

1 **Title:**

2
3 **Fastest may not maximize gait quality: differential and individual-specific immediate effects of gait speed**
4 **on biomechanical variables post-stroke**
5
6
7
8
9

10
11
12 **Authors:**

13
14 Michael C. Rosenberg¹, Hannah Christianson², Justin Liu², Vincent Santucci², Payton Sims², Alex Schilder²,
15 Laura Zajac-Cox², Taniel S. Winner¹, Lena H. Ting¹, Trisha M. Kesar^{2,3}
16

17
18 ¹Department of Biomedical Engineering, Emory University & Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA,
19 USA

20 ²Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, Emory University School of Medicine, Atlanta, GA, USA

21 ³Center for Physical Therapy and Movement Science, Emory University, Atlanta, GA

22 **ABSTRACT**

23 A common perspective in post-stroke gait training is that walking at the fastest safe speed maximizes the quality
24 of gait biomechanics, but effects on compensatory biomechanics and inter-limb asymmetry have not been
25 widely characterized. It is unclear whether walking at the fastest speed maximizes the quality of (*i.e.*, optimizes)
26 post-stroke biomechanics across variables, individuals, and walking function levels. In low- (n=9) and high-
27 functioning (n=9) stroke survivors walking at six individualized speeds, we determined if walking at the fastest
28 speed optimized 16 biomechanical variables. Across participants, 46% of magnitude and 17% of asymmetry
29 variables were optimized at the fastest speed, but the optimized variables differed across individuals. Some
30 inter-limb asymmetry variables sustained large biomechanical costs, (*i.e.*, biomechanical quality lost by walking
31 at the fastest vs. the optimal speed; difference in Cohen's $d=0.1-0.7$). In both groups, faster speeds were
32 associated with increased (improved) paretic-leg trailing limb angle, peak ankle moment, and peak hip and
33 ankle power magnitudes (all $p<0.001$), but changes in inter-limb asymmetry were individual-specific. Our
34 findings suggest that treadmill training at the fastest safe speed does not maximize gait quality across
35 individuals or biomechanical variables. More holistic, individual-specific gait quality metrics are needed to
36 guide gait speed optimization during rehabilitation.

37

38

39

40 **KEYWORDS**

41 Biomechanics, gait rehabilitation, walking speed, interindividual variability, motor impairments, stroke,
42 treadmill training

43

44 **INTRODUCTION**

45 A common perspective in post-stroke gait rehabilitation is that mass stepping practice at the fastest safe speed
46 maximizes training-induced improvements in walking function without compromising gait quality¹⁻³. Clinical

47 practice guidelines support high-intensity treadmill training to improve overground walking function⁴.
48 Treadmill training provides a safe and predictable environment in which physical therapists can modulate gait
49 speed to promote high-quality gait biomechanics^{1,2,4}. However, it remains unclear if gait training at faster
50 speeds optimizes the biomechanical quality across all individuals, for all biomechanical variables, and for
51 individuals with different levels of walking function. Because complex and individual-specific gait impairments
52 post-stroke may lead to heterogeneous changes in biomechanics with walking speed, training at the fastest
53 speed may not always maximize biomechanical gait quality^{5,6}. Given the importance of gait speed in
54 quantifying post-stroke walking function and community participation, as well as speed being a key training
55 parameter during rehabilitation, refining our understanding of the relationships between speed and
56 biomechanics may inform data-driven strategies to personalize training speeds to optimize (*i.e.*, maximally
57 improve) both gait biomechanics and walking function⁷⁻⁹.
58
59 Prior studies typically compared a small number of gait speeds, limiting our ability to identify sub-maximal
60 speeds that optimize gait biomechanics post-stroke^{1,3,10}. Multiple studies have reported that walking faster than
61 the individual's self-selected (SS) gait speed improves post-stroke gait deficits, such as paretic push-off and
62 ankle power, without increasing reliance on compensatory mechanisms or increasing inter-limb
63 asymmetry^{1,3,4,10,11}. For example, Lamontagne and Fung (2004) reported improved kinematics and muscle
64 activity and reductions in inter-limb asymmetry for some temporal variables when walking at participants'
65 fastest safe speed compared to the self-selected (SS) speed¹. Similarly, Jonkers and colleagues (2009) found
66 improvements in hip and knee power when walking at the fastest safe speed compared to the SS speed¹⁰.
67 However, it is unclear whether intermediate speeds would further improve biomechanics. Tyrell and colleagues
68 (2011) provided greater resolution into the biomechanical impacts of gait speed by evaluating changes in 8
69 biomechanical variables across four gait speeds in relatively high-functioning stroke survivors (speeds 0.3-1.0
70 m/s)³. However, the proportion of participants for whom the fastest speed was best was not investigated.

71 Evaluating a wider range of speeds and determining the proportion of participants whose biomechanics are
72 optimized at the fastest speed will provide a refined perspective on the optimality of training at faster speeds.
73
74 An additional challenge to personalizing gait training speeds is that a single speed may optimize only a subset
75 of biomechanical variables while increasing gait compensations and inter-limb asymmetry. The complexity of
76 post-stroke gait dysfunction is not fully captured by singular variables; improving the quality of one variable
77 may not correspond to improvements in the quality of other important biomechanical variables. Key
78 biomechanical deficits such as reduced paretic push-off and reduced ankle moment and power generation
79 during the stance phase of gait are seen in many stroke survivors and have been targeted during rehabilitation¹²⁻
80 ¹⁴. Further, swing-phase joint flexion deficits can increase fall risk due to poor ground clearance¹⁵. These
81 deficits may be compensated for by pelvic hiking or hip circumduction during swing^{5,10} or relying on the non-
82 paretic leg to increase propulsion¹². Different coordination strategies to increase walking speed have been
83 observed in stroke survivors: increasing joint powers in the paretic or non-paretic leg and in either the hip or
84 ankle^{3,10,16}. As even small changes in gait biomechanics may impact gait stability, efficiency, and function,
85 quantifying which variables are optimized at the fastest speeds is critical for optimizing post-stroke gait training
86 speeds¹⁷⁻¹⁹.

87

88 While prior studies identified a range of biomechanical variables that were optimized at the fastest speed, no
89 study has comprehensively investigated the tradeoffs between multi-joint changes in gait biomechanics,
90 compensations from proximal joints such as the pelvis and hip, and inter-limb asymmetry^{1,3,10}. Multiple studies
91 reported the immediate effects of speed on spatiotemporal variables, joint kinematics, moments, powers, and
92 muscle activity in the paretic and non-paretic legs^{1,3,10,11,15}, but only Tyrell and colleagues (2004) tested the
93 effects of speed on inter-limb step length asymmetry³. Increasing speed improved (*i.e.*, decreased) step length
94 asymmetry, though it is unclear if the inter-limb asymmetry of kinematic or kinetic variables also improved.
95 Jonkers and colleagues showed that improvements (*i.e.*, increases) in paretic-limb hip power at faster gait

96 speeds were accompanied by even greater increases in non-paretic hip power¹⁰. In this case, inter-limb
97 asymmetry degraded (*i.e.*, increased), despite improvements in paretic hip power. Therefore, gains in the
98 magnitude of some biomechanical variables may come at the cost of degradations in others. In this case,
99 walking at faster speeds would incur a *biomechanical cost*—a benefit lost—compared to walking at a slower,
100 “optimal” speed. Quantifying the biomechanical costs of walking at the fastest speed for different variables will
101 provide a framework for researchers and clinicians to objectively weigh the tradeoffs between changes in
102 different biomechanical variables with speed.

