

1

2

3

4 **Feature analysis of joint motion while reaching the occiput in patients with mild**
5 **hemiplegia: a cross-sectional study**

6

7

8 **Short title:** Kinematic characteristics of reaching the occiput in hemiplegia

9

10

11 Daigo Sakamoto^{1,2}, Toyohiro Hamaguchi^{2*}, Naohiko Kanemura², Takashi Yasojima², Keisuke

12 Kubota³, Ryota Suwabe¹, Yasuhide Nakayama⁴, Masahiro Abo^{4*}

13

14 ¹ Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, The Jikei University School of Medicine Hospital,

15 Tokyo, Japan

16 ² Department of Rehabilitation, Graduate School of Health Science, Saitama Prefectural

17 University, Saitama, Japan

18 ³ Research Development Center, Saitama Prefectural University, Saitama, Japan

19 ⁴ Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, The Jikei University School of Medicine, Tokyo,

20 Japan

21

22 * Corresponding authors

23 E-mail: hamaguchi-toyohiro@spu.ac.jp (TH), abo@jikei.ac.jp (MA)

25 **Abstract**

26 This cross-sectional study aimed to clarify the kinematic characteristics of reaching
27 the occiput in patients with mild hemiplegia. Ten patients with post-stroke hemiplegia who
28 attended the Department of Rehabilitation Medicine of the Jikei University Hospital and met the
29 eligibility criteria were included. Reaching motion to the back of the head by the participants'
30 paralyzed and non-paralyzed upper limbs was measured using three-dimensional motion
31 analysis, and the motor time, joint angles, and angular velocity were calculated. Multivariate
32 analysis of covariance was performed on these data. After confirming the fit to the binomial
33 logistic regression model, the cutoff values were calculated using the receiver operating
34 characteristic curve. The cutoff values for the movement until the hand reached the back of the
35 head were 1.6 s for the motor time, 55° for the maximum shoulder joint flexion angle, and 145°
36 for the maximum elbow joint flexion angle. The cutoff values for the movement from the back
37 of the head to the hand being returned to its original position were 1.6 s for the motor time, 145°
38 for the maximum elbow joint flexion angle, 53°/s for the maximum angular velocity of shoulder
39 joint abduction, and 62°/s for the maximum angular velocity of elbow joint flexion. The
40 numbers of clusters were three, four, and four for the outward non-paralyzed side, outward and
41 return paralyzed side, and return non-paralyzed side, respectively. The findings obtained by this
42 study can be used for practice planning in patients with mild hemiplegia who aim to improve the
43 reaching motion to the occiput.

44

45 **Introduction**

46 Stroke affects 14 million individuals annually worldwide, and 80 million people live
47 with the aftereffects of stroke [1]. Motor paralysis, a sequela of stroke, occurs in approximately
48 80% of patients [2]. As motor paralysis of the upper limbs and fingers limits patients' activities

49 of daily living (ADLs) and decreases their quality of life (QOL), patients are provided with
50 continuous rehabilitation to improve motor paralysis [3,4].

51 Reaching the occiput is an important exercise for achieving rehabilitation. Reaching is
52 a fundamental movement of the upper limb, with the goal of reaching the target point [5].
53 Although there are various target points for reaching, such as a space or an object on a desk, a
54 reach whose target point is one's body has a direct influence on self-care performance. The
55 movement of the hand to the back of the head is included in movements for grooming, such as
56 washing, tying hair, and putting on and taking off clothes, ornaments and hats [6]. Improving
57 the patient's appearance positively affects their QOL through social participation, such as going
58 out and socializing. Reaching the back of the head requires a wide range of motion and
59 coordinated joint movement of the shoulder and elbow joints and is a difficult task for patients
60 with motor paralysis; therefore, even if the patient's motor paralysis is mild, smooth movement
61 requires practice [7,8]. Therefore, therapists monitor changes in patients owing to exercise and
62 treatment and provides further treatment based on the evaluation.

63 Clinically, the arm function test, manual function test, and action research arm test
64 (ARAT) are used for upper extremity function assessment to observe the reach to the occiput
65 include [9–11]. In these tests, the examiner observes whether the patient can perform the task
66 and the reaching position of the patient's hand at the end of the motor limb; the test is scored
67 using an ordinal scale. However, as the human body has redundant degrees of freedom, multiple
68 combinations of joint motions exist, even when the final hand position is the same [12].
69 Specifically, in patients with hemiplegia after stroke, synergistic patterns may emerge, and
70 compensatory movements may be used [13]. In patients with motor paralysis, even if reaching
71 the occiput is possible, the motion trajectory may be prolonged and the motion time may be
72 delayed. The scores obtained using the clinically used evaluation methods alone are difficult to
73 refer to when planning exercises to change a patient's joint movement patterns or shorten the
74 motor time of exercises.

75 Three-dimensional motion analysis is used for analyzing upper limb movement
76 characteristics in patients with stroke [14]. In this method, markers are attached to landmarks on
77 the body and upper limb movements are recorded using an infrared camera and analyzed.
78 Studies have been conducted to analyze the joint motion and motion time of patients with stroke
79 using three-dimensional motion analysis [15–18]. In these studies, reaching a target placed in
80 front or on a desk is occasionally set as the measurement task. However, it is difficult to utilize
81 the obtained results for practice because of the discrepancy between the results and the upper
82 limb movements in daily activities [19]. As the tasks are measured in a manner that is close to
83 daily life situations, the results can be easily applied to the treatment of patients [20,21]. Several
84 studies have evaluated healthy participants and patients with orthopedic diseases in terms of
85 their ability to reach the occipital region; however, the kinematic characteristics of patients with
86 stroke with mild motor paralysis have not been verified [7,8,22]. The data on the kinematic
87 characteristics of patients with stroke with regard to reaching backward to the occiput would
88 provide a useful basis for devising a practice method for those who aim to acquire ADLs,
89 including reaching backward to the occiput. When upper limb motor tasks are measured using a
90 three-dimensional motion analyzer, the motions of the paralyzed and non-paralyzed sides should
91 be compared [23]. The movements of the non-paralytic upper limb in patients with hemiplegia
92 after stroke differ from those of normal participants; however, the non-paralytic upper limb,
93 which does not show obvious functional impairment, can be used in clinical situations for
94 comparison with the paralytic upper limb [23,24]. In a recent study, accelerometers, gyroscopic
95 sensors, and magnetic sensors were attached to the bodies of patients with stroke. The results of
96 four types of forward reaching were compared between the paralyzed and non-paralyzed upper
97 limbs using three-dimensional motion analysis to obtain evaluation values for patients with mild
98 hemiplegia based on the motor time and joint angle of the non-paralyzed side of the upper limb
99 [25]. Three-dimensional motion analysis is clinically useful because the motion of the non-

100 paralyzed upper limb is referenced, and the joint motion patterns of the paralyzed upper limb
101 can be used to devise isolation exercises to be practiced [19].

102 Based on the above discussion, in this study, we aimed to clarify the kinematic
103 characteristics of patients with mild hemiplegia in the chronic phase while reaching the occipital
104 region using three-dimensional motion analysis. Our results will provide a basis for devising
105 motor targets and effective exercises to reach the occiput in patients with posterior upper limb
106 hemiplegia.

107

108 **Materials and methods**

109 **Study design**

110 In this cross-sectional study, kinematic data of patients with post-stroke hemiplegia
111 were obtained while reaching the hand to the back of the head, and the patient's paralyzed and
112 non-paralyzed upper limbs were compared.

