

# Abnormal synergies and associated reactions post-hemiparetic stroke reflect the neuroanatomy of brainstem motor pathways

1 **Laura M. McPherson<sup>1-3</sup>, Julius P. A. Dewald<sup>4-6\*</sup>**

2 <sup>1</sup>Program in Physical Therapy, Washington University School of Medicine, St. Louis, MO, USA

3 <sup>2</sup>Department of Neurology, Washington University School of Medicine, St. Louis, MO, USA

4 <sup>3</sup>Program in Neurosciences, Division of Biology and Biomedical Sciences, Washington University  
5 School of Medicine, St. Louis, MO, USA

6 <sup>4</sup>Department of Biomedical Engineering, Northwestern University, Chicago, IL, USA

7 <sup>5</sup>Department of Physical Therapy and Human Movement Sciences, The Feinberg School of Medicine,  
8 Northwestern University, Chicago, IL, USA

9 <sup>6</sup>Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, The Feinberg School of Medicine,  
10 Northwestern University, Chicago, IL, USA

11 **\* Correspondence:**

12 Julius P.A. Dewald

13 [j-dewald@northwestern.edu](mailto:j-dewald@northwestern.edu)

14 **Keywords: stroke, upper limb, rehabilitation, flexion synergy, extension synergy, associated  
15 reaction, brainstem motor pathways**

16 **Abstract**

17 Individuals with moderate-to-severe post-stroke hemiparesis have difficulty controlling proximal and  
18 distal joints of the arm independently because they are constrained to stereotypical movement patterns  
19 called the flexion and extension synergies. Over the last three decades, we and others have  
20 quantitatively characterized these patterns and have provided evidence that they emerge because of an  
21 increased influence of diffusely-projecting brainstem motor pathways following stroke-induced  
22 damage to corticospinal and corticobulbar pathways. In our recent work that has focused on how they  
23 influence post-stroke hand function, we observed three notable aspects of synergy expression that we  
24 have never studied systematically: (1) paretic wrist and finger muscles were often activated maximally  
25 while individuals contracted muscles at a different joint, not during a maximal voluntary contraction  
26 of the wrist and finger muscles themselves; (2) there were differences in the magnitude of synergy  
27 expression when elicited via contraction of proximal muscles vs. distal muscles; (3) there was  
28 consistent movement resembling flexion or extension synergy patterns in the paretic limb during  
29 maximal efforts with the non-paretic limb (a phenomenon described clinically as an associated  
30 reaction), and the strength of these movement seemed to differ based on which muscles in the non-  
31 paretic limb were being activated. In the current study, we investigated the above behaviors  
32 systematically during maximal isometric contractions of shoulder, elbow and wrist/finger muscles,  
33 specifically focusing on differences between proximal vs. distal joints and flexor vs. extensor muscles.  
34 Our overall hypothesis is that the muscle-dependent nature of the behaviors we have observed is  
35 consistent with how the muscles are impacted by corticofugal damage and the upregulation of  
36 brainstem motor pathways that results. That is, we expected that our findings would reflect the fact  
37 that the greatest proportion of descending neural control comes from the corticospinal tract for distal  
38 muscles and from brainstem motor pathways for proximal muscles. We further expected that findings

39 would reflect the fact that the reticulospinal tract, thought to underlie the flexion synergy, has bilateral  
40 effects in the upper limbs and favors facilitation of flexor muscles on the ipsilateral side. Supporting  
41 this hypothesis, we found that for some participants, joint torque and muscle activation generated  
42 during maximal voluntary contractions were lower than during maximal synergy-induced  
43 contractions. This was more prevalent and more severe in magnitude at the wrist and fingers than at  
44 the shoulder and elbow. We also found that synergy-driven contractions were strongest when elicited  
45 via proximal joints and weakest when elicited via distal joints. Finally, we found that associated  
46 reactions in the paretic wrist/finger flexors were stronger than those of other paretic muscles and were  
47 the only ones whose response depended on whether the contralateral contraction was at a proximal or  
48 distal joint. Our results provide indirect evidence for how an increased reliance on brainstem motor  
49 pathways post-stroke contributes to abnormal motor behaviors and demonstrate the need to examine  
50 whole-limb behavior when studying or seeking to rehabilitate the paretic upper limb.

## 51 **1 Introduction**

52 Stereotypical movement patterns that emerge in the upper limb of individuals with moderate-to-severe  
53 post-stroke hemiplegia present a substantial barrier to completing functional tasks because they  
54 interfere with the ability to control proximal and distal joints independently. These obligatory  
55 movement patterns are described clinically as the flexion synergy (shoulder abduction coupled with  
56 elbow, wrist, and finger flexion) and the extension synergy (shoulder adduction coupled with elbow  
57 extension, wrist flexion or extension, and finger flexion) (Brunnstrom 1970; Dewald and Beer 2001;  
58 Lan et al. 2017; McPherson and Dewald 2019; Miller and Dewald 2012). They emerge as a result of  
59 an increased influence of diffusely-projecting brainstem motor pathways following stroke-induced  
60 damage to the corticospinal pathway (Karbasforoushan et al. 2019; McPherson et al. 2018a, 2018b;  
61 Owen et al. 2017).

62 Over the last decade, we have extensively characterized the flexion and extension synergies at the  
63 shoulder, elbow, wrist, and fingers (Lan et al. 2017; McPherson and Dewald 2019; Miller and Dewald  
64 2012), extending the laboratory's previous work that focused on the proximal manifestation of the  
65 synergies at the shoulder and elbow joints (Dewald et al. 1995, 2001; Dewald and Beer 2001; Ellis et  
66 al. 2007, 2012; Sukal et al. 2007). Over the course of these experiments, we have observed three  
67 notable aspects of synergy expression that we have never studied systematically. First, we noticed that  
68 paretic wrist and finger muscles were often activated maximally while individuals contracted muscles  
69 at a different joint, not during a maximal voluntary contraction of the wrist and finger muscles  
70 themselves, as is typical. Second, we noticed differences in the magnitude of synergy expression when  
71 it was elicited via contraction of proximal muscles vs. distal muscles. Third, we noticed consistent  
72 movement resembling flexion or extension synergy patterns in the paretic limb during maximal efforts  
73 with the non-paretic limb (a phenomenon described clinically as an associated reaction). The strength  
74 of these associated reactions seemed to differ based on which muscles in the non-paretic limb were  
75 being activated. Therefore, the goal of this study was to quantify and characterize the above behaviors  
76 systematically, specifically focusing on differences between proximal vs. distal joints and flexor vs.  
77 extensor muscles.

