

1 **Impaired Scaling of Step Length in Parkinsonian Postural Instability**

2 Robert A. McGovern, MD¹, Juan C. Cortés, MD², Anne P. Wilson, MD³, Guy M. McKhann II,
3 MD³, Pietro Mazzoni, MD PhD⁴

4
5 Affiliations:

6 1. Department of Neurosurgery, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN

7 2. Department of Neurology, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD

8 3. Departments of Neurology and Neurosurgery, Columbia University, New York, NY

9 4. Department of Neurology, Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, MO

10

11 Corresponding author:

12 Pietro Mazzoni

13 Washington University in St. Louis

14 660 S. Euclid Ave., CB 8111

15 St. Louis, MO 63110

16 Phone: 314-747-7036

17 Email: mazzonip@wustl.edu

18

19 Word Count: [Abstract: 250; Body: 3670]

20

21 Running Title: Hypokinesia in parkinsonian postural instability

22

23 Keywords: Pull test; Parkinson's disease; Motor control; Bradykinesia; Falls

24

25 Financial Disclosure/Conflict of Interest: The authors do not have any financial information to
26 disclose related to the work described in this article.

27

28 Funding Sources: This study was supported by grants from the Parkinson's Disease Foundation
29 and the Doris Duke Charitable Foundation.

30

31 **Abstract**

32 Background: Postural stepping is an important strategy for recovery of balance in response to
33 postural perturbations. It is disrupted by Parkinson's disease (PD) and other conditions. The
34 nature of this disruption remains poorly understood. Understanding the motor control nature of
35 this impairment can guide the development of novel interventions.

36 Objectives: To identify the motor control abnormalities responsible for parkinsonian impairment
37 of postural stepping.

38 Methods: We studied four groups of participants: control, aged, PD, and normal-pressure
39 hydrocephalus (NPH). We performed kinematic analysis of postural stepping by recording
40 participants' body motion during a modified version of the clinical pull test, which was
41 performed multiple times with different amounts of pulling forcefulness.

42 Results: Successful postural stepping in the control group was accompanied by linear scaling of
43 their first step's length and latency to the body's initial motion: more forceful pulls caused larger
44 initial body acceleration, which resulted in longer steps that began earlier. PD patients exhibited
45 reduced scaling of step length: they maintained normal reaction time but took steps that were
46 inadequately short. Reduced step length scaling was present, but less severe, in aged individuals,
47 and was more severe in NPH patients. Aged individuals and PD patients exhibited partial
48 compensation for reduced step length scaling: their step length included a component that was
49 independent of initial body acceleration, which was absent in control and NPH groups.

50 Conclusions: the impairment of postural stepping caused by PD and related conditions is due to
51 inadequate scaling of movement amplitude and is thus a form of hypokinesia.

52 **Introduction**

53 When standing in a bus that starts moving, we must sometimes take a step back to avoid falling.

54 This behavior is an example of the postural stepping response, an important motor strategy that
55 helps us maintain balance in response to postural perturbations.

56 We can counter small perturbations by adjusting our body's geometry without moving our feet
57 (hip and ankle strategies) [1]. These strategies are inadequate, however, for a variety of
58 perturbations encountered in daily life, such as stumbling on a curb, being nudged when standing
59 in a crowd, and stepping off an escalator. Postural stepping is a commonly used strategy when
60 there are no constraints on foot movement [2]. It can counter a wide variety of perturbation types
61 and magnitudes [3,4], as it allows balance recovery by changing the body's base of support.

62 Balance disorders are an important cause of falls, which in turn are a major cause of morbidity,
63 mortality, and reduced quality of life in the elderly and in patients with neurologic disorders [5–
64 7]. The balance disorder caused by Parkinson's disease (PD) and related conditions
65 (parkinsonism) is characterized by impaired postural stepping, as exhibited in inadequate
66 responses to the pull test [8]. The nature of this impairment, however, remains unclear.

67 Studies of postural stepping in PD patients [9–14] have identified reduced static sway before
68 stepping [9], particular susceptibility to backwards perturbations [15], and abnormally
69 coordinated responses (simultaneous activation of ankle, hip and trunk muscles) to surface force
70 plate translation [9,11,12]. PD patients also exhibit anticipatory lateral postural adjustments,
71 later-onset and shorter steps [16,17], increased weight shift time, and a base-width neutral step
72 [18]. These varied abnormalities do not readily point to a motor control problem responsible for
73 impaired postural stepping.

74 In spite of the complex sensory processing and precisely coordinated force control required to
75 maintain balance, postural stepping can be described rather simply at the task level in kinematic
76 terms: as the body moves away from its base of support, a step is taken to extend the base of
77 support and counter the body's falling motion. The relevant perturbation is the body's movement
78 away from a stable configuration, regardless of the nature and magnitude of the force that caused
79 this perturbation. The relevant response is placement of the foot in the appropriate position and at
80 the appropriate time to counter the body's motion. Successful postural stepping may thus be
81 explained by a kinematic account, i.e. by relationships between initial body motion and
82 kinematic features of the stepping response.