113

114 **Ethical considerations**

115 All patients provided written informed consent to participate in this study. This study
116 was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Jikei University School of Medicine (approval
117 number: 22-061-6238).

118

119 **Participants**

120 Patients with post-stroke hemiplegia who attended the Department of Rehabilitation
121 Medicine of the Jikei University Hospital between May 1 to October 30, 2020, cases where at
122 least 6 months had passed since the onset of stroke, patients aged ≥ 20 years, and those with a

123 total score of ≥ 47 points in the Fugl–Meyer assessment of the upper extremity (FMA-UE) or
124 with a gross movement score of ≥ 6 points in the ARAT, were included. The 47 points achieved
125 in the FMA-UE is the cutoff for mild motor paralysis in the severity classification of motor
126 paralysis reported by Woodbury et al. [26]. The gross movement in the ARAT includes a task to
127 reach the back of the head, and 6 points of gross movement is the threshold for patients who can
128 perform this movement [10]. The exclusion criteria were as follows: cases with a paralyzed
129 hand not reaching the external occipital ridge with automatic movements; presence of a central
130 nervous system disease other than stroke, orthopedic disease, mental disorder, higher brain
131 dysfunction, dementia, visual field disorder, and ataxia at diagnosis; subluxation of the shoulder
132 joint; pain in the joints of the upper limb or fingers during exercise; presence of a significant
133 limitation in the joint range of motion in the upper limb; and completion of the occupational
134 therapy intervention. Patients who met the study eligibility criteria but did not meet the
135 exclusion criteria were asked to participate in the study, and those who provided consent were
136 considered participants.

137

138 **Sample size**

139 The minimum sample size was calculated to be eight patients using G*Power 3.1
140 (University of Dusseldorf, Dusseldorf, Germany). To calculate the cutoff values of the
141 kinematic data by performing binomial logistic regression analysis using the paralyzed and non-
142 paralyzed upper limbs as nominal variables in patients with hemiplegia, data from previous
143 studies [27], in which the primary assessment was the joint angle, were referenced. The sample
144 size was calculated by setting the difference from the constant (binomial test, one sample case).
145 For calculating the required sample size, the effect size was 0.4, α was 0.05, power (1- β) was
146 0.8, and constant proportion was 0.5.

147

148 Survey period

149 The acquisition of patients' medical information, clinical evaluation, and measurement
150 of motor tasks began on October 1, 2020, and ended on October 1, 2021.

151

152 Experimental procedure

153 The examiner affixed infrared reflective markers at 35 points on the participant's body
154 according to the Plug-in Gait marker model (Fig 1). Infrared reflective markers were applied by
155 a single examiner similarly in all participants according to the following procedure: the
156 examiner made the participants sit on a backless chair with their elbow joints fully extended,
157 their forearms in the middle, and their upper limbs drooped. The examiner adjusted the height
158 and position of the chair such that the participants' forearms and fingers did not touch the chair,
159 and the flexion angles of the knee and hip joints were 90°. The participants sat on a height-
160 adjusted chair with their feet shoulder-width apart and both soles of their feet on the floor. Six
161 thermal imaging cameras were placed on the ceiling of the room, and a landmark was placed 5
162 m away from the participants (Fig 2).

163

164 **Fig 1. Attachment positions of the markers.** (a) Frontal image and (b) rear image.

165

166 Markers were affixed at 35 points on the bodies of the participants. On the head, they
167 were placed at four bilateral anterolateral and posterolateral points; on the trunk, they were
168 placed at five points on the upper sternal body, lower sternal spine, seventh cervical vertebra,
169 10th thoracic vertebra, and right posterior back; and on the pelvis, at four points on the bilateral
170 anterior and posterior superior iliac spines. On the upper limbs, they were affixed at 10 points
171 on the bilateral upper acromion, lateral olecranon, radial and ulnar eminence, and the head of

172 the second metacarpal. On the lower limbs, they were affixed at 12 points on the bilateral femur,
173 lateral patella, tibia, calcaneus, external calcaneus, and head of the second metatarsal bone.

174

175 **Fig 2. Measurement environment and starting limb position.** (a) Top view and (b) side view.

176

177 **Reaching task**

178 The starting position of the upper limb on the measurement side was set with the
179 elbow in full extension, forearm in mid-extension, and fingers in extension, with the forearm
180 and fingers not in contact with the chair. The upper limb on the non-tested side was also placed
181 in the same position. If the starting position was difficult to achieve owing to paralysis and
182 muscle tone, the participants were reminded to relax the muscles of the upper limbs and fingers,
183 and the upper limbs were allowed to droop as much as possible (Fig 2b).

184 The reaching task involved placing the palmar aspect of the hand (the palmar aspect of
185 the second metacarpal) in contact with the center of the external occipital ridge. The examiner
186 provided the following verbal instructions to all participants: “touch the center of the occiput
187 with the palm of the hand”; “return the upper limbs to the starting posture; maintain the head,
188 neck, and trunk as still as possible while looking at the landmarks placed in front during the
189 measurement”; and “move the arms as usual without any particular awareness of speed.”
190 Flexion of the fingers during the reaching motion was allowed. The examiner asked the
191 participants to perform the exercise several times and checked whether they understood the
192 instructions correctly.

193 Measurements were performed on the paralyzed and non-paralyzed sides, in that
194 order, five times each for a total of 10 measurements (Fig 3). A 1-min rest period was allowed
195 between the measurements. Before each measurement, the examiner verified whether the
196 participants were in the correct starting position. The order of the measurements did not change,

197 and all participants underwent measurements in the same manner. During the rest period, the
198 participants were allowed to stretch the muscles by themselves but were not allowed to receive
199 any therapeutic intervention from the therapist.

200

201 **Fig 3. Measurement sequence.**

202

203 **Data acquisition and analysis**

204 The reaching task was analyzed using an optical three-dimensional motion analyzer
205 (Vicon motion system; Oxford, UK). Data were recorded at a sampling rate of 100 Hz using six
206 infrared cameras mounted on the ceiling of the examination room. The displacement
207 information for each marker was compiled in three dimensions using parallax images from the
208 six cameras, converted into positions (x, y, and z) in the same virtual space, and recorded on a
209 personal computer for analysis. The motion was divided into an outward motion from the
210 starting position until the hand reached the occiput (outward motion) and a return motion from
211 the point when the hand reached the occiput until it returned to its original position (return
212 motion). The onset of the outward and return motions was defined as the time when the position
213 data of the index finger marker in the three-dimensional space changed continuously for 0.2 s,
214 and the end of the movement was defined as the time when the position data of the index finger
215 marker recorded the same value continuously for 0.2 s [28].

216 A whole-body rigid-body linkage model was constructed from the acquired reflective
217 marker information using the Plug-in gait model specified by the Vicon motion system [29].
218 The flexion and abduction angles of the shoulder joint as well as the flexion angle of the elbow
219 joint were calculated using the Eulerian method, in which the joint angles are calculated from
220 the distal body segment coordinates in motion relative to the proximal body segment
221 coordinates. The angular velocity was calculated by dividing the change in the joint angle by the

222 time of motion. The displacements of the markers attached to the sternal pattern and occiput on
223 the same side as the measured upper limb during the measurement were calculated using the
224 position data in three-dimensional space. The mean, standard deviation, and maximum and
225 minimum values of the joint angles and angular velocities of shoulder flexion and abduction and
226 elbow flexion, and displacements of the sternal pattern and occipital markers were calculated
227 separately for outward and return motions.