103
104 Changes in post-stroke gait biomechanics with speed likely depend on walking function level, often
105 characterized by individuals’ SS speeds^{1,10,20}. Lower-functioning individuals are often defined as those who
106 walk slower than speeds required for community ambulation^{1,10,20}. Stroke survivors with more severe
107 impairments may use distinct biomechanical strategies to modulate gait speed. For example, high-functioning
108 stroke survivors exhibit changes in hip flexion and ankle plantarflexion power, while low-functioning stroke
109 survivors struggle to modulate joint power generation at faster speeds¹⁰. This finding highlights the possibility
110 that changes in biomechanics with speed depend on walking function level, and that this relationship may be
111 variable-specific. However, prior studies have not quantified the effects of function level on gait biomechanics
112 across more than 2 speeds^{3,10,11}. Quantifying the immediate effects of speed and walking function level on
113 changes in gait biomechanics is needed to guide personalization of speed-based gait rehabilitation.

114
115 Here, we tested the hypothesis that different post-stroke biomechanical gait variables are optimized at different
116 gait speeds and vary across individuals and function levels. We build upon prior studies by analyzing post-
117 stroke gait biomechanics (paretic leg kinematics and kinetics, compensations, inter-limb asymmetry) at 6
118 speeds, ranging from SS to the fastest safe speed, in high- (>0.4 m/s) and low-functioning (\leq 0.4 m/s) stroke
119 survivors. We identified gait speeds that maximized the quality of (*i.e.*, optimized) 16 biomechanical
120 magnitude, compensatory, and inter-limb asymmetry variables for each individual and variable. To further

121 quantify the potential importance of optimizing gait speed, we characterized the biomechanical cost (*i.e.*, the
122 potential loss of gait quality) of training at the fastest rather than the optimal gait speed for each variable.
123 Finally, we characterized the immediate effect of speed and walking function level on changes in each of the 16
124 biomechanical variables. We predicted that not all paretic-leg biomechanical magnitude and inter-limb
125 asymmetry variables' quality would be maximized at the fastest speed across individuals and function levels.

126

127

128 METHODS

129 Eighteen post-stroke individuals (6 females; 60 ± 10 years; 47 ± 52 months post-stroke; Table 1) participated in
130 one session of treadmill-based gait analysis. Study procedures were approved by the Emory University
131 Institutional Review Board and all participants provided written informed consent. Inclusion criteria included
132 >6 months post-stroke, the ability to walk on a treadmill without an orthotic device for 1-minute, and the ability
133 to communicate with investigators. Exclusion criteria included neurologic diagnosis other than stroke, hemi-
134 neglect, orthopedic conditions limiting walking, and cerebellar dysfunction. Before gait analysis, a clinical
135 evaluation comprising standard measures of lower limb sensorimotor impairment and function (*e.g.*, Fugl-
136 Meyer score, Berg Balance score) was conducted by a clinician (Table 1). Study procedures were approved by
137 and performed in accordance with guidelines set forth by the Emory University Institutional Review Board and
138 all participants provided written informed consent.

139

140 **Table 1: Participant demographics.**

	Sex	Age (yrs)	Mo. Post-stroke	Paretic side	Lower-extremity Fugl-Meyer	Self-Selected speed (m/s)	Fastest speed (m/s)
ST01	M	70-80	14	R	26	0.22	0.32
ST02	M	50-60	7	L	15	0.25	0.45
ST03	F	50-60	213	R	30	0.26	0.39
ST04	M	40-50	78	R	17	0.30	0.60
ST05	M	70-80	106	R	22	0.35	0.55
ST06	F	50-60	64	L	18	0.35	0.50

ST07	M	50-60	46	L	23	0.37	0.47
ST08	M	50-60	75	L	14	0.38	0.53
ST09	M	70-80	8	L	22	0.40	0.70
ST10	M	60-70	14	R	32	0.42	0.60
ST11	F	50-60	32	L	27	0.43	0.52
ST12	F	70-80	24	L	26	0.45	0.70
ST13	M	30-40	35	R	20	0.45	0.80
ST14	M	50-60	15	R	23	0.55	0.80
ST15	F	60-70	65	L	20	0.60	0.85
ST16	M	50-60	27	R	27	0.70	1.15
ST17	F	60-70	19	L	25	0.75	0.95
ST18	M	50-60	6	L	26	0.90	1.20
Low-functioning*	2F	61 ± 10	68 ± 65	5L	21 ± 5	0.32 ± 0.06	0.50 ± 0.11
High-functioning*	4F	59 ± 11	26 ± 27	5L	25 ± 4	0.58 ± 0.17	0.84 ± 0.23
Overall*	6F	60 ± 10	47 ± 52	10L	23 ± 5	0.45 ± 0.18	0.67 ± 0.25

*Summary statistics show the average and standard deviation across groups and across all participants. Low- and high-functioning stroke survivors were stratified based on self-selected (SS) speed, with the low-functioning group having SS speed ≤ 0.40 m/s.

Experimental setup

Participants walked on a split-belt instrumented treadmill (Bertec Corp., Ohio, USA) to enable collection of ground reaction force (GRF) data independently for each limb. Reflective markers were attached to the trunk, pelvis, and bilateral thigh, shank, and foot segments as described by Kesar and colleagues (2010)²¹. Marker trajectories were recorded using a 7-camera motion capture system (Vicon Inc., Oxford, UK). During all walking trials, for safety, participants held onto a front handrail and wore an overhead safety harness without body-weight support. Participants were instructed to maintain a light and consistent handrail grip for all walking trials; if investigators suspected a change in handrail grip or excessive reliance on the handrail, the participant was given feedback and, if needed, the trial was restarted.

Determination of walking speeds

After a 30-60 second trial to acclimatize to the treadmill, each participant's self-selected (SS) walking speed was determined by slowly increasing the belt speed until the participant reported their comfortable walking speed. Next, the fastest safe walking speed was determined by gradually increasing the treadmill speed above their SS speed until either the participant reported the fastest speed that they could safely walk for 30 seconds,

159 or the investigators deemed it unsafe to increase the speed further. Next, four intermediate speeds were
160 computed at equal increments between the SS and fastest walking speeds, resulting in a total of six evenly
161 distributed speeds spanning each participant's walking capacity. Data were collected during 15-second treadmill
162 walking trials at each of the six speeds, in increasing order from the SS speed to the fastest speed. Brief 1-2
163 minute standing rest breaks were provided between walking trials as needed, to prevent fatigue. Based on SS
164 speed, participants were stratified into low- (SS speed ≤ 0.4 m/s) and high-functioning (SS speed > 0.4 m/s)
165 groups, similar to prior studies^{1,10}.

167 **Data processing**

168 All GRFs, joint kinematics, and joint moments and powers were processed in Visual 3D (C-Motion Inc.,
169 Maryland, USA). Before computing joint moments and powers, GRFs and joint kinematics were low-pass
170 filtered at 30 and 6 Hz, respectively using a 4th-order Butterworth filter. At each gait speed, dependent variable
171 magnitudes were computed for the paretic and non-paretic limbs. For each variable, the average value across all
172 gait cycles during each trial was used for each speed.