83 An interesting feature of normal postural stepping is that, when pulled backwards at the waist
84 with different force magnitudes, the step length of control participants increases as force
85 increases [19]. This finding suggests that a scaling relationship exists between magnitude of
86 postural perturbation and the stepping response. We thus hypothesized that successful postural
87 stepping can be described by a kinematic control policy: when posture is perturbed, a step is
88 taken with appropriate amplitude and latency to stop the body's motion.

89 If normal postural stepping can be described kinematically, then perhaps its impairment seen in
90 PD and other conditions has a kinematic explanation: are the steps of postural stepping too short,
91 too slow, or too late, to stop the body from falling? Such a kinematic account of postural
92 stepping impairment would link parkinsonian postural instability to bradykinesia, a complex of
93 motor symptoms that includes slowness (bradykinesia itself), reduced amplitude (hypokinesia),
94 and delay in movement onset (akinesia) [20].

95 We devised a quantitative version of a clinical maneuver commonly used to test the stepping
96 response, the pull test, in which a participant is pulled from behind and must step backwards to
97 recover balance [8]. By recording the body's motion in response to repeated pulls of varying
98 intensity, we examined relationships between postural perturbation intensity and stepping
99 kinematics. We characterized the kinematic control policy of normal postural stepping in control
100 participants, and then examined how this control is disrupted by PD and by two other conditions
101 that disrupt postural responses, normal aging and normal pressure hydrocephalus (NPH).

102 **Methods**

103 *Participants*

104 We studied 29 participants with no musculoskeletal disorder, dementia, or depression (Table 1):
105 control participants (*Control* group); older participants (*Aged* group); patients with PD based on
106 UK Brain Bank Criteria [21] (*PD* group); patients with NPH (inclusion criteria: progressive gait
107 impairment with multiple falls, cognitive symptoms, urinary incontinence, and communicating
108 hydrocephalus disproportionate to cerebral atrophy). PD patients were tested on their usual
109 medications. The study protocol was approved by the Institutional Review Board.

110 *Quantitative Pull Test Protocol*

111 Participants were pulled from behind by one of us (P.M.) with a firm brisk pull at the shoulders
112 [22] and were caught if they did not recover balance on their own. This procedure was repeated
113 for 8-20 trials with varying degrees of pull intensity. A Proreflex camera (Qualisys AB) captured
114 motion of the right shoulder, elbow, hip, knee, toe, and heel in the sagittal plane. Participants
115 held their arms folded to prevent reflective marker occlusion.

116 *Data Analysis*

117 We recorded the number of steps (steps taken before stopping) and failure rate (fraction of trials
118 without recovery after 3 steps). We calculated the body's center of mass (*COM*) position using
119 standard biomechanical equations [23]. We differentiated COM and foot position to obtain COM
120 and foot velocity and acceleration.

121 A pull test trial consisted of an initial backward motion of the upper body (*perturbation phase*;
122 Fig. 1A), followed by one or more backward steps (*response phase*; Fig 1B). Pull onset was the
123 time when COM acceleration exceeded 15 cm/s². Step onset and landing were the times when
124 the ankle marker's velocity crossed a 3 cm/s threshold for the first step (Fig. 1C). We quantified
125 perturbation intensity as the average COM acceleration after pull onset and before step onset
126 (shaded area in lower panel of Fig. C). The response (first step) was characterized by reaction
127 time (time to step onset; Fig. 1C), horizontal amplitude (step length), and duration (time from
128 step onset to step landing).

129 *Statistical Analysis*

130 We computed linear correlation between selected kinematic variables. We performed ANOVA
131 with corrections for multiple comparisons using Tukey's method of Honest Significant
132 Differences (JMP, SAS Institute), and with significance set at alpha=0.05.

133 **Results**

134 Participants did not differ in sex ratio, height, weight, or cognitive scores (Montreal Cognitive
135 Assessment [24]). Control participants were younger than other groups, as intended (Table 1).
136 PD and NPH participants had similar UPDRS III scores. Pull test scores differed across groups
137 (ANOVA, $p < 0.0001$): Control and Aged participants exhibited normal recovery (pull test score

138 0); PD and NPH had higher pull test scores than Control and Aged groups (t test, $p < 0.05$); and
139 NPH had higher pull test scores than PD participants (t test, $p = 0.002$; Table 1).

140 Participants differed in number of steps (steps taken before stopping) and failure rate (fraction of
141 trials without recovery after 3 steps; Table 1; ANOVA, $p < 0.001$). Control participants all
142 recovered in one step in all trials, regardless of pull intensity. Aged and PD groups more steps
143 than Control ($p < 0.05$) and less than NPH ($p < 0.01$). NPH participants failed more frequently than
144 Control and Aged $p < 0.01$).