228

229 **Clinical evaluation**

230 The FMA was used to assess the motor paralysis of the participants. The FMA is a
231 comprehensive evaluation battery that tests motor function, balance, sensory function, joint
232 range of motion, and the degree of joint pain in patients with post-stroke hemiplegia [30]. Upper
233 and lower extremity motor function (FMA of the lower extremity [FMA-LE]) items can be used
234 in excerpts and assess isolated movements in accordance with the recovery phase of motor
235 paralysis. The FMA-UE is scored on a 66-point scale, and the FMA-LE is scored on a 34-point
236 scale on a 3-point ordinal scale. The FMA-UE has been reported to classify the severity of
237 motor paralysis, and the severity of motor paralysis was investigated in the present study based
238 on the classification given by Woodbury et al. [26]. The ARAT and Box and Block Test (BBT)
239 were used to assess the participant's ability to manipulate objects. The ARAT is an upper limb
240 function assessment tool, which was developed based on the upper extremity test [31]. The
241 ARAT consists of grasp, grip, pinch, and gross movement subtests and is scored on a 4-point
242 ordinal scale on a 57-point scale [10]. The BBT is used to evaluate hand dexterity. The task is to
243 move 100 blocks from one compartment of a box to the opposite compartment one by one
244 across a partition [32,33]. In this test, the number of blocks moved per minute is measured. The
245 modified Ashworth scale (mAs) was used to assess the muscle tone of the study participants.
246 The mAs is used to evaluate spasticity, a symptom of abnormal muscle tone in central nervous

247 system diseases [34]. In this test, the resistance to rapid movement of the joints in an alternating
248 manner is evaluated on a 6-point scale. In this study, the biceps brachii muscle of the paralyzed
249 side of the participants was evaluated. The Berg balance scale (BBS) and the functional reach
250 test (FRT) were used to assess the participant's balance function. The BBS is used to evaluate
251 the functional balance ability and is useful as an indicator of walking independence and fall
252 prediction [35,36]. The test is scored on a 5-point ordinal scale on a 56-point scale. The FRT is
253 a balance ability assessment that measures the distance of the forward reach of the upper limb in
254 the standing position without changing the basal plane of support [37]. In this work, the FRT
255 was performed three times, and the mean value was calculated. The Semmes–Weinstein
256 monofilament test (SWT) and the thumb search test (TST) were used to evaluate the sensory
257 function of the participants. The SWT is used to examine static tactile sensations related to
258 object properties, discrimination ability, and sustained grasping [38]. In this test, five types of
259 nylon filaments with different diameters are used to stimulate the skin, and the participant's
260 responses are evaluated. The TST is used to evaluate the joint localization of the upper limb
261 [39]. This test integrates the proprioceptive information of each joint of the upper limb and
262 evaluates the perception of thumb position in space on a 4-point ordinal scale. The Barthel
263 Index (BI) was used to assess participants' daily functioning in this study. The BI is used to
264 assess the level of independence in performing ADLs [40]. The test consists of 10 items, and the
265 degree of assistance is evaluated using a 4-point ordinal scale. If the patient independently
266 performs all items, the score is 100 points; if the patient requires full assistance for all items, the
267 score is 0 points.

268

269 **Participant characteristics**

270 Basic and medical information regarding the participants, including sex, age, height,
271 body mass index (BMI), stroke type, post-stroke duration, and paralytic side, was collected from

272 their medical records. The Edinburgh hand test was used to examine the handedness of the
273 participants [41]. This test consists of 10 questions, in which the participants are asked which
274 hand they use to perform ADLs. A positive index indicates right-handedness, whereas a
275 negative index indicates left-handedness. In this study, the dominant hand before the stroke and
276 the current dominant hand were investigated.

277

278 **Statistical analysis**

279 Multivariate analysis of covariance was conducted to test the hypothesis that the
280 kinematic characteristics of reaching the back of the head in patients with mild hemiplegia in
281 the chronic phase differ between the paralyzed and non-paralyzed upper limbs. The dependent
282 variable was the measured side of the reaching task, and the independent variables were motor
283 time, maximum values of joint angles, and angular velocities of shoulder flexion and abduction
284 and elbow flexion. The covariates included sex, age, BMI, time since stroke onset, maximum
285 displacement of the sternal pattern, and occipital markers. Statistical analyses were conducted
286 separately for the outbound and return motions. Binomial logistic regression analysis was
287 conducted on the features fitted to the model for the paralyzed and non-paralyzed sides using
288 multivariate analysis of covariance. After confirming the fit of the binomial logistic regression
289 model, Youden's index was calculated using the receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve,
290 and the cutoff value to discriminate between the paralyzed and non-paralyzed sides was
291 calculated. The calculated cutoffs, especially the area under the curve (AUC) values, were
292 compared using the DeLong test [42]. The dependent variables were the paralyzed and non-
293 paralyzed sides, and the independent variables were the characteristics that showed significant
294 differences between the paralyzed and non-paralyzed sides in the multivariate analysis. The
295 covariates included sex, age, BMI, post-onset period, and the maximum displacement values of

296 sternal pattern markers and occipital markers. For these analyses, jamovi version 2.2.1
297 (<https://www.jamovi.org>) was used.

298 Pattern identification using random forest clustering was performed to analyze the
299 pattern of changes in the joint angle on the paralyzed and non-paralyzed sides of reaching the
300 occipital region. Random forest clustering is an algorithm that divides the data into several
301 clusters, virtually partitioning the data such that each observation belongs to only one group.
302 The clustering method is an unsupervised method that uses the random forest algorithm,
303 wherein the dependent variable y is set as T , the number of decision trees, and the machine is
304 trained with each motor data input as unlabeled data with and without motor paralysis (Equation
305 1). The random forest algorithm generates a proximity matrix that estimates the distance
306 between the observations based on the frequency of observations ending at the same leaf node
307 (Equation 2). These data consist of continuous variables [43–45].

308

309 $(x,y) = (x_1,x_2,x_3,\dots,x_k,y) \dots$ (Equation 1)

310 $IG(D_p, f) = I(D_p) - \frac{N_{left}}{N_p}I(D_{left}) - \frac{N_{right}}{N_p}I(D_{right}) \dots$ (Equation 2)

311

312 In Equation 1, x is the reference dataset and y is the dependent variable. In Equation 2,
313 D_p is the parent dataset, f is the number of explanatory variables, N is the depth of the decision
314 tree, D_{left} is the left child node from the parent node, D_{right} is the right child node from the parent
315 node, and I is the impurity. The variables used were the motor time and shoulder flexion,
316 shoulder abduction, and elbow flexion angles. Each variable C was assigned a discrete-valued
317 class label, that is, $C_0, C_1, C_2, \dots, C_n$, using random forest clustering. The motor patterns were
318 clustered for four conditions: outward and return motions on the paralyzed and non-paralyzed
319 sides of the reach to the occipital region. The number of clusters was determined using the
320 elbow method. The elbow method plots the sum of squares of the intra-cluster error for each
321 cluster and considers the point where the value sharply decreases to be the optimal number of

322 clusters [46]. The clustering structure of these four conditions is illustrated and is considered a
323 unique pattern underlying the motion data. JASP version 0.16 (<https://jasp-stats.org/>) was used
324 to identify these patterns. The statistical significance level was set at 5%.