174 **Dependent variables**

175 To conduct a comprehensive analysis of the immediate effects of speed on post-stroke gait biomechanics, a total
176 of 16 dependent variables included the magnitude of paretic-leg kinematics, kinetics and gait compensations,
177 and inter-limb asymmetries. Paretic leg magnitude variables included: Peak paretic propulsion was normalized
178 to body mass and was calculated as the peak value of the anteriorly-directed GRF during the terminal double-
179 support phase of the limb^{22,23}. Trailing limb angle (TLA) was calculated as the maximum angle between the
180 vertical axis of the laboratory and a line joining the greater trochanter and fifth metatarsal head marker^{7,24,25}.
181 Peak ankle moment and peak ankle power were calculated during the stance phase of gait. Peak hip power was
182 defined as the peak hip flexor power generation power during the pre-swing and initial swing phase of gait.
183 Peak moments and powers were normalized to body mass^{10,22}. Additionally, ankle angle at initial contact (IC)

184 was calculated. We included two gait compensation variables: hip circumduction and pelvic hiking of the
185 paretic leg. Paretic leg circumduction was calculated as the maximum frontal plane deviation of the bottom heel
186 marker during stance phase versus the subsequent swing phase. Pelvic hiking was calculated as the maximum
187 frontal plane angle between the pelvis during a static standing calibration trial and during the swing phase of the
188 paretic leg³. Inter-limb asymmetry variables included the inter-limb asymmetry of each magnitude and
189 compensatory variable, calculated as the difference between the non-paretic and paretic limb magnitudes²⁶. The
190 dataset containing participant demographics and dependent variables used in this study can be found in
191 *Additional file 1*.

193 **Statistical analyses**

194 *Characterizing the immediate effects of speed on post-stroke gait biomechanics*

195 To confirm that treadmill speed had significant effects on post-stroke gait biomechanics, we conducted
196 repeated-measures Analyses of Variance (RM-ANOVAs; $\alpha = 0.05$) to test for immediate effects of treadmill
197 speed on each dependent variable separately for the low- and high-functioning groups. This approach is
198 consistent with prior literature and served as a preliminary characterization and replication of the immediate
199 effects of speed on gait biomechanics^{1,3}. For each variable, we report percent changes between the SS and
200 fastest speeds, as well as the number of participants who exhibited changes in the same direction between the
201 SS and fastest speeds.

203 *Determining if faster speeds result in improved gait biomechanics across individuals*

204 We defined the optimal speed for each biomechanical variable within each individual. Specifically, optimal
205 speeds were defined as the speeds that either maximized a paretic-leg magnitude variable, minimized the
206 magnitude of a paretic-leg compensation variable, or minimized a variable's inter-limb asymmetry. To
207 determine the extent to which the fastest speeds optimized each gait variable, we computed the percentage of
208 variables that were optimized at each speed for each individual. Percentages were computed separately for the 8

magnitude variables (including compensations) and 8 inter-limb asymmetry variables. If faster speeds are better for maximizing overall gait quality, then the fastest speed should optimize 100% of variables for all participants. We computed the average change in each biomechanical variable at the fastest speed relative to the SS speed as $\Delta_{fast-SS}$.

Characterizing the biomechanical cost of walking at sub-optimal speeds

For each of the dependent variables, we computed an individual-specific *biomechanical cost* (Δd) of training at the fastest rather than the optimal speed as the difference in the immediate effect ($d =$ Cohen's d vs. the SS speed) of walking at the fastest versus the optimal speed, identified for that participant and variable²⁷. If walking at the fastest speed resulted in worse biomechanical quality of a variable (e.g., reduced paretic leg propulsion, increased propulsive asymmetry) compared to that at the optimal speed, then the fastest speed was considered to incur a biomechanical cost. If the optimal speed was the fastest speed for a variable and individual, the biomechanical cost would be zero. If the fastest speed maximized a variable's biomechanical quality, then the fastest and optimal speeds would be identical for that variable. We used Wilcoxon signed-rank tests to test for differences in biomechanical costs separately for magnitude and asymmetry variables.

Identifying gait biomechanics variables associated with modulation of absolute walking speed

Based on significant effects of relative speed on biomechanics in the RM-ANOVA, we used multivariate regression to characterize the effects of changes in absolute trial walking speed (i.e., absolute speed for each trial relative to SS speed; henceforth "*trial speed*"), SS speed, and their interaction on changes in each biomechanical variable compared to walking at the SS speed. Our premise for this analysis is that changes in gait biomechanics depend on both absolute trial speed during each trial and baseline walking function^{10,16}. The regression equation is shown in Equation (1): change in a biomechanical variable (ΔY) at each speed is estimated as a function of change in trial speed ($\Delta Speed$), SS speed ($Speed_{SS}$), their interaction ($Speed_{SS} \times \Delta Speed$), and an error term (ϵ). Coefficients α , β , and γ that are significantly different from zero

234 according to Wald Tests, suggest that changes in the biomechanical variable are associated with changes in
235 speed, SS speed, or their interaction, respectively. Because SS speed is not categorical, we report regression
236 results using an adjusted speed as a weighted combination of trial speed, SS speed, and their interaction. We
237 report significant effects of changes in trial speed, SS speed, and their interaction.

$$\Delta Y = \alpha \Delta \text{Speed} + \beta \text{Speed}_{SS} + \gamma (\text{Speed}_{SS} \times \Delta \text{Speed}) + \epsilon \quad (1)$$
$$\Delta \text{Speed} = \text{Speed} - \text{Speed}_{SS}$$

239
240 When trial speed was identified as a significant predictor variable during regression, we used independent-
241 samples t-tests to identify differences in speed-induced changes in gait biomechanics at the SS speed versus the
242 fastest speed between the low- and high-functioning groups. When either SS speed or the interaction term was
243 identified as a significant predictor of speed-induced changes in a biomechanical variable, we used univariate
244 linear regression to estimate the immediate effects of walking speed on changes in the variable (vs. SS speed)
245 separately in the low- (SS speed ≤ 0.4 m/s) and high-functioning groups, with 7 participants in each group¹⁰.
246 All tests were conducted using MATLAB 2021b (Mathworks Ltd, Natick, USA) with an unadjusted
247 significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$. For RM-ANOVA, paired t-test, and univariate regression analyses, we adjusted
248 the significance level (α_{Sidak}) for multiple comparisons using Holm-Sidak stepdown corrections²⁸.