145 Because all control participants recovered their balance in once step, we focused our analysis on
146 the first step. We looked for group differences in first step features that might explain why
147 participants in PD and NPH groups had higher failure rates.

148 The kinematics of a successful trial illustrate how postural stability may be regained after a pull.
149 The COM initially accelerated backward after a pull, away from its initial position under the base
150 of support (arrows in Fig. 1A; upper panel of Fig. 1D). The first step landed well behind the
151 COM, which stopped the COM's backward motion and restored postural stability (Fig. 1B; upper
152 panel of Fig. 1D). Failure to recover is illustrated in a trial for an NPH participant (Fig. 1D,
153 lower panel). After a short first step, the COM continued to move backwards in spite of
154 additional short steps.

155 Initial COM acceleration values varied widely, as intended, within each participant, and ranged
156 between 20 and 340 cm/s^2 . We examined the time course of COM velocity after the first step to
157 establish how quickly participants regained their balance in a subset of trials with matched initial
158 COM acceleration. Control participants' speed decreased from the end of the first step ($t=0$) to
159 near 0 at $t=1$ s (Fig. 2A). Aged participants' speed decreased to the same value as Control at $t=1$ s

160 (Tukey HSD; $p > 0.1$), though their intermediate speeds were higher than for Control ($p = 0.0003$ at
161 0.25s; $p < 0.0001$ at 0.5s). PD participants' speed was higher than for Control ($p = 0.0002$) and
162 Aged ($p < 0.05$) groups at $t = 1$ s. NPH participants' speed remained the highest across groups at
163 $t = 1$ s ($p < 0.0001$ vs PD group speed). Thus, PD and NPH participants were still moving 1 second
164 after the first step ended. These results are consistent with the groups' rankings in number of
165 steps and failure rates (Table 1).

166 Pulls of greater intensity caused faster and larger changes in COM position (Fig. 2B, upper
167 panel), which were followed by steps of earlier onset, shorter duration, and larger amplitude (Fig.
168 2B, lower panel). This finding suggests a kinematic control policy for postural stepping: step
169 latency and amplitude are scaled to the intensity of postural perturbation, so that the foot lands
170 sufficiently behind the COM to stop its motion. We examined Control participants' responses for
171 evidence of this policy and then examined how it might be disrupted in the other groups.

172 There was a marked linear correlation between step length and initial COM acceleration, both
173 within and across Control participants (Figure 3A, 3B; $r = 0.80 \pm 0.2$, mean \pm SEM; $p < 0.01$ for
174 each participant). Similarly, there was an inverse correlation between reaction time and initial
175 COM acceleration, (Figure 4A, 4B; $r = 0.68 \pm 0.2$; $p < 0.05$ in each participant). By contrast, first
176 step duration did not significantly vary across trials (ANOVA, $p > 0.05$, mean $r = 0.35 \pm 0.2$).

177 These correlations are a plausible mechanism for stepping responses' success: larger
178 perturbations are handled by making the first step of larger amplitude and earlier onset, so that
179 the foot lands further behind the moving body and has a better chance of halting its motion.

180 The correlation of step length and initial COM acceleration is characterized by a slope and a y-
181 intercept. The slope indicates how much longer the step is in response a larger initial acceleration

182 and represents a scaling factor between acceleration and step length. The correlation between
183 step length and initial COM acceleration had a lower slope in the Aged, PD, and NPH groups
184 compared to Control (Figure 3B, 3C; ANOVA, $p < 0.0001$, Control vs. Aged, Tukey HSD,
185 $p = 0.002$, Control vs. PD, Tukey HSD, $p = 0.0003$, Control vs. NPH, Tukey HSD, $p < 0.0001$).
186 Aged participants had a higher slope than NPH participants (Aged vs. NPH, Tukey HSD,
187 $p = 0.04$), but otherwise slope was not significantly different among Aged, PD, and NPH groups
188 ($p > 0.05$ for all other comparisons, Tukey HSD).

189 The correlation's y-intercept indicates, in practice, the smallest possible step that a participant
190 takes in response to the smallest possible initial COM acceleration. It raises the entire correlation
191 line by this amount, and thus indicates a bias--a minimum amount of step length that is added to
192 every step, regardless of perturbation magnitude. The step length correlation's intercept was
193 higher in Aged and PD groups compared to Control (Figure 3B, 3D; Aged vs. Control, Tukey
194 HSD, $p = 0.006$, PD vs. Control, Tukey HSD, $p = 0.02$), and smaller in the NPH group compared to
195 Aged (Tukey HSD, $p = 0.04$).