325

326 **Results**

327 **Participants**

328 In total, 88 patients with chronic stroke had a history of intervention in the previous 6
329 months. Among these patients, three were aged <20 years, and 60 had FMA-UE or ARAT
330 scores below the inclusion criteria. One patient was diagnosed with higher brain dysfunction,
331 two had ataxia, two had shoulder subluxation, and seven completed the occupational therapy
332 intervention. Of the 88 patients, 75 were excluded and 13 met the inclusion criteria set for the
333 study. These 13 patients were asked to participate in the study; three patients who did not agree
334 to participate were excluded; therefore, 10 patients were included in the final analysis (Fig 4).

335

336 **Fig 4. Patient selection procedure.**

337

338 **Descriptive data**

339 The characteristics of the participants and the survey results are presented in Table 1.
340 In total, 10 participants were included, of whom three were female and seven were male
341 individuals. All the participants had right hemiplegia. The right hand was dominant in 10
342 participants before the onset of FMA-UE and changed to the left hand in five of 10 participants
343 after the onset of FMA-UE. The severity of FMA-UE was moderate in one patient and mild in
344 nine patients. One participant classified as moderate met the eligibility criterion of at least 6
345 points for gross movement on the ARAT. The median scores of all the participants were 34

346 points on the ARAT and 24 points on the paralytic side in the BBT. Eight and two patients had
 347 mAs scores of 1 and 1+, respectively. None of the patients showed severe spasticity. The FMA-
 348 LE score, BBS score, and FRT were 28 points, 55 points, and 33 cm, respectively. The
 349 participants had good lower limb, trunk, and balance functions. The SWT was normal in seven
 350 participants and lowered in three, while the TST was normal in nine participants and lowered in
 351 one; there was no significant decrease in the superficial or deep sensation in the participants. All
 352 participants had a BI score of 100 points and independently performed all daily activities.
 353

Table 1. Clinical characteristics of the patients.

Characteristics		Female	Male	All
Participants		3 (30)	7 (70)	10 (100)
Age (years)		50 [35–51]	46 [46–55]	48 [45–51]
Height (cm)		154 [152–159]	170 [169–173]	169 [164–171]
Weight (kg)		51 [51–56]	72 [66–77]	66 [55–73]
BMI (kg/m ²)		23 [21–24]	25 [22–26]	25 [20–25]
Time from onset (months)		59 [37–83]	53 [38–78]	54 [34–91]
Diagnosis	CI	3 (100)	3 (43)	6 (60)
	ICH	0 (0)	4 (57)	4 (40)
Paralyzed side	Left	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	Right	3 (100)	7 (100)	10 (100)
Dominant hand				
Before onset	Left	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	Right	3 (100)	7 (100)	10 (100)
After onset	Left	2 (67)	3 (43)	5 (50)
	Right	1 (33)	4 (57)	5 (50)

FMA-UE		56 [52–57]	57 [55–60]	57 [55–58]
FMA-UE severity				
Moderate ($20 \leq \text{score} \leq 46$)		0 (0)	1 (14)	1 (10)
Mild ($\text{score} \geq 47$)		3 (100)	6 (86)	9 (90)
FMA-LE		28 [25–28]	30 [28–31]	28 [28–30]
<hr/>				
ARAT		31 [23–34]	43 [28–50]	34 [27–45]
<hr/>				
BBT	Paralyzed side	22 [12–25]	25 [10–38]	24 [7–28]
	Non-paralyzed side	53 [53–56]	59 [53–61]	57 [53–60]
<hr/>				
mAs	0	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	1	2 (67)	6 (86)	8 (80)
	1+	1 (33)	1 (14)	2 (20)
<hr/>				
BBS		55 [54–55]	56 [55–56]	55 [55–56]
FRT (cm)		29 [28–30]	38 [33–40]	33 [29–39]
<hr/>				
SWT	Normal	3 (100)	4 (57)	7 (70)
	Decline	0 (0)	3 (43)	3 (30)
<hr/>				
TST	Normal	3 (100)	6 (86)	9 (90)
	Decline	0 (0)	1 (14)	1 (10)
<hr/>				
BI		100 [100]	100 [100]	100 [100]

Values are expressed as numbers (%) or medians [25th–75th percentile].

ARAT, action research arm test; BBS, Berg balance scale; BBT, Box and Block Test; BI, Barthel Index; BMI, body mass index; CI, cerebral infarction; FMA-LE, Fugl-Meyer assessment of the lower extremity; FMA-UE, Fugl-Meyer assessment of the upper extremity; FRT, functional reach test; ICH, intracranial hemorrhage; mAs, modified Ashworth scale; SWT, Semmes-Weinstein monofilament test; TST, thumb search test.

355 **Outcome data**

356 Tables 2 and 3 present the results for the kinematic data on outward and inward
357 reaching motions. Fig 5 shows the changes in the joint angles of shoulder flexion, shoulder
358 abduction, and elbow flexion during the outward and return motions of the reaching motion.

Table 2. Outward motion of the reaching task: results of multivariate analysis of covariance.

Descriptive statistics		Paralyzed side				Non-paralyzed side				F	p
		Mean	SD	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Min	Max		
Motor time (s)		2.3	0.7	1.5	4.4	1.3	0.3	0.9	1.9	136.6	<0.001
	Shoulder flex	48.9	15.4	24.4	75.1	42.3	11.2	23.2	59.5	15.3	<0.001
Peak angle (°)	Shoulder abd	117.5	16.7	88.8	156.8	118.9	6.2	102.7	129.2	0.3	0.560
	Elbow flex	134.2	8.0	113.0	145.0	140.0	6.1	120.6	145.6	19.5	<0.001
Peak angular velocity (°/s)	Shoulder flex	213.6	190.8	71.8	893.6	180.5	88.5	70.6	524.8	1.4	0.237
	Shoulder abd	306.0	249.4	90.3	1116.3	271.3	109.6	142.6	792.5	0.9	0.339
	Elbow flex	211.6	118.6	80.6	658.6	252.9	142.5	115.3	887.0	2.9	0.090
Displacement (mm)	Manubrium	4.8	4.7	0.5	16.4	2.9	4.4	0.4	29.3	-	-
	Back of the head	1.0	19.9	1.8	141.2	8.5	6.0	0.5	24.2	-	-

abd, abduction; flex, flexion; Max, maximum; Min, minimum; SD, standard deviation.

Multivariate analysis of covariance was used, with the statistical significance set at 0.05 (N = 10). The manubrium and back of the head displacements were used as covariates.

Table 3. Return motion of the reaching task: results of multivariate analysis of covariance.