251 RESULTS

252 Speed altered biomechanics differentially in low- and high-functioning groups

253 Across the high- and low-functioning stroke groups, walking speed modulated 75% of the biomechanical
254 magnitude and compensatory variables and 38% of the asymmetry variables across participants (Figure 1A; the
255 direction of improvements in each biomechanical variable is denoted by a green arrow, yellow stars denote
256 variables that were modulated by speed, see Table 2 for statistical outcomes). Paretic-limb AGRF magnitude

257 increased by $51 \pm 440\%$ (average across participants) between the SS and fastest speeds only in the high-
258 functioning group (RM-ANOVA, $p < 0.001$; $\alpha_{sidak} = 0.006$; Table 2). Peak TLA, ankle moment, hip power,
259 and ankle power increased by 23-174% with speed in both groups (all $p < 0.003$; $\alpha_{sidak} < 0.006$). Conversely,
260 compensatory circumduction increased at faster speeds, indicating a detrimental effect of speed in only the
261 high-functioning ($107 \pm 173\%$; $p < 0.002$; $\alpha_{sidak} = 0.006$; Figure 1A & B; blue bars and lines) group after
262 correction for multiple comparisons. Pelvic hiking trended toward increases (*i.e.*, degradations) with speed in
263 the low-functioning ($-92 \pm 365\%$; $p = 0.024$; $\alpha_{sidak} = 0.005$) but not high-functioning group ($10 \pm 33\%$; $p =$
264 0.536 $\alpha_{sidak} = 0.006$). Changes in circumduction and pelvic hiking, however, were highly variable between
265 participants.

266
267 Walking at faster speeds modulated inter-limb asymmetry differentially between groups. For example, only the
268 low-functioning group trended towards increased peak AGRF asymmetry ($125 \pm 224\%$; $p = 0.012$; $\alpha_{sidak} =$
269 0.005) with speed (Figure 1A). Speed effects on joint moment asymmetry also differed between the groups:
270 ankle moment asymmetry increased (*i.e.*, worsened) only in the high-functioning group ($50 \pm 86\%$; $p = 0.003$;
271 $\alpha_{sidak} = 0.006$). Ankle power asymmetry trended towards significance in both the low- ($-86 \pm 119\%$; $p = 0.006$;
272 $\alpha_{sidak} = 0.005$) but not high-functioning ($p = 0.027$; $\alpha_{sidak} = 0.006$) groups.

273
274 However, there was substantial inter-individual variability in each group for inter-limb asymmetry variables;
275 not all individuals followed group trends (Figure 1A & C). For example, compared to the SS speed, the fastest
276 speed increased peak hip power asymmetry in 6 of 9 low-functioning participants and 3 of 9 high-functioning
277 participants (Figure 1C). This contrasts with magnitude variables, in which all participants in both groups
278 increased TLA, hip and ankle power, and ankle moments at the fast speed compared to the SS speed. Similarly,
279 within individuals, not all asymmetry variables changed in the same direction: $49 \pm 17\%$ of each participant's
280 asymmetry variables increased between the SS and fastest speeds. For comparison, $80 \pm 12\%$ of magnitude
281 variables changed in the same direction.




Figure 1: Changes in biomechanical variables with speed in low- and high-functioning stroke survivors.

A) Average (thick lines) and individual participants (thin lines) magnitudes (top) and inter-limb asymmetries (bottom) for biomechanical variables across the six gait speeds, ranging from the SS to fastest (Fast) speeds. Averages for low- (black) and high- (blue; SS speed > 0.4 m/s) functioning groups of participants, are shown to highlight potential group differences in changes in biomechanics with speed. Green arrows along the vertical axis denote the direction of improved biomechanical quality for each gait variable. Stars denote variables and groups that exhibited significant effects of speed according to the RM-ANOVA after correction for multiple comparisons. B) Average (standard error of the mean; SEM) percent change in each biomechanical magnitude (top) and asymmetry (bottom) variable at the fast speed relative to the SS speed, grouped by function level. The SEM is shown for clarity and was computed with n = 9 for each group. C) The number of participants in each group (9 per group) that exhibited an increase in each variable between the SS and fastest speeds. If all participants changed a variable in the same direction, the corresponding bar would have a value of 9.

284

285 **Table 2: RM-ANOVA results demonstrating within-group immediate effects of trial speed on**
 286 **biomechanical variables.**

		Low-functioning		High-functioning	
		F	p	F	p
Magnitude variables	AGRF	3.4	0.012	19.4	<0.001*
	TLA	19.6	<0.001*	36.8	<0.001*
	Hip power	13.1	<0.001*	10.6	<0.001*
	Ankle power	19.9	<0.001*	33.7	<0.001*
	Ankle moment	28.5	<0.001*	33.9	<0.001*
	Ankle angle at IC	3.0	0.021	1.7	0.161
	Circumduction	2.5	0.043	4.6	0.002*
	Pelvic hiking	2.9	0.024	0.8	0.536
Asymmetry variables	AGRF	4.4	0.003*	1.1	0.389
	TLA	1.6	0.176	1.3	0.273
	Hip power	2.7	0.033	0.3	0.926
	Ankle power	3.9	0.006	2.9	0.027
	Ankle moment	0.1	0.989	4.5	0.003*
	Ankle angle at IC	0.6	0.718	4.2	0.004*
	Circumduction	2.4	0.056	1.7	0.155
	Pelvic hiking	2.3	0.064	1.4	0.234

AGRF = anterior ground reaction force; IC = initial contact; TLA = trailing limb angle

*Significant after Holm-Sidak stepdown correction.

287

288 **The fastest walking speed did not optimize all biomechanical variables across participants**

289 Across all participants, not all gait variables were optimized at the fastest speed. When looking at all magnitude
 290 variables, only 46% were maximized (*i.e.*, optimized) at the fastest speed, with 15% of variables maximized at
 291 the SS speed (Figure 2A, brown bars). Conversely, only 17% of inter-limb asymmetry variables were optimized
 292 at the fastest speed, whereas 31% were optimized at the SS speed (Figure 2A, cyan bars). Magnitude variables
 293 were optimized at the fastest speed in more participants than were inter-limb asymmetry variables (Figure 2B).
 294 For example, at the fastest speed, paretic-limb AGRF magnitude (*change vs. SS speed* = $\Delta_{Fast-SS} = 0.2 \pm 0.2$
 295 N/kg) was optimized in 67% of participants but AGRF asymmetry ($\Delta_{Fast-SS} = -0.2 \pm 0.3$ N/kg) was optimized
 296 in only 22% of participants. Compensatory circumduction and pelvic hiking magnitudes and asymmetries were
 297 optimized at the fastest speed for less than 28% of participants.

298




Figure 2: The effects of walking at the fastest speed compared to the sub-maximal speeds. A) The percentage of participants whose biomechanics were optimized across the eight magnitude (orange) and eight asymmetry (cyan) variables. If training at the fastest speed was best for all variables (gray), the percent optimized at the fastest speed would be 100%. B) The percent of participants for whom each magnitude and asymmetry variable was optimized at the fastest speed. If the fastest speed always optimized a variable, it would have a value of 100%. C) Effect sizes (Cohen's d) of each variable across participants for magnitude and asymmetry variables at the fastest (Fast) and optimal (Opt) speeds. Boxplots show the distribution of effect sizes across the eight biomechanical variables. Each gray dot corresponds to one variable (8 per box). Bars displaying p -values denote the probability of differences in immediate effects of training at the fastest rather than the optimal speed (Wilcoxon Signed-Rank test). The immediate effects on magnitude variables were not significant (n.s.). Effect sizes are oriented such that positive effects imply improved biomechanical quality.

299

300 When the fastest speed is not best, it can incur substantial biomechanical costs

301 Compared to walking at the SS speed, the fastest and optimal speeds had similar desirable immediate effects

302 (Cohen's d across individuals) on magnitude variables, but the fastest speed had detrimental immediate effects

303 on inter-limb asymmetry variables (Figure 2C; positive values indicate a desirable immediate effect).