196 The lower slope values indicate that the step length of Aged, PD, and NPH participants did not
197 increase by a normal amount in response to increasing perturbations. For sufficiently large COM
198 accelerations, step length of Aged and PD participants was smaller than for Control (Figure 4B).
199 Step length in the NPH group was shorter than for the Control group for most of the range of
200 COM accelerations (Figure 4B). The higher intercept values of Aged and PD participants, on the
201 other hand, made their steps longer than they would have otherwise been. As a result, for Aged
202 and PD groups, the first step was longer than necessary in the range of smaller COM
203 accelerations, and less abnormally short for larger COM accelerations (Figure 4B). An increase

204 in the intercept thus countered the effect of slope reduction and partially compensated for the
205 loss of adequate scaling of step size to perturbation magnitude in Aged and PD groups. For
206 example, step length for the PD group was shorter than normal only for accelerations above ~100
207 cm/s² (Figure 4B) because of the higher intercept of this group's correlation. This effect was not
208 seen in the NPH group.

209 The correlation between reaction time and initial COM acceleration did not significantly vary
210 across groups (Figure 4; slope, ANOVA, $p=0.45$, all Tukey HSD comparisons, $p>0.45$; intercept,
211 ANOVA, $p=0.10$, all Tukey HSD comparisons, $p>0.08$).

212 **Discussion**

213 Kinematic analysis of a clinical test of postural stability revealed that the normal response to
214 postural perturbations across a wide range of intensities is to recover by scaling the first step's
215 amplitude and latency to the body's initial acceleration. These scaling relationships indicate a
216 *kinematic strategy* for successful recovery from postural perturbations of different intensities:
217 increasing step length and decreasing reaction time allows the body to recover balance by
218 placing the foot further behind the center of mass, and sooner, in response to greater postural
219 perturbations.

220 Aged participants successfully recovered but took more than one step. PD and NPH participants
221 took more steps and had higher failure rates. The slope of the correlation between step length and
222 postural perturbation magnitude was reduced in all 3 groups, and its intercept was increased in
223 Aged and PD groups. Reaction time scaling to postural perturbation was normal in Aged, PD,
224 and NPH groups.

225 The slope reduction in step length scaling in Aged, PD, and NPH groups offers a kinematic
226 explanation for failure to recover balance in the pull test. For larger perturbations, step size was
227 abnormally small, so that the foot was not placed far enough behind the body to stop its motion.
228 Aged participants exhibited the same type of postural stepping abnormality, reduced step length
229 scaling, as PD participants, though this reduction was less than in the PD group. Aged and PD
230 groups also exhibited a compensatory increase in the intercept of the correlation between body
231 acceleration and step size. This compensatory change was of similar magnitude in both groups. It
232 may have been sufficient to counter the smaller amount of slope reduction in the Aged group and
233 thus explain their lower failure rate in the pull test (Table 1). The intercept increase may have not
234 been sufficient to counter the larger slope reduction of the PD group, which potentially accounts
235 for the group's higher failure rate.

236 Regarding the symptom complex of bradykinesia (bradykinesia proper, hypokinesia, akinesia;
237 see Introduction) [20], our findings indicate a postural stepping abnormality that consists of
238 hypokinesia: steps were shorter than they needed to be to allow balance recovery in PD and NPH
239 groups. By contrast, these participants did not show evidence of delayed movement onset
240 (akinesia). This finding could reflect normal control of step reaction time in the groups we
241 studied, or a combined effect of reaction time increase, known to be caused by PD [25] and
242 compensatory reaction time reduction to counteract first step hypokinesia. Similarly, there was
243 no evidence of movement slowing.

244 Finding a similar motor control abnormality underlying abnormal postural stepping across Aged,
245 PD, and NPH groups suggests that these conditions share brain changes responsible for postural
246 instability. A shared pathology for PD and NPH is consistent with the overlap of other clinical

247 manifestations of these disorders, such as bradykinesia of rapid repeated leg and foot movements
248 [26]. Similarly, aging is accompanied by brain changes also seen in PD, including loss of
249 neurons in the substantia nigra and parkinsonian movement abnormalities [27]. In aging,
250 however, these abnormalities may be subclinical, rather than entirely absent, thanks to
251 compensatory mechanisms like the rise in the intercept of the step length scaling relationship.
252 The lack of evidence of compensation (increase in intercept) in the NPH group may indicate that
253 compensatory mechanisms are not available when kinematic scaling relationships are severely
254 disrupted: NPH participants' slopes for the step size vs. initial acceleration scaling were nearly
255 flat. Alternatively, NPH may disrupt additional gait control mechanisms not affected by aging or
256 PD.

257 Elderly individuals are known to take multiple steps when recovering from a postural
258 perturbation [28–31]. Step kinematics differed from those of young participants in some studies
259 [29,31] but were normal in another study [30]. Our results may explain this variation as
260 emerging from the changes in the scaling relationship of step length to perturbation magnitude.
261 Thanks to the compensatory effect of increased intercept, aged participants in our study took
262 abnormally short steps only for perturbations greater than 150 cm/s^2 (Fig. 3B).