78 Our overall hypothesis is that the muscle-dependent nature of the behaviors we have observed is  
79 consistent with the ways in which the muscles are impacted by the increased utilization and  
80 upregulation of brainstem motor pathways that occurs following stroke-induced corticospinal and  
81 corticobulbar tract damage. All upper limb muscles are controlled by both the precise, sophisticated  
82 lateral corticospinal system and the diffusely-projecting, comparatively-more-crude brainstem motor  
83 system (e.g., reticulospinal, vestibulospinal pathways). However, these two motor systems have  
84 different contributions to neural control of proximal vs. distal muscles. Brainstem motor pathways

85 have the strongest projections to proximal muscles (Davidson & Buford, 2006; Lawrence & Kuypers,  
86 1968a, 1968b), which is in line with their role in postural stability. Conversely, the corticospinal  
87 pathway has the strongest and most frequent projections to distal muscles (McKiernan et al., 1998),  
88 which is in line with their role as the predominate muscles for fine motor control. In addition, the  
89 reticulospinal pathway, which is the brainstem pathway thought to underlie the flexion synergy, has  
90 bilateral effects in the upper limbs and favors facilitation of flexor muscles on the ipsilateral side  
91 (Davidson et al. 2007; Davidson and Buford 2004, 2006; Herbert et al. 2010; Schepens and Drew  
92 2006). Following corticospinal and corticobulbar damage, activity of brainstem pathways may be  
93 inadequately balanced due to the reduced activity of the corticospinal tract and/or a loss of  
94 oligosynaptic inhibitory cortico-reticular connections (Fisher et al. 2021). As a result, the way that  
95 muscles are activated may reflect characteristics of brainstem pathways.

96 Based on this overall hypothesis, our study has the following aims and specific predictions. The first  
97 aim of the study was to determine which paretic upper limb muscles are activated maximally during  
98 contractions of muscles at other joints (i.e., during elicitation of the flexion and extension synergies)  
99 rather than during voluntary contractions of the muscles themselves. We predicted that maximal  
100 activation of proximal muscles (i.e., those of the shoulder and elbow) would be achieved through  
101 voluntary contractions but that maximal activation for the most distal muscles (i.e., those of the wrist  
102 and fingers) would occur during synergy-driven contractions.

103 The second aim of the study was to determine whether the magnitude of flexion and extension synergy  
104 expression differs when elicited via maximal contractions of proximal vs. distal muscles in the paretic  
105 arm. Similarly, the third aim of the study was to determine whether the magnitude of associated  
106 reactions differs when elicited via maximal contractions of proximal vs. distal muscles of the  
107 *contralateral* (non-paretic) arm. Because proximal muscles are more heavily innervated by brainstem  
108 pathways than are distal muscles, we predicted that activation of proximal muscles would result in  
109 stronger synergy expression and associated reactions compared with activation of distal muscles.

110 Our findings are consistent with our predictions. For some participants, joint torque and muscle  
111 activation generated during maximal voluntary contractions were lower than during maximal synergy-  
112 induced contractions. This was more prevalent and more severe in magnitude at the wrist and fingers  
113 than at the shoulder and elbow. Synergy-driven contractions were strongest when elicited via proximal  
114 joints and weakest when elicited via distal joints. Associated reactions in the paretic wrist/finger  
115 flexors were stronger than those of other paretic muscles and were the only ones whose response  
116 depended on whether the contralateral contraction was at a proximal or distal joint.

117 Portions of the data have been reported in abstract (Miller and Dewald 2014) and dissertation (Miller  
118 2014) form.

## 119 **2 Methods**

### 120 **2.1 Participants**

121 Individuals with chronic hemiparetic stroke (>1 year prior) were recruited through a departmental  
122 research database. Participation required enough passive range of motion at the shoulder, elbow, wrist,  
123 and fingers to be placed comfortably in the isometric testing setup (described in the following  
124 subsection). A physical therapist performed a clinical exam on potential participants. Clinical motor  
125 deficits that were acceptable for inclusion in the study were those consistent with cortical or sub-  
126 cortical lesions (e.g., unilateral hemiparesis with non-cerebellar, non-brainstem clinical signs). We  
127 could obtain specific lesion locations for 9 of the 12 participants from either their medical records, or  
128 when available, a computed tomography scan and/or a T1-weighted magnetic resonance imaging scan.

129 For scans that had not been interpreted by a radiologist, research personnel with training in  
 130 neuroanatomy identified lesion locations. Exclusion could result from of any one of the following four  
 131 conditions: first, an upper extremity Fugl-Meyer Motor Assessment (FMA) (Fugl-Meyer et al. 1975)  
 132 score outside of the 10–44 range (0–9 indicating near paralysis and 45–66 indicating mild  
 133 impairment); second, a Chedoke-McMaster Stroke Assessment hand portion (CMSAh) (Gowland et  
 134 al. 1995) score greater than 5 (indicating mild impairment); third, significant impairment of vision or  
 135 upper extremity tactile somatosensation; or fourth, the recent use of Botox® or Dysport® in the paretic  
 136 upper limb.

137 Twelve individuals with chronic post-stroke hemiparesis met all inclusion criteria and completed the  
 138 study (three females, nine males; mean age  $\pm$  SD: 59.0  $\pm$  6.2 years, range 47-70; mean  $\pm$  time post-  
 139 stroke 10.3  $\pm$  5.9 years; range: 3.5– 26.6; Table 1). Participants exhibited severe-to-moderate upper  
 140 limb motor impairment according to the FMA with scores ranging from 13 to 30 of 66 possible (mean:  
 141 22.7). They also exhibited severe-to-moderate hand motor impairment according to the CMSAh with  
 142 score ranging from 2 to 4 of a possible 7 (mean: 3.0). Seven participants had right-sided hemiparesis  
 143 and five had left-sided hemiparesis.

144 Six control participants without known neurological injury (four males, two females; mean age 60.6  
 145 years) were included for comparison with the non-paretic limb of participants with stroke. All  
 146 participants gave informed consent for participation in the study, which was approved by the  
 147 Institutional Review Board of Northwestern University.

148 Table 1. *Demographics of the participants with chronic hemiparetic stroke*

Participant	Sex	Affected/ Dominant	Lesion Location	Yrs post-stroke	FMA	CMSAh
1	F	R/R	BG, TH, IC	26.6	20	3
2	M	L/L	N/A	11.4	24	2
3	M	R/R	BG, IC, CFL, SFL, IN	4.5	13	3
4	F	R/R	BG, IC, TH, HC	5.3	30	3
5	M	L/L	IC	3.8	25	4
6	M	L/R	BG, IC	6.5	24	3
7	F	L/R	N/A	9.0	15	3
8	M	R/L	BG, TH, IC, CTL	17.0	19	2
9	M	R/L	N/A	25.5	26	3
10	M	L/L	CPL, CFL, CTL	5.6	31	3
11	M	R/L	IC	5.1	20	4
12	M	R/R	IC	3.5	29	3
<b>Mean (SD)</b>				<b>10.3 (8.3)</b>	<b>22.7 (5.9)</b>	<b>3.0 (0.6)</b>

149 FMA = Upper extremity score of the Fugl-Meyer Motor Assessment (max = 66); CMSAh = Hand portion of  
 150 the Chedoke-McMaster Stroke Assessment (max = 7); BG = Basal Ganglia; TH = Thalamus; IC = Internal  
 151 Capsule; CFL = Cortical Frontal Lobe; SFL = Subcortical Frontal Lobe; CPL = Cortical Parietal Lobe; HC =  
 152 Hippocampus; IN = Insula; N/A = Not Available

## 153 2.2 Experimental setup and data collection

154 The experimental protocol was conducted in a testing device capable of measuring isometric shoulder,  
 155 elbow, wrist, and finger (metacarpophalangeal) joint torques simultaneously (McPherson and Dewald  
 156 2019; Miller et al. 2014). Participants were seated in an experimental chair (Biodex, Inc.) with  
 157 shoulder/waist restraints to prevent shoulder girdle and trunk motion. The tested forearm was placed  
 158 in a fiberglass cast to interface the arm rigidly with a six degree-of-freedom load cell (JR3, model

159 45E15A) through a Delrin ring. The wrist and fingers were placed in a custom Wrist and Finger  
160 Torque Sensor (WFTS) (Stienen et al. 2011). The arm was positioned in 75° shoulder abduction, 40°  
161 horizontal adduction, 90° elbow flexion, 15° pronation, and 0° wrist flexion/extension. Paretic fingers  
162 were positioned at 15° finger flexion to accommodate range of motion restrictions. The non-paretic  
163 and control fingers had to be positioned at 0° finger flexion/extension because the increased strength  
164 of these groups slightly deformed the WFTS attachment bracket such that it would interfere with the  
165 isometric device if positioned at 15° of finger flexion. The contralateral (non-tested) arm rested  
166 comfortably at each participant's side. A computer monitor displayed real-time visual feedback of  
167 joint torque data.