304 Magnitude variables were typically maximized, and thus optimal, at the fastest speed (Figure 2A), such that the

305 median immediate effect sizes were similar at both the optimal ($d = 0.7$) and fastest speeds ($d = 0.6$; Figure 2C).

306 Consequently, the biomechanical cost of walking at the fastest speed, rather than the optimal speed, was not

307 significant for magnitude variables.

308

309 Across inter-limb asymmetry variables, there was a small positive (*i.e.*, desirable; decreased asymmetry)
310 immediate effect of walking at the optimal speed versus the SS speed (median $d = 0.2$; Figure 2C). Conversely,
311 when walking at the fastest speed compared to the SS speed, inter-limb asymmetry increased, resulting in a
312 small negative effect (median $d = 0.2$). This difference in immediate effects of walking at the fastest, rather than
313 the optimal, speed corresponded to a small-to-moderate median biomechanical cost for inter-limb asymmetry
314 across variables (median $\Delta d = 0.3$, $p = 0.008$). The biomechanical cost of inter-limb asymmetry variables was
315 largest in AGRF ($\Delta d = 0.7$; $\Delta_{fast-opt} = 0.2$ N/kg), hip power ($\Delta d = 0.6$; $\Delta_{fast-opt} = 0.1$ W/kg), and ankle power
316 ($\Delta d = 0.6$; $\Delta_{fast-opt} = 0.4$ W/kg; Figure 2C).

317

318 **Only changes in the magnitude variables were explained by changes in trial speed and SS speed**

319 Across all participants, changes in magnitude, but not compensatory or inter-limb asymmetry variables were
320 explained by a linear combination of changes in trial speed (vs. the SS speed) and SS speed. For magnitude
321 variables, changes in trial speed, SS speed, and their interaction explained 44-82% of the variance in changes in
322 AGRF, TLA, ankle moment, hip power, and ankle power (Figure 3A, C & E). Changes in trial speed were
323 positively associated with changes in TLA ($p < 0.001$, $r^2 = 0.60$), ankle power ($p < 0.001$, $r^2 = 0.82$), and ankle
324 moment magnitudes ($p < 0.001$, $r^2 = 0.77$). Only peak ankle angle at IC exhibited a weak negative association
325 with changes in speed ($p < 0.001$, $r^2 = 0.27$; $\alpha_{Sidak} = 0.005$). SS speed was not associated with changes in
326 magnitude variables (all $p > 0.030$; $\alpha_{Sidak} = 0.003$). However, the interaction between changes in trial speed
327 and SS speed was significant for changes in all magnitude variables (all $p < 0.001$; $\alpha_{Sidak} = 0.005$; Table 3).
328 Neither compensatory circumduction nor pelvic hiking magnitudes was explained by changes in trial speed and
329 SS speed ($r^2 < 0.05$; Figure 3E).

330

331 Changes in inter-limb asymmetry variables were not strongly associated with changes in trial speed and SS
332 speed ($r^2 < 0.20$; Figure 3E). Our linear model failed to capture individual differences in the direction of
333 changes in inter-limb asymmetry across participants (Figure 3B & D). For example, some participants' peak

334 AGRF asymmetry increased while others decreased at faster speeds (Figure 3B). While change in trial speed
 335 was a predictor of changes in AGRF ($p < 0.001$, $r^2 = 0.09$; $\alpha_{Sidak} = 0.005$) and ankle power ($p < 0.001$, $r^2 =$
 336 0.04) asymmetry, the models explained less than 20% of the variance in the data (Table 3; Figure 3E).
 337




Figure 3: Biomechanical variables regressed against a combination of SS speed, trial speed, and their interaction. A-D) Multivariate regression results showing the estimate (solid line) and 95% confidence interval (dashed lines) of each fit. Samples (gray dots) correspond to a participant and speed. The horizontal axis (*Adjusted speed*) corresponds to a weighted combination of trial speed, SS speed, and their interaction used in the multivariate regression analysis. A) AGRF magnitude. B) TLA magnitude. C) Peak hip power magnitude. D) Ankle moment asymmetry. E) Coefficient of determination (R^2) values for magnitude (orange) and asymmetry (cyan) biomechanical variables.

338

339

340

Table 3: Results of within-group regression and independent-samples t-tests.

		Within-group effects of trial speed on speed-induced changes				Between-group effects of function level (<i>Fastest – SS speed</i>)	
		Low-functioning		High-functioning		<i>d</i>	<i>p</i>
		slope	<i>p</i>	slope	<i>P</i>		
Magnitude variables	AGRF [‡]	0.5 N·s/kg·m	<0.001	1.1 N·s/kg·m	<0.001	-	-
	TLA ^{**}	21.0 deg·s·m	<0.001	16.5 deg·s·m	<0.001	0.4	0.435
	Hip power [‡]	0.9 J/kg·m	<0.001	1.3 J/kg·m	<0.001	-	-
	Ankle power ^{**}	1.9 J/kg·m	<0.001	2.4 J/kg·m	<0.001	1.0	0.042
	Ankle moment ^{**}	1.1 N·s/kg	<0.001	0.8 Ns/kg	<0.001	0.1	0.764
	Ankle angle at IC ^{**}	-8.0 deg·s/m	0.235	1.5 deg·s·m	<0.001	0.9	0.074
	Circumduction	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Pelvic hiking	-	-	-	-	-	-
	A	AGRF ^{**}	-1.0 N·s/kg·m	<0.001	-0.5 N·s/kg·m	<0.001	2.0

TLA	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hip power	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ankle power*	-	-	-	-	0.3	0.523
Ankle moment	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ankle angle at IC	-	-	-	-	-	-
Circumduction	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pelvic hiking	-	-	-	-	-	-

341 *Within-group effects of trial speed:* Univariate linear regression slopes quantify immediate effects of changes in trial speed on changes
 342 in biomechanical variables.

343 *Between-group effects of function level:* Independent-samples t-tests test for between-group differences in changes in biomechanical
 344 variables between the SS and fastest speeds. Between-group effect sizes (d ; Cohen's d) are reported.

345 Dashes denote variables that did not meet criteria for within- or between-group analyses following multivariate regression.

346 *Significant effect of trial speed on change in variable vs. SS speed ($\alpha_{\text{Sidak}} = 0.005$).

347 †Significant effect of SS speed on change in variable vs. SS speed ($\alpha_{\text{Sidak}} = 0.003$).

348 ‡Significant effect of trial speed×SS speed on change in variable vs. SS speed ($\alpha_{\text{Sidak}} = 0.005$).

349

350 **Low- and high-functioning stroke survivors exhibited different changes in biomechanics with trial speed**

351 Changes in trial speed and function level independently impacted changes in different biomechanical variables

352 in the low- and high-functioning groups. For variables that exhibited a significant effect of change in trial speed

353 (asterisks in Table 3), only changes in ankle power magnitude between the fastest and SS speeds approached a

354 significant difference between the low- and high-functioning groups before correction for multiple comparisons

355 (Cohen's d : $d_{\text{high-low}} = 1.0$, $p = 0.042$; $\alpha_{\text{Sidak}} = 0.003$; Table 3).