263 PD patients have been reported to take abnormally short steps in compensatory stepping, as we
264 found, but also to exhibit increased reaction time, unlike our findings [17]. Differences in how
265 perturbations were applied may account for this discrepancy: platform motion is likely more
266 sudden than a manual pull at the shoulders, and could thus unmask reaction time increases not
267 visible in the pull test. Another study [18] did not find an effect of PD on step length, which we
268 also found for initial body accelerations below 100 cm/s^2 . Some of these findings, such as

269 reduced static sway, may reflect the same kinematic abnormality (hypokinesia) we identified,
270 while others may be independent additional contributors to impaired postural stepping.

271 Postural response impairment in PD has been examined within a model of standing as the
272 balancing of a two-segment inverted pendulum, in which the CNS acting as a multivariate
273 feedback controller that processes sensory information, estimates body kinematics, and sends
274 appropriate motor commands scaled by feedback gains [32]. PD patients in this study had
275 abnormal feedback gains and were unable to scale postural responses to changes in perturbation
276 amplitude. Although these results were observed in a fixed-support postural task, the model
277 offers a convincing mechanism to explain our findings for normal and abnormal stepping
278 responses. Consistent with this model, our findings show that the normal stepping response is
279 governed by a linear gain between perturbation magnitude and postural response, and that PD
280 reduces this gain so that postural responses are scaled down.

281 While gait parameters have been studied in detail for NPH patients [33], our understanding of
282 postural control in these patients remains limited. NPH patients appear to have a larger static
283 sway area and higher backwards directed COM velocity during upright stance [34], but no
284 dynamic studies have examined NPH patients' postural control in detail. The patients in our
285 study were essentially unable to scale step length to increases in perturbation amplitude. This
286 resulted in the highest percentage of inadequate responses among the groups we studied.

287 We chose the COM's initial backward acceleration as the measure of perturbation intensity,
288 rather than the force applied at the shoulders. The COM's initial acceleration results from the
289 combined effect of pull force and inertial resistance due to a person's mass, height, posture, and
290 stiffness (mechanical impedance). COM acceleration thus reflects the *effective* intensity of the

291 pull, that is, how effectively a pull's force displaces the body away from a stable posture. We
292 would argue that the relevant variable that ultimately leads to loss of balance is the body's
293 motion towards the limits of the base of support, and not the force applied at the shoulders. The
294 body's motion is what needs to be countered: a fall is, after all, the end-result of the COM being
295 in the wrong position, and headed in the wrong direction, relative to the base of support for too
296 long. Therefore, even though COM acceleration is not an independent variable (as it is an
297 outcome of the applied force), we consider it an appropriate measure of perturbation intensity in
298 the pull test.

299 An advantage of using COM acceleration as a measure of perturbation intensity is that it is not
300 confounded by anticipatory strategies. If participants leaned forward or stiffened their body in
301 anticipation of the pull, the effect of a given pull force would be diminished. These strategies are
302 equivalent to increasing inertial resistance. Their dampening effect on applied force is thus
303 accurately reflected in the COM's initial acceleration and does not confound the estimate of
304 perturbation intensity.

305 A kinematic explanation of postural instability as a manifestation of hypokinesia suggests that
306 postural responses should improve with treatments that benefit other forms of hypokinesia. At
307 this time, whether any treatment improves postural instability is in our opinion unclear.

308 Treatment of PD with levodopa is associated with reduced frequency of falls [35] and with
309 improved scores on all motor subcomponents of the UPDRS, including the subscale related to
310 postural control and gait [36]. However, levodopa worsened the ability to scale responses to
311 large perturbation amplitudes in a fixed-support strategy postural task [37]. Postural instability
312 has been reported not to benefit from deep brain stimulation (DBS) when assessed with clinical

313 measures [38], but showed clear benefit from DBS (Nantel *et al.*, 2012) and pallidotomy [41]
314 when assessed with posturography. Compensatory stepping has been shown to be unaffected by
315 globus pallidus internus DBS while subthalamic nucleus DBS has been associated with delays in
316 the preparatory phase prior to stepping and more steps required to regain balance [42]. Treatment
317 of NPH with ventriculoperitoneal shunting has benefit on gait [43,44]; whether this treatment
318 improves postural responses is unclear.

319 We found that successful recovery of balance in postural stepping is mediated by a kinematic
320 mechanism (scaling of first step length and reaction time to initial body motion) and that
321 parkinsonian postural instability can be explained by hypokinesia of the first step. People with
322 parkinsonism have difficulty recovering balance because their reactive steps are too small
323 relative to the size of the imposed perturbation, and not because of a delay in step initiation.
324 Further quantitative testing of postural stepping may clarify whether treatments that are effective
325 for other forms of hypokinesia, such as dopaminergic medications and DBS, can also benefit
326 parkinsonian postural instability.