168 Electromyographic (EMG) activity was recorded using active differential surface electrodes with a 1-  
169 cm interelectrode distance (16-channel Bagnoli EMG System; Delsys, Inc.; 1000x gain, 20–450 Hz  
170 bandpass). On the tested arm, electrodes were placed over the following muscles according to the  
171 landmarks described by Perotto and Delagi (1994): anterior deltoid (DELTA), sternocostal head of the  
172 pectoralis major (PEC), biceps brachii (BIC), lateral head of the triceps brachii (TRI), extrinsic wrist  
173 and finger flexors (flexor carpi radialis (FCR), flexor digitorum profundus (FDP)), an intrinsic finger  
174 flexor (first dorsal interosseous (FDI)), extrinsic wrist and finger extensors (extensor carpi radialis  
175 (ECR), extensor digitorum communis (EDC)), and two thumb muscles (flexor pollicis brevis (FPB)  
176 and extensor pollicis longus (EPL)). In addition, electrodes were placed on the DELTA, BIC, TRI, FCR,  
177 and ECR muscles of the contralateral arm. A signal conditioner (Frequency Devices, Model 9064)  
178 filtered (8th order Butterworth low-pass filter, 500 Hz) and amplified EMG and wrist and finger  
179 torque data before digitization at a sampling frequency of 1 kHz. A handgrip dynamometer collected  
180 maximum grip forces used for descriptive purposes.

### 181 **2.3 Experimental protocol**

182 *Ipsilateral contractions:* Each participant's maximum voluntary torques (MVTs) and corresponding  
183 maximum voluntary muscle contractions (MVC) were measured in the tested arm during isometric  
184 torque generation in the following directions: shoulder abduction (SABD), shoulder adduction  
185 (SADD), elbow flexion (EF), elbow extension (EE), wrist flexion (WF), wrist extension (WE), finger  
186 flexion (FF), finger extension (FE), thumb flexion (for FPB MVC only) and thumb extension (for EPL  
187 MVC only). MVT directions were randomized, and trials within a direction were repeated until three  
188 trials with peak torque within 85% of the maximum torque value were obtained. If the last trial  
189 produced the largest peak torque, additional trials were collected. Participants were given vigorous  
190 verbal encouragement throughout MVT trials.

191 Visual feedback of torque in the target direction was shown except for during the WE and FE tasks  
192 while testing the paretic limb. Because most participants with stroke had little-to-no voluntary WE or  
193 FE on the paretic side, efforts to produce these movements often resulted in flexion (a phenomenon  
194 described previously (Kamper et al. 2003; McPherson and Dewald 2019; Miller and Dewald 2012)).  
195 Therefore, no visual feedback was given for these directions to ensure participants' maximal effort.

196 *Contralateral contractions:* Maximum voluntary efforts in SABD, EF, EE, WF and WE directions  
197 were performed for the arm contralateral to the tested arm. A physical therapist manually resisted the  
198 contralateral arm during these efforts, and the response of the tested arm was measured in the  
199 isometric testing device.

### 200 **2.4 Data analysis**

201 All data analysis was performed using custom MATLAB software. A Jacobian-based algorithm was  
202 used to convert forces and moments collected from the six degree-of-freedom load cell attached at the

203 forearm into shoulder and elbow joint torques. Torque and full-wave rectified EMG data were  
204 smoothed using an acausal one-sided moving average filter of window length 250 ms, baseline  
205 corrected so that any muscle tone at rest would not factor into subsequent analyses and normalized to  
206 the largest value obtained over the experiment, but only during voluntary activation of the tested arm  
207 (not during contralateral torque generation). This normalization value was chosen instead of the  
208 maximum value during a voluntary contraction, because paretic limb voluntary wrist and finger torque  
209 and EMG values were often very small in comparison to values generated during other MVT  
210 directions, resulting in inflated values when normalized.

211 For each MVT trial in the tested arm, maximal torque in the primary (intended) direction was  
212 determined. Secondary torques (i.e., those in degrees-of-freedom other than the primary direction) at  
213 the time of maximal primary torque were collected, as were EMG values at 50 ms preceding the  
214 maximal value, to account for an estimate of the electromechanical delay inherent to skeletal muscle  
215 (Cavanagh and Komi 1979).

216 To compare muscle activation during voluntary vs. synergy-driven contractions, we calculated a  
217 “voluntary activation deficit” as follows. We divided the maximal EMG value obtained during  
218 maximal voluntary contractions (i.e., when the muscle performed as an agonist, e.g. during finger  
219 flexion for FCR and FDP) by the maximal EMG value obtained during maximal contractions in all  
220 torque directions. We then subtracted this ratio from a value of 1 so that low values would indicate a  
221 small deficit in activation during voluntary contractions and high values would indicate a large deficit  
222 in activation during voluntary contractions, and it was multiplied by 100 to achieve a percentage. A  
223 value of 0% indicates a muscle’s largest EMG value occurred during a voluntary contraction, and a  
224 value of 90% indicates a muscle’s EMG value during voluntary contraction is 10% of the EMG value  
225 obtained during the largest synergy-driven contraction. We made the same calculation with torque  
226 data to compute the “voluntary strength deficit.”

227 To calculate the magnitude of synergy expression that resulted from each primary torque direction,  
228 mean synergy-driven torque was calculated by averaging the magnitude of all secondary torques.

229 For each MVT trial performed in the contralateral arm, maximal EMG of the agonist muscle was  
230 determined and EMG from the tested arm at that time point was collected.

## 231 **2.5 Statistical analysis**

232 For statistical analyses,  $p \leq 0.05$  was used to determine significance. Cases where  $p$ -values were  
233 greater than 0.05 but less than 0.10 are presented. Values in the text are presented as mean  $\pm$  SEM  
234 unless otherwise specified; values in Table 2 are presented as mean  $\pm$  SD.