356

357 For variables with significant interaction effects between trial speed and SS speed (double daggers in Table 3),

358 both groups exhibited positive associations between trial speed and most magnitude variables: AGRF, TLA, hip

359 power, ankle power, ankle moment magnitudes (all $p < 0.001$; $\alpha_{\text{Sidak}} = 0.025$; Table 3). However, changes in

360 some variables per unit change in trial speed differed between groups. For example, the low-functioning group

361 exhibited smaller changes in AGRF magnitude (slope = 0.5 N·s/kg·m) and larger changes in TLA with speed

362 (slope = 21.0 deg·s/m) than did the high-functioning group (slopes = 1.1 N·s/kg·m and 16.5 deg·s/m,

363 respectively; Figure 4C).

364

365 Group differences extended to only AGRF asymmetry, which appeared to decrease more with trial speed in the

366 low- (slope = -1.0 N·s/kg·m, $p < 0.001$; $\alpha_{\text{Sidak}} = 0.050$) than the high-functioning (slope = -0.5 N·s/kg·m, $p <$

0.001; $\alpha_{sidak} = 0.050$) group (Figure 4B). The other asymmetry variables did not meet the criteria to test the effects of trial speed, but appeared to exhibit subject-specific effects of trial speed that were not captured in group-level analyses (e.g., ankle power asymmetry; Figure 4D).




Figure 4: Changes in biomechanical variables regressed against changes in trial speed for each group. Subplots show changes in biomechanical variables for which a significant effect of SS speed was identified during multivariate regression analysis. The low- (black) and high-functioning (blue) groups were analyzed separately. Solid lines denote the regression estimate and dashed lines denote the 95% confidence interval of the estimate. A) Peak AGRF magnitude, B) Peak AGRF asymmetry, C) TLA magnitude, and D) Ankle power asymmetry.

371

372

373 DISCUSSION

374 Our results refine the perspective that post-stroke gait training at faster speeds improves biomechanical quality,
375 instead suggesting that selecting optimal gait training speeds may require balancing tradeoffs between attaining
376 faster speeds and maximizing the quality of multiple biomechanical variables. Our results show that walking at

377 speeds *faster* than SS can improve the quality of gait biomechanics, but the *fastest* safe speed does not
378 maximize biomechanical quality for all variables and all participants. As speed increases, there is a tradeoff
379 between improvements in the magnitude of biomechanical variables and increases in inter-limb asymmetry,
380 including peak paretic-limb propulsion asymmetry and peak ankle power asymmetry. However, changes in
381 asymmetry with speed are heterogeneous and are not well described by SS walking speed. Considering inter-
382 limb asymmetry variables during gait speed selection is critical because walking at the fastest, rather than the
383 optimal speed incurred substantial biomechanical costs in these variables. Accounting for tradeoffs between gait
384 speed, and the magnitude of biomechanical output, compensations, and inter-limb asymmetry may improve our
385 ability to select personalized post-stroke gait training speeds that maximize gait quality across biomechanical
386 variables.

387
388 Evaluating biomechanical quality across more speeds than prior studies revealed intermediate speeds that
389 maximized biomechanical gait quality. Here we tested 6 speeds, compared to only 2 or 4 speeds in previous
390 studies^{1,3,10}. Our average speed increment was 0.05 m/s, compared to 0.13 m/s in a study with 4 speeds³ and
391 0.34-0.55 m/s in studies with 2 speeds^{1,10}. These small increments maximized our ability to precisely detect
392 changes in biomechanics with speed: changes in some biomechanical variables (e.g., TLA and AGRF) were
393 smaller than the minimum detectable changes during treadmill walking¹⁵.

394
395 Although walking faster than an individual's SS speed generally improves biomechanical magnitude variables,
396 the fastest safe speed is unlikely to maximize the quality of all magnitude variables. Improvements in
397 magnitude variables at faster speeds are consistent with prior studies that showed increases in TLA, hip power,
398 and ankle power at speeds faster than SS^{1,3,10}. Approximately linear changes in magnitude variables with speed
399 support that faster speeds, if safe, could further improve these variables for some individuals. Increases in
400 magnitude variables are unsurprising, as faster speeds are often achieved by increasing peak propulsion and
401 joint powers^{16,25}. However, no magnitude variables were optimized at the fastest speed for all individuals. This

402 is consistent with the observation that multiple biomechanical strategies, such as increasing hip or ankle power,
403 can be used to achieve the same walking speed in able-bodied adults and stroke survivors^{6,10,16,29,30}. Near the
404 fastest safe speed, changes in biomechanical strategies may result in some magnitude variables plateauing or
405 even degrading as speed increases.

406
407 Despite improvements in magnitude variables, faster speeds often had detrimental, though variable, effects on
408 the quality of compensatory and inter-limb asymmetry variables. Our RM-ANOVA results support that faster
409 speeds may increase circumduction and ankle moment asymmetry in high-functioning stroke survivors, and
410 increase AGRF asymmetry in low-functioning stroke survivors. This finding contrasts with Tyrell and
411 Colleagues (2011), who did not find speed effects on circumduction in a predominantly high-functioning cohort
412 (18 of 20 participants had SS speed > 0.4 m/s)³. This discrepancy may stem from speed effects on
413 circumduction being individual-specific and, therefore, sensitive to both studies' limited sample sizes. Weak
414 associations between walking speed and changes in circumduction and asymmetry variables support that
415 stratification by walking function level may mask effects of speed on gait compensations and asymmetry.

416
417 Changes in inter-limb asymmetry with speed differ more between individuals than do magnitude variables.
418 Unlike most magnitude variables evaluated here, asymmetry variables do not appear to change linearly with gait
419 speed, with inter-limb asymmetry for some variables minimized (*i.e.*, optimized) at intermediate speeds. One
420 recent study found similar nonlinear within-individuals changes in circumduction with speed⁶. Further, while an
421 individual's asymmetry can change with speed, individuals do not necessarily change asymmetry in the same
422 direction for a single variable. Even within-individuals, predicting which direction asymmetry variables will
423 change is challenging. On average, half of the asymmetry variables for a participant would favor the non-paretic
424 leg at faster speeds, while the other half would favor the paretic leg. Both nonlinear speed-asymmetry
425 relationships within- and between-individuals may explain poor regression performance for asymmetry
426 variables, and may explain why prior studies did not identify effects of speed on inter-limb asymmetry^{1,3}.

427 Changes in asymmetry with speed may be influenced by heterogeneous neural and biomechanical impairments
428 post-stroke that limit individuals' abilities to achieve faster speeds symmetrically^{5,31,32}. Individual-specific
429 nonlinear analyses may be needed to better characterize the relationships between speed and inter-limb
430 asymmetry.

431
432 Only changes in biomechanical magnitude variables with speed are well-described by low/high function level
433 grouping. Low- and high-functioning stroke survivors experience similar directional effects of speed on
434 biomechanical magnitude variables, but with different effect magnitudes. For example, ankle power increased
435 more with speed in the high- than the low-functioning group, consistent with one prior study¹⁰. Similar to inter-
436 limb asymmetry variables, individuals' abilities to modulate specific magnitude variables (e.g., joint powers) at
437 faster speeds may be sensitive to group-specific motor or biomechanical deficits^{5,16,31,32}. Identifying group-level
438 motor or musculoskeletal factors driving gait compensations would enhance our ability to prescribe
439 rehabilitation protocols based on walking function level.