Descriptive statistics		Paralyzed side				Non-paralyzed side				F	p
		Mean	SD	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Min	Max		
Motor time (s)		2.3	0.7	1.5	4.2	1.5	0.3	1.0	2.2	98.4	<0.001
	Shoulder flex	50.3	15.1	25.2	70.2	46.9	12.8	23.9	71.9	3.7	0.057
Peak angle (°)	Shoulder abd	116.9	16.2	89.2	156.6	121.1	6.9	102.7	139.0	3.2	0.075
	Elbow flex	134.2	8.1	110.3	145.1	140.0	6.1	120.5	145.0	19.0	<0.001
	Shoulder flex	122.7	103.4	13.1	405.6	79.2	43.9	17.6	235.6	7.4	0.008
Peak angular velocity (°/s)	Shoulder abd	81.7	87.1	-4.3	359.7	34.2	32.3	-5.6	132.9	13.9	<0.001
	Elbow flex	95.4	98.1	-1.0	428.5	48.9	41.8	-12.1	187.5	9.4	0.003
Displacement (mm)	Manubrium	29.6	167.6	0.5	1190.0	4.1	4.9	0.5	19.6	-	-
	Back of the head	9.1	20.2	1.4	145.4	5.9	4.4	0.7	19.4	-	-

abd, abduction; flex, flexion; Max, maximum; Min, minimum; SD, standard deviation.

Multivariate analysis of covariance was used, with the statistical significance set at 0.05 (N = 10). The displacements of the manubrium and back of the head were used as covariates.

361 **Fig 5. Changes in the joint angle during the reaching motion.** (a) Changes in the shoulder
362 flex angle, (b) changes in the shoulder abd angle, (c) changes in the elbow flex angle while
363 reaching the occiput, (d) changes in the shoulder flex angle, (e) changes in the shoulder abd
364 angle, and (f) changes in the elbow flex angle while reaching from the occiput to the starting
365 limb position. abd, abduction; flex, flexion.

366

367 **Main findings**

368 **Detection of motion features**

369 Multivariate analysis of covariance was performed. For the outward motion of the
370 reaching task, Wilks' lambda test showed a significant main effect ($F [7, 86] = 25.1, p < 0.001$)
371 on the measurement side. The paralyzed side had a significantly longer motor time ($F = 136.6, p$
372 < 0.001). The peak shoulder flexion angle was significantly greater on the paralyzed side ($F =$
373 $15.3, p < 0.001$), and the peak elbow flexion angle was significantly greater on the non-
374 paralyzed side ($F = 19.5, p < 0.001$). There were no differences in the peak shoulder abduction
375 angle ($F = 0.3, p = 0.560$) and peak angular velocities of shoulder flexion ($F = 1.4, p = 0.237$),
376 shoulder abduction ($F = 0.9, p = 0.339$), and elbow flexion ($F = 2.9, p = 0.090$; Table 2). For the
377 return motion of the reaching task, Wilks' lambda test showed a significant main effect ($F [7,$
378 $86] = 31.5, p < 0.001$) on the measured side. Motor time ($F = 98.4, p < 0.001$) was significantly
379 longer on the paralyzed side, as were the peak elbow flexion angle ($F = 19.0, p < 0.001$) and the
380 peak angular rates of shoulder flexion ($F = 7.4, p = 0.008$), shoulder abduction ($F = 13.9, p <$
381 0.001), and elbow flexion ($F = 9.4, p = 0.003$). There was no significant difference in the peak
382 shoulder flexion angle ($F = 3.7, p = 0.057$) or peak shoulder abduction angle ($F = 3.2, p = 0.075$;
383 Table 3).

384 Binomial logistic regression analysis of the model-fitted features on the paralyzed and
385 non-paralyzed sides was performed using multivariate analysis of covariance. During the

386 outward motion, the regression model was fitted for the motor time ($X^2 = 112, p < 0.001$), peak
387 shoulder flexion angle ($X^2 = 18.4, p = 0.010$), and peak elbow flexion angle ($X^2 = 24.9, p <$
388 0.001 ; Table 4 and Fig 6). During the return motion, the regression model was fitted for the
389 motor time ($X^2 = 87.5, p < 0.001$), peak elbow flexion angle ($X^2 = 28.8, p < 0.001$), peak
390 angular velocity of shoulder abduction ($X^2 = 18.4, p = 0.01$), and peak angular velocity of elbow
391 flexion ($X^2 = 15.8, p = 0.03$). The peak angular velocity of shoulder flexion ($X^2 = 11.8, p = 0.1$)
392 did not fit the regression model (Table 4 and Fig 7)

Table 4. Model goodness of fit results of the binomial logistic regression analysis.

Model	Deviance	AIC	McFadden's R ²	Overall model test			Estimate	95% CI		SE	Z	p	
				X ²	df	p		Lower	Upper				
Reaching motion to the back of the head													
Motor time (s)	26.4	42.4	0.8	112	7	<0.001	19.0	6.1	32.0	14.3	-2.2	0.030	
Peak angle (°)	Shoulder flex	120	136	0.2	18.4	7	0.010	0.01	0.04	0.2	0.03	3.1	0.001
	Elbow flex	114	130	0.2	24.9	7	<0.001	-0.2	-0.2	-0.1	0.04	-3.7	<0.001
Reaching motion from the back of the head to the starting position													
Motor time (s)	51.1	67.1	0.6	87.5	7	<0.001	-11.2	-21.7	-0.7	5.4	-2.1	0.036	
Peak angle (°)	Elbow flex	110	126	0.2	28.8	7	<0.001	-0.2	-0.26	-0.1	0.04	-3.9	<0.001
Peak angular velocity (°/s)	Shoulder flex	127	143	0.1	11.8	7	0.1	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.003	2.1	0.032
	Shoulder abd	120	136	0.1	18.4	7	0.01	0.01	0.004	0.02	0.01	2.9	0.004
	Elbow flex	123	139	0.1	15.8	7	0.03	0.01	0.002	0.02	0.004	2.5	0.013
abd, abduction; AIC, Akaike's information criterion; flex, flexion; SE, standard error.													

Binomial logistic regression was used, with the statistical significance set at 0.05 (N = 10).

393

394 **Fig 6. Results of the binomial logistic regression analysis for the features of reaching**
395 **motion to the back of the head.** (a) Motor time, (b) peak angle of shoulder flex, and (c) peak
396 angle of elbow flex. flex, flexion.

397

398 **Fig 7. Results of the binomial logistic regression analysis for the features of reaching**
399 **motion from the occiput to the starting position.** (a) Motor time, (b) peak angle of elbow flex,
400 (c) peak angular velocity of shoulder abd, and (d) peak angular velocity of elbow flex. abd,
401 abduction; flex, flexion.

402

403 For features fitted to the regression model, cutoff values were calculated to
404 discriminate between the paralyzed and non-paralyzed sides using the ROC curve. The cutoff
405 values for the outward motion were 1.6 s for the motor time, 55° for the peak shoulder flexion
406 angle, and 145° for the peak elbow flexion angle (Table 5). The cutoff values for the return
407 motion were 1.6 s for the motor time, 145° for the maximum elbow flexion angle, 53°/s for the
408 peak angular velocity of shoulder abduction, and 62°/s for the peak angular velocity of elbow
409 flexion (Table 5). Among the cutoff values detected, the kinematic feature with the highest
410 Youden's index was the motor time for both outward and return motions, whereas the kinematic
411 feature with the largest AUC was the motor time for both the outward motion (AUC = 0.96, SD
412 = 0.02, $p = 0.00$) and return motion (AUC = 0.92, SD = 0.03, $p = 0.00$).

Table 5. Results of the receiver operating characteristic curve.

Scale	Cutoff point	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	Youden's index	AUC	
Reaching the occiput						
Motor time (s)	1.6	80	98	0.78	0.96	
Peak angle (°)	Shoulder flex	55	84	44	0.28	0.63
	Elbow flex	145	96	4	0.00	0.28
Reaching from the occiput to the starting limb position						
Motor time (s)	1.6	78	90	0.68	0.92	
Peak angle (°)	Elbow flex	145	100	6	0.06	0.29
Peak angular velocity (°/s)	Shoulder abd	53	84	48	0.32	0.65
	Elbow flex	62	74	56	0.30	0.67

abd, abduction; AUC, area under the curve; flex, flexion.