235 To compare maximal voluntary strength between paretic and non-paretic limbs, we used a 2 x 7 linear  
236 mixed effects model to test effects of the fixed, repeated factors of limb (paretic, non-paretic) and  
237 primary torque direction (SABD, SADD, EF, EE, WF, FF, Grip) as well as the limb-by-primary  
238 torque direction interaction on maximum voluntary torque (or force, in the case of Grip strength)  
239 (GraphPad Prism, v8). Participant was included as a random factor, and the Greenhouse-Geiser  
240 correction was applied. The WE and FE directions were not included in this model because none of  
241 the paretic limbs could generate voluntary torque in these directions. To compare maximal voluntary  
242 strength between non-paretic and control limbs, we used a 2 x 9 linear mixed effects model to test  
243 effects of the fixed factors of limb (non-paretic, control) and primary torque direction (repeated;  
244 SABD, SADD, EF, EE, WF, FF, WE, FE, Grip) as well as the limb x primary torque direction  
245 interaction on maximum voluntary torque/force (GraphPad Prism, v8). Participant was included as a  
246 random factor, and the Greenhouse-Geiser correction was applied. The effects of interest for both of  
247 the above models were the main effect of limb and the limb-by-direction interaction. Planned

248 comparisons on the interactions using Fisher's least square difference tests determined differences  
249 between limbs for each primary torque direction.

250 To evaluate whether the voluntary strength deficit in torque differed among proximal and distal  
251 contraction directions, we used a 1-way repeated measures Friedman test (due to non-normally  
252 distributed data per the Shapiro-Wilk test).

253 To evaluate whether the voluntary activation deficit in EMG differed among proximal and distal  
254 contraction directions, we used a 1-way repeated measures linear mixed effects model with random  
255 factor of participant (GraphPad Prism, v8). Then, we conducted planned comparisons using an  
256 uncorrected Dunn's test to determine whether voluntary activation deficit values for each muscle  
257 differed from those for the deltoid. Out of 156 data points (12 participants x 13 muscles) there were 5  
258 instances of missing data due to poor signal quality: one from the ECR, two from the FPB, and 2 from  
259 the EPL.

260 To determine differences in secondary torque generation between paretic and non-paretic limbs for  
261 each primary torque direction, we used a 2 x 8 repeated measures ANOVA (GraphPad Prism, v8) to  
262 test the main effect of limb and the limb-by primary torque direction interaction on joint torque. We  
263 used planned comparisons on the interaction using Fisher's least square difference tests to determine  
264 differences between limbs for each torque direction.

265 To determine whether there are differences in the strength of synergy expression for proximal-to-distal  
266 and distal-to-proximal joint combinations, we used a 1-way ANOVA to test for differences among  
267 joint combinations for joints that elicited the flexion synergy. Then, we conducted planned  
268 comparisons using Fisher's least square difference tests among the salient joint combinations (see  
269 Results). We repeated these tests with data from joints the elicited the extension synergy. We also  
270 used a 1-way ANOVA to test for differences in the strength of overall synergy expression for each  
271 primary torque direction, followed by planned comparisons that compared data from each primary  
272 torque direction with that of the SABD direction.

273 To examine the effect of contralateral muscle contractions on the tested arm, we averaged EMG data  
274 from the three wrist and finger flexors (FCR, FDP, FDI) to establish an EMG value for the  
275 wrist/finger flexor muscle group as a whole for brevity. In the same way, we established EMG values  
276 for the wrist/finger extensor muscle group by averaging EMG values from the ECR and EDC. To test  
277 differences between paretic and non-paretic limbs for each muscle group (wrist/finger flexors,  
278 wrist/finger extensors, biceps, triceps), our model included fixed factors of limb, contraction direction,  
279 and the limb-by-contraction direction interaction (R, version 3.6.3 with lme4 package (Bates et al.  
280 2015)). A random intercept was included, clustered by participants. To test differences in flexor and  
281 extensor muscle groups within the paretic limb, our model included fixed factors of muscle group,  
282 contraction direction, and the muscle group-by-contraction direction interaction. A random intercept  
283 and random slopes of muscle group and torque direction were included (clustered by participants).  
284 Estimation of fixed and random effects for all models used Restricted Maximum Likelihood  
285 Estimation.

### 286 **3 Results**

287 Maximum voluntary strength measurements from the paretic, non-paretic, and control limbs are  
288 shown in Table 2. The paretic limb was significantly weaker than the non-paretic limb in all directions  
289 (main effect of limb:  $F(1, 11) = 160.3, p < 0.0001$ ; limb-by-direction interaction:  $F(1.1, 11.9) = 117.8,$   
290  $p < 0.0001$ ; SABD:  $t(11) = 3.9, p = 0.002$ ; SADD:  $t(11) = 5.6, p = 0.0002$ ; EF:  $t(11) = 6.7, p < 0.0001$ ;  
291 EE:  $t(11) = 3.9, p = 0.003$ ; WF:  $t(11) = 7.9, p < 0.0001$ ; FF:  $t(11) = 6.6, p < 0.0001$ ; Grip:  $t(11) = 11.7,$   
292  $p < 0.0001$ ), and none of the paretic limbs could generate appreciable wrist or finger extension torque.

293 There were no overall differences between the non-paretic and control limbs (main effect of limb:  
 294  $F(1,16) = 1.8, p = 0.20$ ; limb-by-direction interaction:  $F(8, 128) = 0.49, p = 0.86$ ).

295 Table 2. *Maximum voluntary strength measurements*


	<i>Maximal voluntary strength in primary direction</i>			<i>Participants in paretic group with synergy-driven strength greater than voluntary strength</i>		
	<i>Control</i>	<i>Non-Paretic</i>	<i>Paretic</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Mean(range) percent increase from voluntary to synergy-driven</i>	<i>Direction eliciting maximum torque</i>
SABD	50.1 ± 21.1	37.3 ± 17.5	* 24.1 ± 13.2	0	—	—
SADD	67.8 ± 21.8	49.0 ± 23.2	* 24.9 ± 11.6	2	18.6 (4.0 – 33.3)	EE x 2
EF	58.8 ± 18.6	51.3 ± 21.4	* 24.0 ± 11.8	3	7.1 (1.0 – 16.5)	SABD x 3
EE	47.5 ± 16.0	38.1 ± 15.3	* 18.5 ± 8.4	1	11.7	SADD
WF	18.5 ± 4.5	15.1 ± 5.6	* 3.9 ± 1.8	5	48.5 (9.2 – 102.1)	SABD x 3, EF x 2
WE	8.6 ± 2.1	6.8 ± 2.2	—	—	—	—
FF	11.3 ± 2.7	7.7 ± 3.3	* 3.0 ± 1.5	5	37.6 (9.0 – 103)	SABD x 1, SADD x 1, EF x 3
FE	2.1 ± 0.5	2.1 ± 0.7	—	—	—	—
Grip	417.3 ± 108.9	376.8 ± 115.7	* 62.0 ± 28.0	—	—	—

296 Values are group mean ± standard deviation. Strength data are displayed in Newton-meters, except for grip  
 297 strength which is displayed in Newtons. An asterisk indicates a significant difference between paretic and non-  
 298 paretic groups, and *p*-values are reported in the text.

299 **3.1 Voluntary vs. synergy-driven maximal torque and muscle activation at proximal vs. distal**  
 300 **joints**

301 Eight of the twelve participants generated more paretic torque during a synergy-driven contraction  
 302 than during a voluntary contraction for at least one joint (Table 2, Figure 1A). SABD was the only  
 303 direction for which all participants generated maximal torque during the voluntary contraction. For the  
 304 remaining contraction directions, the numbers of participants with maximal torque during the  
 305 voluntary contraction was fewer at the wrist and finger joints than shoulder and elbow joints (SADD:  
 306 10, EF: 9, EE: 11, WF: 5, FF: 5) (significant effect of contraction direction on voluntary strength  
 307 deficit ( $p = 0.029$ ). For the participants whose maximum torque was achieved via synergy-driven  
 308 rather than voluntary efforts, the discrepancy between the voluntary and synergy-driven activation was  
 309 substantially greater for the wrist and finger joints, with the voluntary strength deficit values averaging  
 310 14.4%, 6.2%, 10.5%, 29.5%, 23.3% for the SADD, EF, EE, WF, and FF directions, respectively. The  
 311 combinations of joints were within the flexion and extension synergy patterns (e.g., maximal EF  
 312 torque produced during SABD and maximal EE torque produced during SADD; Table 2).