440
441 Our results suggest that walking at faster speeds incurs substantial biomechanical costs for inter-limb
442 asymmetry variables. Biomechanical cost is analogous to an "opportunity cost" in economics³³. In the context
443 of gait rehabilitation, biomechanical costs quantify the potential benefit missed or additional worsening of
444 biomechanical quality by selecting non-optimal training parameters, like walking speed. We calculated
445 biomechanical cost as the difference in immediate effect sizes of training at the individual-specific optimal
446 versus fastest speeds. Our analysis of speed-related biomechanical costs refines prior studies by showing that
447 changes in some inter-limb asymmetry variables at the fastest speed, relative to the SS speed, were substantially
448 worse than what could be achieved if speed was optimized to minimize asymmetry^{1,3}. Variables with large
449 biomechanical costs may be important to consider when optimizing gait training speeds to improve overall gait
450 quality. For example, moderate-to-large biomechanical costs of joint power and AGRF asymmetry suggest that
451 maximizing gait training speeds may miss potential improvements in the quality of these variables, even when

they are not direct therapeutic targets²¹. However, we did not determine if the identified biomechanical costs correspond to clinically meaningful differences in a variable's quality.

Limitations

Our findings' generalizability is constrained by the amount of data collected, our experimental protocol, and the variables analyzed. First, our sample size was limited, though comparable to prior studies^{1,10}. However, our primary goal was to determine whether biomechanical variables were optimized at the fastest safe speeds. While a larger sample size may alter estimated effects of speed on different variables, more data would only further emphasize the heterogeneous changes in biomechanics with speed and the need for new approaches when quantifying post-stroke gait quality. Second, participants walked for only 15 seconds per speed. Short trial durations reduced fatigue risk, but longer walking bouts would enable more precise estimates of biomechanical variables. Third, participants walked on a treadmill, limiting comparisons to overground studies¹. Observed changes in some variables with speed may be conservative compared to changes in overground walking, such as peak GRFs and joint moments^{34,35}. However, participants were also instructed to hold a handrail, which was necessary to ensure safe walking at fast speeds. While this approach is consistent with one prior study, handrail use may alter kinematic and kinetic gait variables and thus limits the generalizability of our findings to gait without handrail support^{3,36}. Quantifying how forces generated on the handrails affect changes in post-stroke biomechanics with speed may explain conflicting results between studies and between individuals in the same study.

Implications for treadmill training and future research

In the context of treadmill-based gait rehabilitation, our results suggest that training at the fastest safe speed is not always best *if the goal is to improve the quality of gait biomechanics*. Rather, speed should be optimized to maximize the quality of specific biomechanical variables of interest. However, improving gait speed is another important functional goal of post-stroke gait rehabilitation^{4,7}. For some stroke survivors, gait training speed

477 selection should consider the tradeoff between the benefits of training at the fastest safe speed on community
478 ambulation ability and its impact on biomechanical quality³⁷. Importantly, our findings are constrained to the
479 *immediate* effects of speed on biomechanical quality. Future studies on the effects of longer-duration walking at
480 a range of speeds (e.g., a dose-response clinical trial evaluating effects of training speed) may reveal new and
481 important insights about how gait speed, gait quality, and training benefits interact. Finally, differential changes
482 in some biomechanical variables with speed highlight the need for holistic metrics of overall gait quality.
483 Holistic data-driven metrics that are sensitive to tradeoffs between biomechanical magnitude, compensations,
484 and inter-limb asymmetry may facilitate patient-specific optimization of gait training speeds.

486 **CONCLUSIONS**

487 This study refines a current perspective in post-stroke gait training—that training at the fastest safe speed
488 maximizes biomechanical quality—by showing that walking at the fastest safe speed does not maximize
489 biomechanical quality for all individuals and all variables. When using treadmill training to elicit mass stepping
490 practice of high-quality biomechanics, our findings suggest that walking speed should be optimized, not
491 necessarily maximized, for an individual and biomechanical variable. Challenges with predicting changes in
492 compensatory and inter-limb asymmetry variables with speed highlights the need for innovative data-driven
493 personalized and holistic metrics quantifying biomechanical quality during gait training.

497 **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

498 AGRF: Anterior ground reaction force

499 IC: Initial contact

500 Fast: Fastest safe speed

501 Opt: Optimal speed

502 SS: Self-selected speed

503 TLA: Trailing limb angle

504

505 **DECLARATIONS**

506 **Consent for publication**

507 Not applicable.

508

509 **Data availability**

510 All data generated and analyzed during this study is included in the file *SupplementalData.xlsx*.

511

512 **Competing interests**

513 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

514

515 **Funding**

516 Research reported in this manuscript was supported by the National Institute of Child Health and Human

517 Development under award number F32HD108927 to MR, and R01HD095975 and K01HD079584 to TK. This

518 work was also supported by the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship Program under

519 Grant No. 1937971 to TW. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this

520 material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

521

522 Authors' contributions

523 M.R. and J.L. drafted the original manuscript. M.R. performed analyses and created all figures. J.L., V.S., P.S.,
524 A.S., L.Z., and T.K. collected the data. J.L., H.C., V.S., A.S., P.S., T.W., and T.K. processed the data and
525 performed preliminary analyses. M.R., T.K., J.L., H.C., L.Z., and L.T. interpreted the data. T.K. was involved
526 with all aspects of the study, including design, data-collection, data-processing, analysis, interpretation, and
527 manuscript-preparation. All co-authors contributed to critical review and revisions of the manuscript.

529 Acknowledgements

530 Not applicable

532 REFERENCES

- 533 1 Lamontagne, A. & Fung, J. Faster is better: implications for speed-intensive gait training after stroke.
534 *Stroke* **35**, 2543-2548 (2004).
- 535 2 Dobkin, B. H. Strategies for stroke rehabilitation. *The Lancet Neurology* **3**, 528-536 (2004).
- 536 3 Tyrell, C. M., Roos, M. A., Rudolph, K. S. & Reisman, D. S. Influence of systematic increases in treadmill
537 walking speed on gait kinematics after stroke. *Physical therapy* **91**, 392-403 (2011).
- 538 4 Hornby, T. G. *et al.* Clinical Practice Guideline to Improve Locomotor Function Following Chronic
539 Stroke, Incomplete Spinal Cord Injury, and Brain Injury. *J Neurol Phys Ther* **44**, 49-100,
540 doi:10.1097/NPT.0000000000000303 (2020).
- 541 5 Clark, D. J., Ting, L. H., Zajac, F. E., Neptune, R. R. & Kautz, S. A. Merging of Healthy Motor Modules
542 Predicts Reduced Locomotor Performance and Muscle Coordination Complexity Post-Stroke. *Journal of*
543 *Neurophysiology* **103**, 844-857, doi:10.1152/jn.00825.2009 (2010).
- 544 6 Kettlety, S. A., Finley, J. M., Reisman, D. S., Schweighofer, N. & Leech, K. A. Speed-dependent
545 biomechanical changes vary across individual gait metrics post-stroke relative to neurotypical adults.
546 *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation* **20**, 1-13 (2023).
- 547 7 Bowden, M. G., Balasubramanian, C. K., Behrman, A. L. & Kautz, S. A. Validation of a speed-based
548 classification system using quantitative measures of walking performance poststroke. *Neurorehabil*
549 *Neural Repair* **22**, 672-675, doi:10.1177/1545968308318837 (2008).
- 550 8 Perry, J., Garrett, M., Gronley, J. K. & Mulroy, S. J. Classification of walking handicap in the stroke
551 population. *Stroke* **26**, 982-989 (1995).
- 552 9 Schmid, A. *et al.* Improvements in speed-based gait classifications are meaningful. *Stroke* **38**, 2096-
553 2100, doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.106.475921 (2007).
- 554 10 Jonkers, I., Delp, S. & Patten, C. Capacity to increase walking speed is limited by impaired hip and ankle
555 power generation in lower functioning persons post-stroke. *Gait & posture* **29**, 129-137 (2009).
- 556 11 Little, V. L., McGuirk, T. E., Perry, L. A. & Patten, C. Pelvic excursion during walking post-stroke: A novel
557 classification system. *Gait Posture* **62**, 395-404, doi:10.1016/j.gaitpost.2018.03.052 (2018).