327 **Acknowledgments**

328 We thank Paul Greene and Ash Rao for discussion.

329 **Authors' Roles**

- 330 1) Research project: A. Conception, B. Organization, C. Execution;
331 2) Statistical Analysis: A. Design, B. Execution, C. Review and Critique;
332 3) Manuscript: A. Writing of the first draft, B. Review and Critique.

333 RAM: 1BC, 2AB, 3AB

334 JCC: 1C, 2C, 3B

335 AW: 1C

336 GMM: 1BC, 3C

337 PM: 1ABC, 2ABC, 3B

338 **Financial Disclosures for Preceding 12 Months**

339 Stock Ownership in medically-related fields: RAM: None; JCC: None; AW: None; GMM: None;

340 PM: None

341 Intellectual Property Rights: RAM: None; JCC: None; AW: None; GMM: None; PM: None

342 Consultancies: RAM: None JCC: None; AW: None; GMM: None; PM: None

343 Expert Testimony: RAM: None, JCC: None; AW: None; GMM: None; PM: Yes

344 Advisory Boards: RAM: Data Safety Monitoring Board, Synerfuse, Inc. JCC: None; AW: None;

345 GMM: None; PM: None

346 Partnerships: RAM: None JCC: None; AW: None; GMM: None; PM: None

347 Contracts: RAM: None JCC: None; AW: None; GMM: None; PM: None

348 Honoraria: RAM: None JCC: None; AW: None; GMM: None; PM: None

349 Royalties: RAM: None JCC: None; AW: None; GMM: None; PM: None

350 Grants: RAM: MnDRIVE; JCC: None; AW: None; GMM: None; PM: NINDS

351 Other: RAM: None JCC: None; AW: None; GMM: None; PM: None

352 **References**

- 353 1 Horak FB, Macpherson JM. Postural Orientation and Equilibrium. In: *Comprehensive*
354 *Physiology*. American Cancer Society 2011. 255–92. doi:10.1002/cphy.cp120107
- 355 2 McIlroy W, Maki B. Task constraints on foot movement and the incidence of compensatory
356 stepping following perturbation of upright stance. *Brain Res* 1993;**616**:30–8.
- 357 3 Maki BE, McIlroy WE. The role of limb movements in maintaining upright stance: the
358 ‘change-in-support’ strategy. *Phys Ther* 1997;**77**:488–507.
- 359 4 Rogers MW, Mille M-L. Chapter 5 - Balance perturbations. In: Day BL, Lord SR, eds.
360 *Handbook of Clinical Neurology*. Elsevier 2018. 85–105. doi:10.1016/B978-0-444-63916-
361 5.00005-7
- 362 5 Sheldon J. On the natural history of falls in old age. *Br Med J* 1960;**2**:1685–90.
- 363 6 Sturnieks DL, St George R, Lord SR. Balance disorders in the elderly. *Neurophysiol Clin*
364 *Clin Neurophysiol* 2008;**38**:467–78. doi:10.1016/j.neucli.2008.09.001
- 365 7 Soh S-E, McGinley JL, Watts JJ, *et al*. Determinants of health-related quality of life in
366 people with Parkinson’s disease: a path analysis. *Qual Life Res Int J Qual Life Asp Treat*
367 *Care Rehabil* 2013;**22**:1543–53. doi:10.1007/s11136-012-0289-1
- 368 8 Bloem BR, Beckley DJ, van Hilten BJ, *et al*. Clinimetrics of postural instability in
369 Parkinson’s disease. *J Neurol* 1998;**245**:669–73.
- 370 9 Horak F, Nutt J, Nashner L. Postural inflexibility in parkinsonian subjects. *J Neurol Sci*
371 1992;**111**:46–58.
- 372 10 Adkin AL, Frank JS, Jog MS. Fear of falling and postural control in Parkinson’s disease.
373 *Mov Disord Off J Mov Disord Soc* 2003;**18**:496–502. doi:10.1002/mds.10396