Receiver operating characteristic curve was used.

414 **Pattern analysis of upper limb movements**

415 The patterns of changes in the motor time and joint angle on the paralyzed and non-
416 paralyzed sides of the reaching motion to the occipital region were analyzed using random
417 forest clustering. Using the elbow method, the number of clusters was determined from the
418 plotted values of the sum of the squares of the intra-cluster errors for each cluster (Fig 8). The
419 number of clusters was determined to be four for the paralyzed side and three for the non-
420 paralyzed side of the outward motion as well as four for the paralyzed and non-paralyzed sides
421 of the return motion. The clustering structure for the four conditions is presented in Figs 9 and
422 10. As an example, in the results of the motor time on the paralyzed side of the reaching motion
423 to the occiput, four clusters are illustrated. As the abscissa is the z-value, the motor time of
424 cluster 1 was shorter than the cutoff value. By contrast, cluster 2 had motion times within and
425 longer than the cutoff values, and clusters 3 and 4 had longer motion times than the cutoff
426 values. For the outward motion, the number of clusters on the paralyzed side was four (N =
427 11,542; $R^2 = 0.40$; AIC = 27,756; Bayesian information criterion [BIC] = 27,873) and that on
428 the non-paralyzed side was three (N = 6648; $R^2 = 0.41$; AIC = 15,673; BIC = 15,754). For the
429 return motion, the number of clusters on the paralyzed side was four (N = 11,574; $R^2 = 0.34$;
430 AIC = 30,581; BIC = 30,699) and that on the non-paralyzed side was four (N = 7429; $R^2 = 0.50$;
431 AIC = 14974; BIC = 15,085; Table 6).

432

433 **Fig 8. Random forest clustering of the elbow method plot.** A plot of the intra-cluster sums of
434 squares of errors for each cluster is shown in the figure. The number of clusters is (a) four for
435 the paralyzed side and (b) three for the non-paralyzed side of the reaching motion to the occiput;
436 and (c) four for the paralyzed side and (d) four for the non-paralyzed side of the reaching
437 motion from the occiput to the starting position.

438 AIC, Akaike's information criterion; BIC, Bayesian information criterion; WSS, within sum of
439 squares

440

441 **Fig 9. Random forest clustering of the features of reaching motion to the occiput.** The
 442 upper panel shows the clustering structure of the (a) motor time, (b) shoulder flex angle, (c)
 443 shoulder abd angle, and (d) elbow flex angle on the paralyzed side. In the lower panel, the
 444 clustering structure of the (e) motor time, (f) shoulder flex angle, (g) shoulder abd angle, and (h)
 445 elbow flex angle for the non-paralyzed side is shown. The horizontal axis of the figure indicates
 446 the Z-values. The areas of each cluster composed of densities and absolute Z-values of each
 447 parameter are all equal. abd, abduction; flex, flexion.

448

449 **Fig 10. Random forest clustering of the features of reaching motion from the occiput to the**
 450 **starting position.** The upper panel shows the clustering structure of the (a) motor time, (b)
 451 shoulder flex angle, (c) shoulder abd angle, and (d) elbow flex angle on the paralyzed side. In
 452 the lower panel, the clustering structure of the (a) motor time, (b) shoulder flex angle, (c)
 453 shoulder abd angle, and (d) elbow flex angle on the paralyzed side. In the lower panel, the
 454 clustering structure of the (e) motor time, (f) shoulder flex angle, (g) shoulder abd angle, and (h)
 455 elbow flex angle for the non-paralyzed side is shown. The horizontal axis of the figure indicates
 456 the Z-values. The areas of each cluster composed of densities and absolute Z-values of each
 457 parameter are all equal. abd, abduction; flex, flexion.

458

Table 6. Results of random forest clustering.

Measuring side	Clusters	N	R ²	AIC	BIC
Reaching motion to the occiput					
Paralyzed side	4	11542	0.40	27756.22	27873.88
Non-paralyzed side	3	6648	0.41	15673.33	15754.96
Reaching motion from the occiput to the starting position					

Paralyzed side	4	11574	0.34	30581.45	30699.15
Non-paralyzed side	4	7429	0.50	14974.92	15085.53

AIC, Akaike's information criterion; BIC, Bayesian information criterion.

459

460

461 **Discussion**

462 In this study, a multivariate analysis of covariance was conducted to test the
463 hypothesis that the kinematic characteristics differ between the paralyzed and non-paralyzed
464 upper limbs when reaching the occiput in patients with mild hemiplegia in the chronic phase.
465 During the outward reaching motion, the paralyzed side showed a significantly longer motor
466 time and significantly greater peak shoulder flexion angle. In contrast, the peak elbow flexion
467 angle was significantly greater on the non-paralyzed side. During the return reaching motion,
468 the motor time was significantly longer on the paralyzed side and the peak angular velocities of
469 elbow flexion, shoulder flexion, shoulder abduction, and elbow flexion were significantly
470 greater on the paralyzed side. Next, to detect the cutoff values of the motor features that
471 discriminate between the paralyzed and non-paralyzed sides, binomial logistic regression
472 analysis was conducted on the features fitted to the models for the paralyzed and non-paralyzed
473 sides using multivariate analysis of covariance. For the features fitted to the regression model,
474 the cutoff values discriminating between the paralyzed and non-paralyzed sides were calculated
475 using the ROC curve. As a result, during the outward reaching motion, the motor time, peak
476 angular velocity of shoulder flexion, and peak angular velocity of elbow flexion were calculated
477 to be 1.6 s, 55°, and 145°, respectively. During the return reaching motion, the motor time, peak
478 elbow joint flexion angle, peak angular velocity of shoulder abduction, and peak angular
479 velocity of elbow flexion were calculated to be 1.6 s, 145°, 53°/s, and 62°/s, respectively.

480 Therefore, the calculated cutoff values can be used as the target values for treatment to improve
481 the reaching motion to the occiput in patients with mild hemiplegia.

482 Among the cutoff values detected, the kinematic feature with the highest Youden's
483 index was the motor time for both the outward and return reaching motions. Previous studies
484 have reported that patients with stroke have a longer motor time, and the most difficult subitem
485 in the FMA-UE is the motor time in Part D [47,48]. Motor time is presumed to be an index that
486 determines whether the reaching motion to the occiput in a patient is a near-normal motion. In
487 this study, the cutoff value for the peak elbow flexion angle was 145° for both the outward and
488 return reaching motions. Hairdressing with a reaching motion to the back of the head requires
489 the highest elbow joint flexion angle among the verified daily activities [49]. Hence, we inferred
490 that sufficient elbow joint flexion is important to reach the occiput. In the outward reaching
491 motion, the peak angle was significantly larger on the paralyzed side during shoulder flexion
492 and on the non-paralyzed side during elbow flexion. Reaching the paralyzed side in patients
493 with stroke has been reported to result in decreased coordination of the shoulder and elbow joint
494 movements [50]. In the outward motion of reaching training, the goal of the exercise is to
495 shorten the motor time and increase the elbow flexion angle more than the shoulder flexion
496 angle. The cutoff values for angular acceleration of the joints were detected in the return
497 reaching motion. When the hand reached the occiput, the upper limb was in abduction at the
498 shoulder joint and flexion at the elbow joint, which is the joint motion pattern of the flexor
499 muscles of the upper limb that appears after a stroke [51,52]. A previous study reported that
500 muscle spasticity affects the angular acceleration of joints in reaching exercises using the
501 paralyzed upper limb in patients with stroke [53]. The limb position, in which the hand reaches
502 the occiput, induces a joint movement pattern of the upper limb and tends to increase the muscle
503 tone of the flexor muscle group. Therefore, it may be difficult to control the angular velocity of
504 the joint when the upper limb is lowered. In the return motion of reaching training, the practice

505 goal is to shorten the movement time and decrease the angular velocity of shoulder abduction
506 and elbow flexion.