313


314 **Figure 1.** Voluntary strength deficit in torque (A) and voluntary activation deficit in EMG (B) for the paretic  
 315 limbs. A value of 0 indicates that maximal torque/EMG was obtained during a contraction in the  
 316 intended/agonist direction, and non-zero values indicate that maximal torque/EMG was obtained during a  
 317 contraction in a different direction (i.e., synergy-driven). The higher the value, the larger the discrepancy  
 318 between the voluntary and synergy-driven values. Asterisks indicate significant differences between values for  
 319 a particular torque direction/muscle and SABD/deltoid at  $p \leq 0.05$  (\*),  $p \leq 0.10$  (+). Exact  $p$ -values are  
 320 presented in the text.

321 Similarly, the voluntary activation deficit differed among the 13 muscles (Figure 1B) (significant  
 322 effect of muscle ( $F(10,105) = 11.6, p < 0.0001$ ). It was higher for wrist/finger extensors ( $ECR: 46.1\%$ ,  
 323  $t(105) = 4.6, p < 0.0001$ ;  $EDC: 46.1\%$ ,  $t(105) = 4.7, p < 0.0001$ ) and intrinsic hand muscles ( $FDI:$   
 324  $46.3\%$ ,  $t(105) = 4.8, p < 0.0001$ ;  $FPB: 60.4\%$ ,  $t(105) = 6.1, p < 0.0001$ ;  $EPL: 59.2\%$ ,  $t(105) = 6.0, p <$   
 325  $0.0001$ ) compared with DELT (4.8%). Values for the remaining muscles, including the wrist/finger  
 326 flexors, were not significantly different from those of the deltoid (although the FDP was significantly  
 327 higher at the  $p < 0.075$  level) ( $PEC: 18.3\%$ ,  $t(105) = 1.6, p = 0.12$ ;  $BIC: 12.3\%$ ,  $t(105) = 0.9, p = 0.40$ ;  
 328  $TRI: 4.0\%$ ,  $t(105) = 0.1, p = 0.92$ ;  $FCR: 11.5\%$ ,  $t(105) = 0.8, p = 0.44$ ;  $FDP: 21.4\%$ ,  $t(105) = 1.9, p =$   
 329  $0.06$ ).

### 330 3.2 Proximal vs. distal elicitation of the flexion and extension synergies

331 Figure 2A shows group mean SABD/SADD, EF/EE, WF/WE, and FF/FE secondary torques produced  
 332 during the generation of each primary torque direction. Secondary torques of the paretic limb differed  
 333 from those of the non-paretic limb for all eight primary torque directions (significant limb-by-  
 334 secondary torque direction interactions: SABD:  $F(3, 33) = 15.4, p < 0.0001$ ; SADD:  $F(3, 33) = 17.5, p$   
 335  $< 0.0001$ ; EF:  $F(3, 33) = 17.7, p < 0.0001$ ; EE:  $F(3, 33) = 31.0, p < 0.0001$ ; WF:  $F(3, 33) = 5.3, p =$   
 336  $0.004$ ; WE:  $F(3, 33) = 47.1, p < 0.0001$ ; FF:  $F(3, 33) = 5.3, p = 0.004$ ; FE:  $F(3, 33) = 94.8, p <$   
 337  $0.0001$ ). Statistically significant planned comparisons on the interaction testing differences between  
 338 limbs for each secondary torque direction are shown with asterisks in Figure 2A, and  $p$ -values ranged  
 339 from  $< 0.0001$  to 0.01.

340




341 **Figure 2. A.** Group mean  $\pm$  SEM shoulder, elbow, wrist and finger joint torques produced by the paretic  
 342 (red/blue) and non-paretic (grey) limbs during generation of SABD, SADD, EF, EE, WF, WE, FF, and FE  
 343 MVT. Red bars highlight SABD and flexion directions, and blue bars highlight SADD and extension directions  
 344 for the paretic limb. Asterisks indicate significant differences between paretic and non-paretic limbs ( $p$ -values  
 345 range from  $< 0.0001$  to  $0.01$ ). **B.** The strength of synergy-driven torque when elicited by each primary torque

346 direction. Asterisks indicate a significantly lower value compared with the synergy-driven torque for SABD ( $p$ -  
347 values range from  $< 0.0001$  to  $0.02$ ; exact values are reported in the text).

348 The overall impact of each primary torque direction on other joints (i.e., the strength of synergy  
349 expression elicited by that joint) was different among primary torque directions (Figure 2B,  $F(7, 77) =$   
350  $24.7, p < 0.0001$ ). Planned comparisons revealed the mean synergy-driven torque for SABD ( $68.1 \pm$   
351  $3.7\%$  MVT) was significantly higher than that of each of the other primary torque directions (*SADD*:  
352  $44.9 \pm 4.1\%$  MVT,  $t(77) = 4.3, p < 0.0001$ ; *EF*:  $57.0 \pm 4.0\%$  MVT,  $t(77) = 2.1, p = 0.04$ ; *EE*:  $42.7 \pm$   
353  $3.8\%$  MVT,  $t(77) = 4.7, p < 0.0001$ ; *WF*:  $25.6 \pm 4.9\%$  MVT,  $t(77) = 7.9, p < 0.0001$ ; *WE*:  $27.9 \pm 5.8\%$   
354 MVT,  $t(77) = 7.5, p < 0.0001$ ; *FF*:  $28.0 \pm 4.9\%$  MVT,  $t(77) = 7.5, p < 0.0001$ ; *FE*:  $10.4 \pm 2.1\%$  MVT,  
355  $t(77) = 10.8, p < 0.0001$ ).

356 Generation of maximal SABD and EF by the paretic limb both resulted in secondary torques that were  
357 consistent with expression of the flexion synergy (EF, WF, FF during SABD; SABD, WF, FF during  
358 EF), and there was a difference among the joint combinations (significant effect of joint combination,  
359  $F(9, 110) = 22.8; p < 0.0001$ ) (Figure 3, left panel). The shoulder-to-elbow effect of the flexion  
360 synergy was stronger than the elbow-to-shoulder effect. Generation of maximal SABD induced more  
361 secondary EF torque ( $77.7 \pm 4.4\%$  EF MVT) than generation of maximal EF induced secondary  
362 SABD torque ( $28.4 \pm 9.9\%$  SABD MVT) ( $t(110) = 5.7, p < 0.0001$ ). Generation of SABD and EF  
363 produced similar amounts of secondary WF torque ( $64.0 \pm 5.1\%$  and  $67.7 \pm 5.3\%$  MVT, respectively,  
364  $t(110) = 0.43, p = 0.67$ ) and secondary FF torque ( $63.5 \pm 3.7\%$  and  $69.1 \pm 4.9\%$  MVT, respectively,  
365  $t(110) = 0.64, p = 0.52$ ).



