Walking speed and step length
- 606 asymmetry modify the energy cost of walking after stroke. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2015;29(5):416–23.
- 607 27. Bohannon R. Muscle strength and muscle training after stroke. *J Rehabil Med* [Internet]. 2007 [cited 2019
- 608 Oct 7];39(1):14–20. Available from: <https://medicaljournals.se/jrm/content/abstract/10.2340/16501977-0018>
- 609 28. Selinger JC, Donelan JM. Estimating instantaneous energetic cost during non-steady-state gait. *J Appl*
- 610 *Physiol*. 2014;117(11):1406–15.
- 611 29. Sánchez N, Finley JM. Individual Differences in Locomotor Function Predict the Capacity to Reduce
- 612 Asymmetry and Modify the Energetic Cost of Walking Poststroke. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair* [Internet].
- 613 2018;154596831878791. Available from: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1545968318787913>
- 614 30. Ijmker T, Houdijk H, Lamoth CJC, Beek PJ, van der Woude LHV. Energy cost of balance control during
- 615 walking decreases with external stabilizer stiffness independent of walking speed. *J Biomech* [Internet].
- 616 2013;46(13):2109–14. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2013.07.005>
- 617 31. Kim M, Collins SH. Once-per-step control of ankle-foot prosthesis push-off work reduces effort associated
- 618 with balance during walking. *J Neuroeng Rehabil*. 2015;12(1):1–13.
- 619 32. Ijmker T, Lamoth CJ, Houdijk H, Tolsma M, Van Der Woude LHV, Daffertshofer A, et al. Effects of
- 620 handrail hold and light touch on energetics, step parameters, and neuromuscular activity during walking
- 621 after stroke. *J Neuroeng Rehabil* [Internet]. 2015;12(1):1–12. Available from:
- 622 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12984-015-0051-3>
- 623 33. Huang HJ, Kram R, Ahmed AA. Reduction of metabolic cost during motor learning of arm reaching
- 624 dynamics. *J Neurosci*. 2012;32(6):2182–90.
- 625 34. Finley JM, Bastian AJ, Gottschall JS. Learning to be economical: The energy cost of walking tracks motor
- 626 adaptation. *J Physiol*. 2013;591(4):1081–95.
- 627 35. Gordon KE, Ferris DP. Learning to walk with a robotic ankle exoskeleton. *J Biomech*. 2007;40(12):2636–
- 628 44.
- 629 36. Sánchez N, Simha SN, Donelan JM, Finley JM. Is More Better? Evaluating the Role of Time in Energy
- 630 Optimization during Split-Belt Adaptation. In: *Dynamic Walking*. 2019.
- 631 37. Stickgold R. Sleep-dependent memory consolidation. Vol. 437, *Nature*. Nature Publishing Group; 2005. p.
- 632 1272–8.
- 633 38. Rikli RE, Jones CJ. The reliability and validity of a 6-minute walk test as a measure of physical endurance
- 634 in older adults. *J Aging Phys Act*. 1998;
- 635 39. Kervio G, Carre F, Ville NS. Reliability and intensity of the six-minute walk test in healthy elderly subjects.
- 636 / Fiabilité et intensité d’un test de six minutes de marche chez des personnes âgées en bonne santé. *Med Sci*
- 637 *Sport Exerc* [Internet]. 2003;35(1):169–74. Available from:
- 638 [http://proxy.lib.sfu.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sph&AN=SPHS-](http://proxy.lib.sfu.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sph&AN=SPHS-863767&site=ehost-live)
- 639 [863767&site=ehost-live](http://proxy.lib.sfu.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sph&AN=SPHS-863767&site=ehost-live)
- 640 40. Bohannon RW. Comfortable and maximum walking speed of adults aged 20-79 years: Reference values and
- 641 determinants. *Age Ageing*. 1997;26(1):15–9.
- 642 41. Brockway JM. Derivation of formulae used to calculate energy expenditure in man. *Hum Nutr Clin Nutr*
- 643 [Internet]. 1987 Nov [cited 2019 Sep 10];41(6):463–71. Available from:

- 644 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/3429265>
645 42. Finley JM, Long A, Bastian AJ, Torres-Oviedo G. Spatial and Temporal Control Contribute to Step Length
646 Asymmetry during Split-Belt Adaptation and Hemiparetic Gait. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*.
647 2015;29(8):786–95.
648 43. Finley JM, Bastian AJ. Associations between Foot Placement Asymmetries and Metabolic Cost of Transport
649 in Hemiparetic Gait. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2017;31(2):168–77.
650 44. Ralston HJ. Energy-speed relation and optimal speed during level walking* With 4 Figures in the Text. *Int Z*
651 *angew Physiol einschl Arbeitsphysiol, Bd* [Internet]. 1958;17:20. Available from:
652 https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2F978-3-642-10075-4_2
653 45. Bornstein MH, Bornstein HG. The pace of life. *Nature*. 1976;259(5544):557–9.
654 46. Balasubramanian CK, Neptune RR, Kautz SA. Variability in spatiotemporal step characteristics and its
655 relationship to walking performance post-stroke. *Gait Posture*. 2009;29(3):408–14.
656 47. Hak L, Houdijk H, Van Der Wurff P, Prins MR, Mert A, Beek PJ, et al. Stepping strategies used by post-
657 stroke individuals to maintain margins of stability during walking. *Clin Biomech*. 2013 Nov;28(9–10):1041–
658 8.
659 48. Ackermann M, van den Bogert AJ. Optimality principles for model-based prediction of human gait. *J*
660 *Biomech* [Internet]. 2010;43(6):1055–60. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2009.12.012>
661 49. Song S, Geyer H. Predictive neuromechanical simulations indicate why walking performance declines with
662 ageing. *J Physiol*. 2018;596(7):1199–210.
663 50. Lauzière S, Miéville C, Betschart M, Duclos C, Aissaoui R, Nadeau S. Plantarflexion moment is a
664 contributor to step length after-effect following walking on a split-belt treadmill in individuals with stroke
665 and healthy individuals. *J Rehabil Med*. 2014;46(9):849–57.
666 51. Lauzière S, Miéville C, Betschart M, Duclos C, Aissaoui R, Nadeau S. A more symmetrical gait after split-
667 belt treadmill walking increases the effort in paretic plantar flexors in people post-stroke. *J Rehabil Med*.
668 2016;48(7):576–82.
669 52. Clark DJ, Ting LH, Zajac FE, Neptune RR, Kautz SA. Merging of Healthy Motor Modules Predicts
670 Reduced Locomotor Performance and Muscle Coordination Complexity Post-Stroke. *J Neurophysiol*
671 [Internet]. 2010;103(2):844–57. Available from: <http://jn.physiology.org/cgi/doi/10.1152/jn.00825.2009>
672 53. Hsu AL, Tang PF, Jan MH. Analysis of impairments influencing gait velocity and asymmetry of hemiplegic
673 patients after mild to moderate stroke. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2003;84(8):1185–93.
674