- 374 11 Carpenter MG, Allum JH, Honegger F, *et al.* Postural abnormalities to multidirectional
375 stance perturbations in Parkinson's disease. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2004;**75**:1245–
376 54. doi:10.1136/jnnp.2003.021147
- 377 12 Dimitrova D, Horak FB, Nutt JG. Postural muscle responses to multidirectional translations
378 in patients with Parkinson's disease. *J Neurophysiol* 2004;**91**:489–501.
379 doi:10.1152/jn.00094.2003
- 380 13 Park S, Horak FB, Kuo AD. Postural feedback responses scale with biomechanical
381 constraints in human standing. *Exp Brain Res* 2004;**154**:417–27. doi:10.1007/s00221-003-
382 1674-3
- 383 14 Ganesan M, Pal PK, Gupta A, *et al.* Dynamic posturography in evaluation of balance in
384 patients of Parkinson's disease with normal pull test: concept of a diagonal pull test.
385 *Parkinsonism Relat Disord* 2010;**16**:595–9. doi:10.1016/j.parkreldis.2010.08.005
- 386 15 Horak FB, Dimitrova D, Nutt JG. Direction-specific postural instability in subjects with
387 Parkinson's disease. *Exp Neurol* 2005;**193**:504–21. doi:10.1016/j.expneurol.2004.12.008
- 388 16 King LA, George RJS, Carlson-Kuhta P, *et al.* Preparation for Compensatory Forward
389 Stepping in Parkinson's Disease. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2010;**91**:1332–8.
390 doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2010.05.013
- 391 17 Schlenstedt C, Mancini M, Horak F, *et al.* Anticipatory Postural Adjustment During Self-
392 Initiated, Cued, and Compensatory Stepping in Healthy Older Adults and Patients With
393 Parkinson Disease. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2017;**98**:1316-1324.e1.
394 doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2017.01.023

- 395 18 McVey MA, Amundsen S, Barnds A, *et al.* The effect of moderate Parkinson's disease on
396 compensatory backwards stepping. *Gait Posture* 2013;**38**:800–5.
397 doi:10.1016/j.gaitpost.2013.03.028
- 398 19 Luchies CW, Alexander NB, Schultz AB, *et al.* Stepping responses of young and old adults
399 to postural disturbances: kinematics. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 1994;**42**:506–12.
- 400 20 Hallett M. Bradykinesia: why do Parkinson's patients have it and what trouble does it cause?
401 *Mov Disord Off J Mov Disord Soc* 2011;**26**:1579–81. doi:10.1002/mds.23730
- 402 21 Hughes AJ, Daniel SE, Kilford L, *et al.* Accuracy of clinical diagnosis of idiopathic
403 Parkinson's disease: a clinico-pathological study of 100 cases. *J Neurol Neurosurg*
404 *Psychiatry* 1992;**55**:181–4.
- 405 22 Lang A. Clinical rating scales and videotape analysis. In: *Therapy of Parkinson's disease*.
406 New York: : Marcel Dekker 1995. 21–46.
- 407 23 Winter DA. *Biomechanics and Motor Control of Human Movement*. New York: : John Wiley
408 and Sons 1990.
- 409 24 Nasreddine ZS, Phillips NA, Bedirian V, *et al.* The Montreal Cognitive Assessment, MoCA:
410 a brief screening tool for mild cognitive impairment. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2005;**53**:695–9.
411 doi:10.1111/j.1532-5415.2005.53221.x
- 412 25 Evarts EV, Teravainen H, Calne DB. Reaction time in Parkinson's disease. *Brain*
413 1981;**104**:167–86.
- 414 26 Hallett M. Parkinson Revisited: Pathophysiology of Motor Signs. In: Gordin A, Kaakkola S,
415 Teravainen H, eds. *Adv Neurol*. Philadelphia: : Lippincott Williams & Wilkins 2003. 9–18.
- 416 27 Ross GW, Petrovitch H, Abbott RD, *et al.* Parkinsonian signs and substantia nigra neuron
417 density in decedents elders without PD. *Ann Neurol* 2004;**56**:532–9. doi:10.1002/ana.20226

- 418 28 Wolfson L, Whipple R, Amerman P, *et al.* Stressing the postural response. A quantitative
419 method for testing balance. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 1986;**34**:845.
- 420 29 Luchies CW, Alexander NB, Schultz AB, *et al.* Stepping responses of young and old adults
421 to postural disturbances: kinematics. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 1994;**42**:506–12.
- 422 30 McIlroy WE, Maki BE. Age-related changes in compensatory stepping in response to
423 unpredictable perturbations. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 1996;**51**:M289.
- 424 31 Thelen DG, Wojcik LA, Schultz AB, *et al.* Age differences in using a rapid step to regain
425 balance during a forward fall. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 1997;**52**:M8.
- 426 32 Kim S, Horak FB, Carlson-Kuhta P, *et al.* Postural feedback scaling deficits in Parkinson’s
427 disease. *J Neurophysiol* 2009;**102**:2910–20. doi:10.1152/jn.00206.2009
- 428 33 Stolze H, Kuitz-Buschbeck JP, Drucke H, *et al.* Comparative analysis of the gait disorder of
429 normal pressure hydrocephalus and Parkinson’s disease. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*
430 2001;**70**:289–97.
- 431 34 Blomsterwall E, Svantesson U, Carlsson U, *et al.* Postural disturbance in patients with
432 normal pressure hydrocephalus. *Acta Neurol Scand* 2000;**102**:284–91.
- 433 35 Parashos SA, Bloem BR, Browner NM, *et al.* What predicts falls in Parkinson disease?:
434 Observations from the Parkinson’s Foundation registry. *Neurol Clin Pract* 2018;**8**:214–22.
435 doi:10.1212/CPJ.0000000000000461
- 436 36 Vu TC, Nutt JG, Holford NHG. Progression of motor and nonmotor features of Parkinson’s
437 disease and their response to treatment. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 2012;**74**:267–83.
438 doi:10.1111/j.1365-2125.2012.04192.x
- 439 37 Horak FB, Frank J, Nutt J. Effects of dopamine on postural control in parkinsonian subjects:
440 scaling, set, and tone. *J Neurophysiol* 1996;**75**:2380–96.