366 **Figure 3.** The strength of proximal-to-distal vs. distal-to-proximal elicitation of the flexion and extension  
367 synergies. Group mean  $\pm$  SEM synergy-driven torques (the same as in Fig. 3) are shown for each joint  
368 combination and direction, as indicated on the x-axis. The top row of labels is the primary torque direction, and  
369 the bottom row of labels is the secondary torque direction. Data from primary torque directions that elicited the  
370 flexion synergy are shown in the plot on the left, and data from primary torque directions that elicited the  
371 extension synergy are shown on the right. Note that attempts to generate WE and FE (i.e., when they were the  
372 primary torque directions) instead resulted in the production of WF and FF, respectively.

373 During the intended generation of maximal WE and FE torques, the paretic limb group instead  
374 produced torque in the WF and FF directions, as we anticipated based on previous literature. Efforts to  
375 produce WE torque elicited the flexion synergy in the paretic limb, as evidenced by SABD and EF  
376 secondary torques that were small to moderate in magnitude ( $11.9 \pm 9.5\%$  and  $30.5\% \pm 7.2\%$  MVT,  
377 respectively). When FE was the primary torque direction, however, virtually no torque as produced at  
378 the shoulder for either limb group, and the amount of EF torque was similar between groups. Similar  
379 to the shoulder and elbow comparisons, proximal-to-distal elicitation of the flexion synergy led to  
380 stronger secondary torques than distal-to-proximal elicitation (SABD led to stronger WF ( $64.0\%$ ) than  
381 WE led to SABD ( $11.9\%$ ), ( $t(110) = 6.0; p < 0.0001$ ). The same pattern was seen between the elbow

382 and wrist and elbow and fingers. Maximal EF torque led to greater secondary WF torque ( $67.7 \pm 5.3\%$   
383 MVT) than maximal WE led to secondary EF torque ( $30.5 \pm 7.2\%$  MVT ( $t(110) = 4.3, p < 0.0001$ ),  
384 and it led to greater secondary FF torque ( $69.1 \pm 4.9\%$  MVT) than maximal FE led to secondary EF  
385 torque ( $9.1 \pm 3.5\%$  MVT, ( $t(110) = 6.9, p < 0.0001$ )).


386 Generation of SADD and EE demonstrated secondary torques that were consistent with expression of  
387 the extension synergy (EE, WF, FF during SADD; SADD, WF, FF during EE), and there was a  
388 significant difference among the joint combinations (significant effect of joint combination,  $F(9, 110)$   
389  $= 4.6, p < 0.0001$ ) (Figure 3, right panel). Unlike the flexion synergy, however, the magnitude of  
390 extension synergy expression elicited via the shoulder was not stronger than that elicited via the  
391 elbow. Secondary EE torque produced during maximal SADD ( $49.3 \pm 9.5\%$  EE MVT) was not  
392 different than secondary SADD torque produced during maximal EE ( $35.1 \pm 9.9\%$  SADD MVT)  
393 ( $t(110) = 1.3, p = 0.19$ ). Secondary WF torque produced during maximal SADD ( $42.2 \pm 7.1\%$  WF  
394 MVT) was not different than that produced during maximal EE ( $25.5 \pm 7.0\%$  WF MVT) ( $t(110) = 1.6,$   
395  $p = 0.10$ ), and secondary FF torque produced during maximal SADD ( $52.7 \pm 6.2\%$  FF MVT) was not  
396 different than that produced during maximal EE ( $46.7 \pm 4.4\%$  FF MVT ( $t(110) = 0.7, p = 0.48$ )).  
397 During the generation of WF and the generation of FF, the paretic limb produced  $32.6 \pm 8.4\%$  and  
398  $32.6 \pm 9.3\%$  MVT of secondary SADD torque, respectively. There was not a difference in extension  
399 synergy expression when examining proximal-to-distal vs. distal-to-proximal elicitation between  
400 SADD and WF ( $t(110) = 0.98, p = 0.33$ ), and for this comparison between SADD and FF, the  
401 difference was significant only at the  $p < 0.075$  level ( $t(110) = 1.87, p = 0.06$ ).

402 There was no appreciable secondary elbow torque produced during WF or FF, although generation of  
403 torque in these directions elicited the extension synergy pattern in other degrees of freedom at the  
404 shoulder and at the forearm, evidenced by shoulder flexion, shoulder internal rotation and forearm  
405 pronation torques that were measured but are not presented in this study. The difference in extension  
406 synergy expression when examining proximal-to-distal vs. distal-to-proximal elicitation between EE  
407 and WF was significant only at the  $p < 0.075$  level ( $t(110) = 1.81, p = 0.07$ ). For this comparison  
408 between EE and FF, proximal-to-distal elicitation was greater than distal-to-proximal elicitation  
409 ( $t(110) = 3.57, p = 0.0005$ ).

### 410 3.3 Proximal vs. distal elicitation of contralateral associated reactions

411 The third aim of the study was to examine the strength of associated reactions in one arm when  
412 elicited via the production of maximal joint torque at proximal compared with distal joints of the  
413 contralateral arm. We also examined the relative activation of flexor and extensor muscles at the  
414 elbow and wrist/fingers. Figure 4A and 4B show paretic group mean EMG (wrist and finger flexors,  
415 wrist and finger extensors, BIC, TRI) and torque (wrist and finger flexion/extension, elbow  
416 flexion/extension) during maximal voluntary efforts by the non-paretic limb in SABD, EF, EE, WF,  
417 and WE directions. Non-paretic data during maximal voluntary efforts by the paretic limb are shown  
418 in Figure 4C and 4D.

419 Maximal activation of contralateral muscles produced stronger contractions in the paretic limb than in  
420 the non-paretic limb, particularly in the wrist/finger flexors (*wrist/finger flexors*:  $41.6 \pm 3.1\%$  MVC  
421 vs.  $3.8 \pm 3.1\%$  MVC; significant main effect of limb:  $F(1, 85.0) = 177.0, p < 0.0001$ ; *wrist/finger*  
422 *extensors*:  $26.3 \pm 3.1\%$ , MVC vs.  $6.6 \pm 3.1\%$  MVC; significant main effect of limb:  $F(1, 86.8) = 38.3,$   
423  $p < 0.0001$ ; *BIC*:  $29.1 \pm 4.0\%$  MVC vs.  $5.2 \pm 4.0\%$  MVC; significant main effect of limb:  $F(1, 85.9) =$   
424  $39.5, p < 0.0001$ ; *TRI*:  $20.8 \pm 2.5$  vs.  $6.4 \pm 2.5\%$  MVC; significant main effect of limb:  $F(1, 87.0) =$   
425  $28.4, p < 0.0001$ ). For the non-paretic limb, maximal activation of contralateral muscles (by the  
426 paretic limb) produced low levels of co-contraction of flexors and extensors at both the wrist/fingers  
427 and elbow.



428 **Figure 4.** Group mean  $\pm$  SEM wrist/finger and elbow EMG (A, C) and torque (B, D) for the paretic (top panel; 429 A, B) and non-paretic (bottom panel; C, D) limbs during maximal voluntary efforts by the contralateral limb in 430 SABD, EF, EE, WF, and WE directions. Values shown are based on actual data, not the linear mixed effect 431 model estimated values that are presented in the text.