- 558 12 Farris, D. J., Hampton, A., Lewek, M. D. & Sawicki, G. S. Revisiting the mechanics and energetics of
559 walking in individuals with chronic hemiparesis following stroke: from individual limbs to lower limb
560 joints. *Journal of neuroengineering and rehabilitation* **12**, 1-12 (2015).
- 561 13 Awad, L. N., Binder-Macleod, S. A., Pohlig, R. T. & Reisman, D. S. Paretic Propulsion and Trailing Limb
562 Angle Are Key Determinants of Long-Distance Walking Function After Stroke. *Neurorehabil Neural*
563 *Repair* **29**, 499-508, doi:10.1177/1545968314554625 (2015).
- 564 14 Awad, L. N., Lewek, M. D., Kesar, T. M., Franz, J. R. & Bowden, M. G. These legs were made for
565 propulsion: advancing the diagnosis and treatment of post-stroke propulsion deficits. *Journal of*
566 *NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation* **17**, 1-16 (2020).
- 567 15 Kesar, T. M., Reisman, D. S., Higginson, J. S., Awad, L. N. & Binder-Macleod, S. A. Changes in Post-Stroke
568 Gait Biomechanics Induced by One Session of Gait Training. *Phys Med Rehabil Int* **2** (2015).
- 569 16 Farris, D. J. & Sawicki, G. S. The mechanics and energetics of human walking and running: a joint level
570 perspective. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface* **9**, 110-118 (2012).
- 571 17 Bauby, C. E. & Kuo, A. D. Active control of lateral balance in human walking. *Journal of biomechanics*
572 **33**, 1433-1440 (2000).
- 573 18 Awad, L. N., Palmer, J. A., Pohlig, R. T., Binder-Macleod, S. A. & Reisman, D. S. Walking speed and step
574 length asymmetry modify the energy cost of walking after stroke. *Neurorehabilitation and neural repair*
575 **29**, 416-423 (2015).
- 576 19 Ellis, R. G., Howard, K. C. & Kram, R. The metabolic and mechanical costs of step time asymmetry in
577 walking. *Proc Biol Sci* **280**, 20122784, doi:10.1098/rspb.2012.2784 (2013).
- 578 20 van de Port, I. G., Kwakkel, G. & Lindeman, E. Community ambulation in patients with chronic stroke:
579 how is it related to gait speed? *Journal of rehabilitation medicine* **40**, 23-27 (2008).
- 580 21 Kesar, T. M., Binder-Macleod, S. A., Hicks, G. E. & Reisman, D. S. Minimal detectable change for gait
581 variables collected during treadmill walking in individuals post-stroke. *Gait & posture* **33**, 314-317
582 (2011).
- 583 22 Genthe, K. *et al.* Effects of real-time gait biofeedback on paretic propulsion and gait biomechanics in
584 individuals post-stroke. *Topics in stroke rehabilitation* **25**, 186-193 (2018).
- 585 23 Kesar, T., Reisman, D., Higginson, J., Awad, L. & Binder-Macleod, S. Changes in post-stroke gait
586 biomechanics induced by one session of gait training. *Physical medicine and rehabilitation international*
587 **2** (2015).
- 588 24 Reisman, D. S., Rudolph, K. S. & Farquhar, W. B. Influence of Speed on Walking Economy Poststroke.
589 *Neurorehabil Neural Repair* (2009).
- 590 25 Bowden, M. G., Balasubramanian, C. K., Neptune, R. R. & Kautz, S. A. Anterior-posterior ground
591 reaction forces as a measure of paretic leg contribution in hemiparetic walking. *Stroke* **37**, 872-876
592 (2006).
- 593 26 Chen, G., Patten, C., Kothari, D. H. & Zajac, F. E. Gait differences between individuals with post-stroke
594 hemiparesis and non-disabled controls at matched speeds. *Gait Posture* **22**, 51-56 (2005a).
- 595 27 Cohen, J. A power primer. *Psychological bulletin* **112**, 155 (1992).
- 596 28 Glantz, S. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2012).
- 597 29 Jonsdottir, J. *et al.* Functional resources to increase gait speed in people with stroke: strategies
598 adopted compared to healthy controls. *Gait Posture* **29**, 355-359, doi:10.1016/j.gaitpost.2009.01.008
599 (2009).
- 600 30 Finley, J. M., Long, A., Bastian, A. J. & Torres-Oviedo, G. Spatial and temporal control contribute to step
601 length asymmetry during split-belt adaptation and hemiparetic gait. *Neurorehabilitation and neural*
602 *repair* **29**, 786-795 (2015).
- 603 31 Allen, J. L., Kautz, S. A. & Neptune, R. R. The influence of merged muscle excitation modules on post-
604 stroke hemiparetic walking performance. *Clinical Biomechanics* **28**, 697-704 (2013).

605 32 Johnson, R. T., Bianco, N. A. & Finley, J. M. Patterns of asymmetry and energy cost generated from
606 predictive simulations of hemiparetic gait. *PLOS Computational Biology* **18**, e1010466,
607 doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1010466 (2022).

608 33 Palmer, S. & Raftery, J. Opportunity cost. *Bmj* **318**, 1551-1552 (1999).

609 34 Brouwer, B., Parvataneni, K. & Olney, S. J. A comparison of gait biomechanics and metabolic
610 requirements of overground and treadmill walking in people with stroke. *Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon)*
611 **24**, 729-734 (2009).

612 35 Riley, P. O., Paolini, G., Della Croce, U., Paylo, K. W. & Kerrigan, D. C. A kinematic and kinetic
613 comparison of overground and treadmill walking in healthy subjects. *Gait Posture* **26**, 17-24 (2007).

614 36 Chen, G., Patten, C., Kothari, D. H. & Zajac, F. E. Gait deviations associated with post-stroke
615 hemiparesis: improvement during treadmill walking using weight support, speed, support stiffness, and
616 handrail hold. *Gait Posture* **22**, 57-62 (2005b).

617 37 Dickstein, R. Rehabilitation of gait speed after stroke: a critical review of intervention approaches.
618 *Neurorehabil Neural Repair* **22**, 649-660 (2008).

619