507 In the present study, changes in the motion time and the joint angle of the paralyzed
508 and non-paralyzed sides during the reaching motion to the occipital region were analyzed using
509 random forest clustering. Using these results as a reference, one practical strategy is to
510 approximate the cluster on the paralyzed side to the cluster on the non-paralyzed side of the
511 patient. The motor time of cluster 1 on the paralyzed side in the reaching motion to the occiput
512 was shorter than the cutoff value. The joint angles of cluster 1 in the paralyzed group were
513 similar to those of cluster 1 in the non-paralyzed group. The motor time of cluster 2 on the
514 paralyzed side was within and longer than the cutoff value. Cluster 2 on the paralyzed side
515 exhibited a variety of joint angles similar to those of cluster 2 on the non-paralyzed side. For
516 patients in cluster 2 on the paralyzed side whose motor time was approximately 1.6 s, we
517 suggested that one of the exercises should be to shorten the motor time by reducing the variation
518 in joint angles such that the hand can reach the occiput in the shortest distance. The motor times
519 of patients in paralytic clusters 3 and 4 were longer than the cutoff values. Hence, we
520 recommended that patients in paralytic clusters 3 and 4 practice joint movement patterns to
521 approach the values of those in non-paralytic clusters 1 or 3. When targeting cluster 1 on the
522 non-paralytic side, a method to reduce the changes in the joint angle and shorten the motor time
523 exists. When targeting cluster 3 on the non-paralyzed side, patients in cluster 3 on the paralyzed
524 side should be trained by increasing the angular changes in shoulder flexion and elbow flexion
525 while aiming for a motor time near the cutoff value. For patients in cluster 4 on the paralyzed
526 side, the motor time was aimed to be near the cutoff value, and the goals of practice were to
527 decrease the angular change in shoulder abduction and increase the angular change in elbow
528 flexion (S1 Table).

529 In the reaching motion from the occiput to the starting limb, the motion time of cluster
530 1 on the paralyzed side was shorter than the cutoff value, and, as in the reaching motion to the

531 occiput, the motion pattern of cluster 1 on the paralyzed side was similar to that on the non-
532 paralyzed side. The motor time of cluster 2 on the paralyzed side was within or near the cutoff
533 value. For cluster 2 on the paralyzed side, one of the practice goals was to shorten the motor
534 time. The motor times of clusters 3 and 4 on the paralyzed side were longer than the cutoff
535 values. The joint angles of clusters 3 and 4 on the paralyzed side were similar to those of
536 clusters 3 and 4 on the non-paralyzed side. These results suggest that there is no difference in
537 the motion pattern between the paralyzed and non-paralyzed sides when reaching from the
538 occiput to the starting position. For the reaching motion from the occiput to the starting position,
539 we proposed a practice to control the angular velocity of shoulder abduction and elbow flexion,
540 with the target motor time within or near the cutoff value (S1 Table).

541 This study had several limitations. First, the participants were patients with mild
542 hemiplegia, whose condition persisted for more than 6 months; therefore, the obtained results
543 should be used with caution in patients with early onset of the disease. Furthermore, eight of 10
544 participants in this study had a mAs score of 1 point, and we did not include patients with
545 significant spasticity. Patients with severe motor paralysis are more likely to have strong muscle
546 spasticity and exhibit joint movement patterns in the upper limbs [54]. Patients with severe
547 motor paralysis who are unable to reach the occiput with their hands may have difficulties in
548 practicing joint movement patterns based on the results of this study. Second, we did not
549 compare the movements of the paralyzed upper limbs of patients with stroke with those of
550 healthy participants. Patients with post-stroke hemiplegia also suffer from motor paralysis of the
551 trunk and lower limb muscles, and their balance function may be impaired [55,56], and, during
552 the reaching motion, the trunk and lower limb functions influence the upper limb joint motion
553 [57,58]. Therefore, in this study, the sitting posture at the time of measurement was defined in
554 detail and the displacement of the markers attached to the trunk was used as an adjustment
555 variable in the statistical analysis. Based on the results of the FMA-LE, BBS, and FRT, the
556 participants in this study had mild motor paralysis of the lower limbs and good trunk and

557 balance function. However, how the lower limb and trunk movements as well as the balance
558 strategies for sitting and holding positions were involved in upper limb movements requires
559 further analysis. To target the upper limb movements of individuals with no motor paralysis, an
560 analysis of the upper limb movements of healthy participants is required. Third, the relationship
561 between the dominant hand and joint movement patterns was not examined. The right side was
562 the dominant hand before the disease onset in all participants; however, the current dominant
563 hand changed to the left in five participants. To verify the influence of the dominant hand, joint
564 movement patterns should be compared under the same conditions as those of the dominant
565 hand before the disease onset and at the time of measurement [59]. Fourth, the distal joints of
566 the upper extremities were not analyzed. During the reaching motion, limitations in the joint
567 range of motion in the forearm and wrist joints affect the shoulder joint motion [60]. In this
568 study, the joint motions of the shoulder and elbow joints were analyzed; however, coordination
569 with the distal joints of the upper limb was not verified. Fifth, the motor tasks were measured at
570 patients' comfortable speeds. When the movement is measured at a specified speed, it may
571 cause changes in the joint motion and compensatory movement strategies are needed [61,62]. It
572 remains unclear whether the practice of movement patterns performed in accordance with the
573 optimal movement time and angular velocity on the non-paralyzed side can restore motor
574 paralysis. Further validation is needed to consider these limitations to clinically utilize the
575 practice methods and target values to reproduce movements equivalent to those of the non-
576 paralyzed side without the appearance of spasticity or compensatory movements when upper
577 limb motor paralysis is mild.

578

579 **Conclusions**

580 In this study, the kinematic features and cutoff values while reaching the back of the
581 head in patients with mild hemiplegia in the chronic phase were detected, and patterns of

582 changes in the joint angle were analyzed. Based on our findings, when patients with hemiplegia
583 who can reach the back of the head practice with the goal of smoother upper limb motion, the
584 motion patterns of the non-paralyzed upper limb can be referenced to set the target values of
585 motion time, joint angle, and angular velocity. The motor time of the paralyzed upper limb was
586 measured, and the corresponding clusters were referred to from the results of random forest
587 clustering. The results of this study will be used to plan motor practice strategies that trace the
588 pattern of joint angles of the upper limb without paralysis. Moreover, the results obtained in this
589 study can be used as a reference to devise effective practice methods to improve the reaching
590 motion to the back of the head.