- 441 38 Brandmeir NJ, Brandmeir CL, Carr D, *et al.* Deep Brain Stimulation for Parkinson Disease
442 Does not Worsen or Improve Postural Instability: A Prospective Cohort Trial. *Neurosurgery*
443 2018;**83**:1173–82. doi:10.1093/neuros/nyx602
- 444 39 Shivitz N, Koop MM, Fahimi J, *et al.* Bilateral subthalamic nucleus deep brain stimulation
445 improves certain aspects of postural control in Parkinson’s disease, whereas medication does
446 not. *Mov Disord Off J Mov Disord Soc* 2006;**21**:1088–97. doi:10.1002/mds.20905
- 447 40 Nantel J, McDonald JC, Bronte-Stewart H. Effect of medication and STN-DBS on postural
448 control in subjects with Parkinson’s disease. *Parkinsonism Relat Disord* 2012;**18**:285–9.
449 doi:10.1016/j.parkreldis.2011.11.005
- 450 41 Bronte-Stewart HM, Minn AY, Rodrigues K, *et al.* Postural instability in idiopathic
451 Parkinson’s disease: the role of medication and unilateral pallidotomy. *Brain J Neurol*
452 2002;**125**:2100–14.
- 453 42 St George RJ, Carlson-Kuhta P, King LA, *et al.* Compensatory stepping in Parkinson’s
454 disease is still a problem after deep brain stimulation randomized to STN or GPi. *J*
455 *Neurophysiol* 2015;**114**:1417–23. doi:10.1152/jn.01052.2014
- 456 43 Williams M, Thomas G, Lateur B de, *et al.* Objective Assessment of Gait in Normal-
457 Pressure Hydrocephalus. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil* 2008;**87**:39–45.
458 doi:10.1097/PHM.0b013e31815b6461
- 459 44 Giordan E, Palandri G, Lanzino G, *et al.* Outcomes and complications of different surgical
460 treatments for idiopathic normal pressure hydrocephalus: a systematic review and meta-
461 analysis. *J Neurosurg* 2018;**131**:1024–36. doi:10.3171/2018.5.JNS1875
462

463 **Figure Legends**

464 **Figure 1.** Trajectories of motion capture markers from pull onset ($t=0$; grey) to $t=250$ ms (black)
465 in a pull test trial. Arrows indicate horizontal center-of-mass (COM) position. **B.** Marker
466 trajectories up to time of first step landing ($t=670$ ms). **C.** Kinematic quantities in a pull test trial
467 for a CTL participant. **D.** Horizontal position of COM (solid), heel, toe (dashed) during a single
468 trial in individual CTL (upper traces) and NPH (lower traces) participants.

469 **Figure 2.** **A.** COM velocity after first step landing for trials with average COM acceleration
470 matched across groups. **B.** Time course of COM and foot (heel) position for selected trials of
471 different perturbation magnitude (randomly interleaved) in a CTL participant.

472 **Figure 3.** **A.** Step length vs. initial COM acceleration for all trials for one CTL and one PD
473 participant. Lines = linear correlation. **B.** Correlation lines between step length and initial COM
474 acceleration. Shading = standard error. **C.** Slope (mean \pm SEM) of linear correlation between
475 step length and initial COM acceleration. *, $p<0.05$; **, $p<0.01$; ***, $p<0.001$ (Tukey HSD
476 contrasts). **D.** Intercept (mean \pm SEM) of linear regression between step length and initial COM
477 acceleration.

478 **Figure 4.** **A.** Reaction time vs. initial COM acceleration for all trials for one CTL and one PD
479 participant. Lines = linear correlation. **B.** Correlation lines between reaction time and initial
480 COM acceleration for each participant group. **C.** Slope (mean \pm SEM) of linear regression
481 between reaction time and initial COM acceleration. *, $p<0.05$; **, $p<0.01$; ***, $p<0.001$ (Tukey
482 HSD contrasts). **D.** Intercept (mean \pm SEM) of linear regression between reaction time and initial
483 COM acceleration.




Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 4