432 For some individuals, the paretic wrist/finger EMG and torque values during contralateral torque 433 generation were actually higher than the maximal value that could be produced in the paretic limb 434 during ipsilateral torque generation at any of the joints. The contralateral contractions activated 435 wrist/finger flexor muscles more strongly on average than wrist/finger extensor muscles ( $41.4 \pm 5.4\%$  436 vs.  $25.5 \pm 6.2\%$  MVC, significant main effect of muscle group,  $F(1, 10.0) = 9.3, p = 0.01$ ; note that 437 these means differ very slightly from those presented in the preceding paragraph because they are 438 marginal means estimated from each statistical model, not the means of the underlying data). In 439 addition, contralateral contractions in the various directions activated the muscle groups differently 440 (significant muscle group-by-contraction direction interaction:  $F(4, 48.3) = 2.9, p = 0.03$ ). The 441 wrist/finger flexors demonstrated a decreasing pattern of activation when comparing directions from 442 proximal to distal and the wrist/finger extensors demonstrated an overall consistent pattern of 443 activation among contralateral contraction directions.

444 For the paretic biceps and triceps, the contralateral contractions produced higher levels of EMG 445 compared with the non-paretic limb, as mentioned above. However, unlike the wrist/finger muscles, 446 the paretic elbow flexor and extensor muscles were activated at similar levels to each other ( $28.7 \pm 447 7.2\%$  vs.  $20.4 \pm 4.8\%$  MVC for BIC and TRI, respectively; no significant main effect of muscle ( $F(1,$

448 10.2) = 1.75,  $p = 0.22$ ); no significant muscle-by-contraction direction interaction ( $F(4, 59.1) = 1.59$ ,  $p$   
449 = 0.19)).

450 Contralateral contractions resulted in a substantial amount of paretic wrist and finger flexion torque  
451 that differed among contraction directions in a decreasing manner from proximal to distal (significant  
452 effect of contraction direction ( $F(4, 31.1) = 3.4$ ,  $p = 0.02$ ); group mean values ranging from  $66.2 \pm$   
453  $9.7\%$  MVT for the shoulder abduction direction to  $36.4 \pm 5.7\%$  MVT for the wrist extension  
454 direction). For the paretic elbow, contralateral contractions resulted largely in flexion torque (i.e.,  
455 eliciting the flexion synergy) for all but one participant, who produced maximal levels of elbow  
456 extension torque as part of the extension synergy. There was no effect of contraction direction ( $F(4,$   
457  $32.4) = 0.21$ ,  $p = 0.93$ ). For all participants, paretic elbow flexion torque averaged  $8.8 \pm 9.8\%$  MVT  
458 over contraction directions, with no significant effect of contraction direction. When excluding the  
459 participant who exhibited the strong extension synergy, paretic elbow flexion torque averaged  $16.7 \pm$   
460  $6.6\%$  MVT.

## 461 **4 Discussion**

462 Our primary findings are that (1) wrist and finger muscles are often activated more strongly during  
463 maximal synergy-driven contractions than during maximal voluntary contractions, (2) expression of  
464 the flexion and extension synergies is strongest when elicited via proximal rather than distal muscle  
465 contractions, and (3) associated reactions in the paretic wrist/finger flexors were stronger than those of  
466 other paretic muscles and were the only ones whose response had a proximal to distal decreasing  
467 pattern. We interpret our findings as being consistent with an increased influence of brainstem motor  
468 pathways, based on the similarity between the effects we saw and the neuroanatomy of this system.

### 469 **4.1 Maximal synergy-driven contractions can be higher than maximal voluntary contractions,** 470 **particularly for extrinsic wrist/finger extensors and intrinsic hand muscles**

471 We predicted that maximal activation of proximal paretic muscles (i.e., those of the shoulder and  
472 elbow) would be achieved through voluntary contractions but that maximal activation for the most  
473 distal paretic muscles (i.e., those of the wrist and fingers) would occur during synergy-driven  
474 contractions. We reasoned that this finding would be consistent with the ways in which the muscles  
475 are impacted by stroke-induced corticospinal and corticobulbar tract damage and the increased  
476 reliance on brainstem motor pathways that follows. For example, with corticospinal damage, distal  
477 paretic muscles lose more of the neural substrate typically used for voluntary activation compared  
478 with proximal muscles, but they can still be activated by brainstem pathways via synergy-driven  
479 activation.

480 Using the voluntary activation deficit to quantify how maximal synergy-driven contractions compare  
481 to maximal voluntary contractions, we found that extrinsic wrist/finger extensors (ECR, EDC) and  
482 intrinsic hand muscles (FDI, FPB, EPL) had the largest and most frequently occurring increase in  
483 synergy-driven activation compared with voluntary activation, which is in line with our prediction.  
484 Voluntary activation was only 48% of the synergy-driven activation for those muscles on average,  
485 with virtually all participants demonstrating a non-zero voluntary activation deficit. In contrast to our  
486 prediction, voluntary activation deficit values for the extrinsic wrist/finger flexors were not  
487 statistically different than that for the DELT (although the comparison between FDP and DELT had a  
488  $p$ -value of 0.06). The difference in the findings between the wrist/finger flexors and the wrist/finger  
489 extensors likely reflect the fact that in the intact nervous system, brainstem motor pathways facilitate  
490 distal flexors to a greater degree than extensors (Davidson and Buford 2004, 2006), and the strength of  
491 this facilitation becomes greater following stroke (Zaaimi et al. 2012). Further, while the strength of

492 corticospinal projections is high to all distal muscles, it is stronger to intrinsic hand muscles and distal  
493 extensors compared with distal flexors (Cheney et al. 1991; McKiernan et al. 1998). Thus, following  
494 corticospinal damage, it appears that shoulder and elbow muscles and wrist/finger flexors can still be  
495 activated voluntarily using brainstem pathways as well as remaining corticospinal resources, whereas  
496 wrist/finger extensors and intrinsic hand muscles rely primarily on remaining corticospinal resources.

497 While the persistence of brainstem pathways following stroke afford the shoulder, the elbow, and the  
498 wrist/finger flexors the ability to have some remaining voluntary activation, we must point out that the  
499 notable consequence of utilizing predominantly brainstem pathways is the loss of independent joint  
500 control that occurs when the flexion and extension synergies are expressed (Karbasforoushan et al.  
501 2019; McPherson et al. 2018b, 2018a; Owen et al. 2017).

#### 502 **4.2 Flexion and extension synergy expression is strongest when the synergies are elicited via** 503 **proximal rather than distal muscle contractions**

504 Because of the aforementioned bias of innervation by brainstem pathways toward proximal muscles,  
505 we predicted that activation of these muscles would result in stronger synergy expression when  
506 compared with activation of distal muscles. Indeed, our findings support this prediction. When  
507 comparing synergy elicitation from one joint to another and vice versa, the proximal-to-distal  
508 elicitation was larger than the distal-to-proximal elicitation for every comparison (except for SADD  
509 and EE, for which the elicitation was not different between the directions).

510 When brainstem pathways are activated with the intent to drive shoulder muscles, the elbow and hand  
511 are activated as well due to the system's diffuse multi-joint projections. In the intact nervous system  
512 this multi-joint activation may be utilized for postural adjustments and/or to provide multi-joint  
513 stability, but the corticospinal tract and its cortico-reticular projections can selectively 'gate' or inhibit  
514 reticulospinal effects at other joints when they are unwanted (Dyson et al. 2014; Schepens and Drew  
515 2006). Following stroke, however, unwanted effects of brainstem pathways at muscles of other joints  
516 are not suppressed, and the flexion and extension synergy patterns emerge. Our findings suggest that  
517 the strength of brainstem pathway influence to muscles about one joint determines how strongly the  
518 synergy is elicited at muscles of other joints.

#### 519 **4.3 Associated reactions are strongest when elicited via proximal rather than distal muscle** 520 **contractions, but only in the wrist and finger flexors**

521 As expected, we observed strong associated reactions in the paretic limb (unintended activation of  
522 paretic muscles that occurred during maximal contractions of the non-paretic limb). We predicted that  
523 the associated reactions would be stronger with proximal rather than distal contractions. We found this  
524 to be the case for the paretic wrist and fingers. Although strong wrist/finger flexion torque was  
525 produced for all contraction directions, it was lower when the contralateral joint was more distal,  
526 decreasing by nearly 50% when comparing torque resulting from contralateral shoulder abduction to  
527 that of contralateral wrist extension. Nonetheless, there was still an appreciable amount generated  
528 during the wrist extension contraction direction. The proximal-distal decreasing pattern in flexion  
529 torque across contraction directions was driven by selective decreases in wrist/finger flexor EMG  
530 rather than overall decreases in EMG for both flexor and extensor groups. Interestingly, however,  
531 paretic elbow torque did not depend on non-paretic contraction direction, evidenced by levels of  
532 elbow flexion torque that were consistent across contraction directions and were milder in comparison  
533 to that of the wrist/fingers (aside from the one individual who generated maximal levels of elbow  
534 *extension* torque).

535

536 The presence of the substantial bilateral muscle activity during non-paretic contractions is consistent  
537 with the bilateral upper limb projections of the cortico-reticulospinal pathway. It is interesting that the  
538 wrist/finger muscles (FCR, FDP, FDI) were the ones that demonstrated the most pronounced  
539 activation as well as the dependence on whether the contraction direction was proximal or distal. In  
540 studies in non-human primates, the bilateral organization of the reticulospinal tract has been shown to  
541 activate muscles as far distal as the wrist (Davidson and Buford 2004, 2006; Herbert et al. 2010), but  
542 whether this bilateral organization extends to muscles acting on digits of the hand has not yet been  
543 investigated (Baker 2011). While it could be argued that increased activity of the bilaterally projecting  
544 reticulospinal tract would also cause associated reactions in the non-paretic limb during paretic limb  
545 activation, it is likely that the intact crossed corticospinal tract projecting to the non-paretic limb helps  
546 suppress such associated reactions

#### 547 **4.4 Implications for clinical research**

548 Results of the study underscore the need to acknowledge whole-limb behavior when examining motor  
549 control of the post-stroke upper limb. Studies examining a joint in isolation from the rest of the limb  
550 should consider whether results will generalize to functional scenarios when proximal or distal  
551 muscles are concurrently activated. Although the current study examines paretic limb behavior during  
552 maximal rather than functional efforts, the involuntary coupling between joints via the flexion and  
553 extension synergy patterns occurs at submaximal efforts (McPherson and Dewald 2019), including  
554 those commensurate with lifting the limb against gravity (Miller and Dewald 2012).

555 Insight derived from previous studies quantifying flexion and extension synergy expression provided  
556 the foundation for a novel physical therapy intervention for reaching based on progressive shoulder  
557 abduction loading (Ellis et al. 2008, 2009, 2018) and helped to improve the control of assistive  
558 technologies (Makowski et al. 2013, 2014) for the post-stroke upper limb. Results of the current study  
559 add to this body of empirical evidence. For example, knowledge of how movement of any of the four  
560 paretic upper limb joints (shoulder, elbow, wrist, and finger) elicits the multi-joint synergy patterns  
561 could inform the control of a technology that assists the limb differently based on the intended task.

562 Results suggest that physical therapy interventions using bilateral movements (van Delden et al. 2012)  
563 or assistive technologies controlled with the non-paretic limb (Knutson et al. 2009, 2012) may elicit  
564 associated reactions in the paretic limb when the amount of effort to the non-paretic limb is high. This  
565 may be particularly evident with activation of proximal non-paretic muscles. Additionally, while  
566 bilateral training may have important benefits including alterations in intra-cortical inhibition  
567 (McCombe Waller and Whittall 2008), it may also upregulate ipsilateral cortico-reticulospinal  
568 connections. This would further compound the elicitation of associated reactions during non-paretic  
569 limb movement and elicitation of the flexion and extension synergies during paretic limb activation,  
570 leading to increased difficulty in controlling joints independently during functional tasks.

#### 571 **4.5 Limitations**

572 Several limitations to the study should be considered. First, the sample size was small; however,  
573 consistent results were seen in the majority of participants. Second, it should be considered that  
574 secondary torques produced during the generation of maximal wrist and finger torques in the paretic  
575 limb could be compensatory behaviors (e.g., adducting the shoulder because of the difficulty of  
576 wrist/finger flexion or abducting the shoulder than due to the difficulty of wrist/finger extension rather  
577 than obligatory synergy-driven shoulder activation). However, if this was the case, the same  
578 compensatory behaviors might be expected in non-paretic and control limbs, given that all  
579 contractions were maximal efforts and the difficulty between groups would be similar.



580 Additionally, it is possible that effects of contralateral contractions on the tested limb might have been  
581 different if the contralateral arm were in a different position. The effects of paretic upper limb position  
582 on ipsilateral reflex behavior (Hoffmann et al. 2009), strength generation (Hoffmann et al. 2011), and  
583 extension synergy expression (Ellis et al. 2007) have been previously demonstrated. In particular, the  
584 shoulder adduction/elbow extension coupling of the extension synergy was shown to switch to  
585 shoulder adduction/elbow flexion when the arm was placed closer to the body as in the current study  
586 (Ellis et al. 2007). However, the influence of non-paretic upper limb position on paretic upper limb is  
587 unknown.

588 Finally, the neuroscientific implications drawn from the results are speculative given the behavioral  
589 nature of our measurements. However, they are consistent with recent work that has been able to  
590 probe the involvement of various neural circuits more directly (Karbasforoushan et al. 2019;  
591 McPherson et al. 2018b, 2018a; Owen et al. 2017).

## 592 **5 Conflict of Interest**

593 The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial  
594 relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

## 595 **6 Author Contributions**

596 LMM and JPAD conceived and designed the research. LMM acquired and analyzed the data and  
597 prepared the initial manuscript. LMM and JPAD interpreted the data, edited and finalized the  
598 submitted manuscript, and agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

## 599 **7 Funding**

600 This work was supported by the National Institute on Disability, Independent Living, and  
601 Rehabilitation Research (NIDILRR) grant H133G070089, the National Institutes of Health (NIH)  
602 grants R01 HD039343, R01 NS105759, and T32 HD057845, the Northwestern University Feinberg  
603 School of Medicine, and a Promotion of Doctoral Studies (PODS) II Scholarship from the Foundation  
604 for Physical Therapy Research, Inc.

## 605 **8 Acknowledgments**

606 The authors thank Carolina Carmona, PT, DPT for assistance with participant recruitment and  
607 screening and Becca Covode, B.S. for assistance with data collection.