591

592 **Acknowledgments**

593 We would like to thank the occupational therapists at the Department of Rehabilitation
594 Medicine, Jikei University Hospital, for their cooperation in obtaining the data for this study.
595 Moreover, we would like to thank Prof. Michito Namekawa and Prof. Satoshi Kido, Department
596 of Rehabilitation, Graduate School of Health Science, Saitama Prefectural University, for their
597 clinical advice for the successful completion of this study.

598

599 **Author contributions**

600 D.S., T.H. and M.A. collated the literature and conceived the study. D.S., T.H., N.K., T.Y., and
601 Y.N. developed the protocol. D.S. recruited participants and conducted data collections. D.S.,
602 T.H., K.K., and R.S. were involved in data analysis. D.S. wrote the first draft of the manuscript.
603 T.H., N.K., T.Y., Y.N., and M.A. reviewed and edited the manuscript. All authors have agreed
604 with the submitted version of the manuscript.

605

606 **References**

- 607 1. World Stroke Organization. Annual Report 2020. 2020 [accessed 2021 December 1].
608 Available from: <https://www.world-stroke.org/about-wso/annual-reports>
- 609 2. Langhorne P, Bernhardt J, Kwakkel G. Stroke rehabilitation. *Lancet*.
610 2011;377(9778):1693-1702. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(11)60325-5.
- 611 3. van Mierlo ML, van Heugten CM, Post MW, Hajós TR, Kappelle LJ, Visser-Meily JM.
612 Quality of life during the first two years post stroke: the Restore4Stroke Cohort Study.
613 *Cerebrovasc Dis*. 2016;41(1-2):19-26. doi: 10.1159/000441197.
- 614 4. Fugl-Meyer AR, Jääskö L. Post-stroke hemiplegia and ADL-performance. *Scand J*
615 *Rehabil Med Suppl*. 1980;7:140-152.
- 616 5. Karger DW, Bayha F. Engineered work measurement: the principles, techniques and
617 data of methods-time measurement, modern time and motion study, and related
618 applications engineering data. 2nd ed. New York: Industrial Press, 1966.
- 619 6. World Health Organization. International Classification of Functioning, Disability and
620 Health (ICF). 2001 [accessed 2021 December 1]. Available from:
621 [https://www.who.int/standards/classifications/international-classification-of-](https://www.who.int/standards/classifications/international-classification-of-functioning-disability-and-health#:~:text=ICF%20is%20the%20WHO%20framework,and%20measure%20health%20and%20disability)
622 [functioning-disability-and-](https://www.who.int/standards/classifications/international-classification-of-functioning-disability-and-health#:~:text=ICF%20is%20the%20WHO%20framework,and%20measure%20health%20and%20disability)
623 [health#:~:text=ICF%20is%20the%20WHO%20framework,and%20measure%20health](https://www.who.int/standards/classifications/international-classification-of-functioning-disability-and-health#:~:text=ICF%20is%20the%20WHO%20framework,and%20measure%20health%20and%20disability)
624 [%20and%20disability](https://www.who.int/standards/classifications/international-classification-of-functioning-disability-and-health#:~:text=ICF%20is%20the%20WHO%20framework,and%20measure%20health%20and%20disability)
- 625 7. Veeger HE, Magermans DJ, Nagels J, Chadwick EK, van der Helm FC. A kinematical
626 analysis of the shoulder after arthroplasty during a hair combing task. *Clin Biomech*
627 (Bristol, Avon). 2006;21 Suppl 1:S39-44. doi: 10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2005.09.012.
- 628 8. Magermans DJ, Chadwick EK, Veeger HE, van der Helm FC. Requirements for upper
629 extremity motions during activities of daily living. *Clin Biomech* (Bristol, Avon).
630 2005;20(6):591-599. doi: 10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2005.02.006.

- 631 9. Nakamura R, Moriyama S, Yamada Y, Seki K. Recovery of impaired motor function of
632 the upper extremity after stroke. *Tohoku J Exp Med.* 1992;168(1):11-20.doi:
633 10.1620/tjem.168.11.
- 634 10. Lyle RC. A performance test for assessment of upper limb function in physical
635 rehabilitation treatment and research. *Int J Rehabil Res.* 1981;4(4):483-492. doi:
636 10.1097/00004356-198112000-00001.
- 637 11. De Souza LH, Hewer RL, Miller S. Assessment of recovery of arm control in
638 hemiplegic stroke patients. 1. Arm function tests. *Int Rehabil Med.* 1980;2(1):3-9. doi:
639 10.3109/09638288009163947.
- 640 12. Bernshteĭn NA. The co-ordination and regulation of movements. 1st English ed.
641 Oxford: Pergamon Press; 1967. p. 196.
- 642 13. Brunnstrom S. Motor testing procedures in hemiplegia: based on sequential recovery
643 stages. *Phys Ther.* 1966;46(4):357-375. doi: 10.1093/ptj/46.4.357.
- 644 14. Alt Murphy M, Häger CK. Kinematic analysis of the upper extremity after stroke - how
645 far have we reached and what have we grasped? *Phys Ther Rev.* 2015;20(3):137-155.
646 doi: 10.1179/1743288X15Y.0000000002
- 647 15. Alt Murphy M, Willén C, Sunnerhagen KS. Responsiveness of upper extremity
648 kinematic measures and clinical improvement during the first three months after stroke.
649 *Neurorehabil Neural Repair.* 2013;27(9):844-853. doi: 10.1177/1545968313491008.
- 650 16. Patterson TS, Bishop MD, McGuirk TE, Sethi A, Richards LG. Reliability of upper
651 extremity kinematics while performing different tasks in individuals with stroke. *J Mot*
652 *Behav.* 2011;43(2):121-130. doi: 10.1080/00222895.2010.548422.
- 653 17. Wagner JM, Rhodes JA, Patten C. Reproducibility and minimal detectable change of
654 three-dimensional kinematic analysis of reaching tasks in people with hemiparesis after
655 stroke. *Phys Ther.* 2008;88(5):652-663. doi: 10.2522/ptj.20070255.

- 656 18. Caimmi M, Carda S, Giovanzana C, Maini ES, Sabatini AM, Smania N, et al. Using
657 kinematic analysis to evaluate constraint-induced movement therapy in chronic stroke
658 patients. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2008;22(1):31-39. doi:
659 10.1177/1545968307302923.
- 660 19. Schwarz A, Kanzler CM, Lambercy O, Luft AR, Veerbeek JM. Systematic review on
661 kinematic assessments of upper limb movements after stroke. *Stroke*. 2019;50(3):718-
662 727. doi: 10.1161/STROKEAHA.118.023531.
- 663 20. Chen YW, Liao WW, Chen CL, Wu CY. Kinematic descriptions of upper limb function
664 using simulated tasks in activities of daily living after stroke. *Hum Mov Sci*.
665 2021;79:102834. doi: 10.1016/j.humov.2021.102834.
- 666 21. Kim K, Song WK, Lee J, Lee HY, Park DS, Ko BW, et al. Kinematic analysis of upper
667 extremity movement during drinking in hemiplegic subjects. *Clin Biomech (Bristol,*
668 *Avon)*. 2014;29(3):248-256. doi: 10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2013.12.013.
- 669 22. van Andel CJ, Wolterbeek N, Doorenbosch CA, Veeger DH, Harlaar J. Complete 3D
670 kinematics of upper extremity functional tasks. *Gait Posture*. 2008;27(1):120-127. doi:
671 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2007.03.002.
- 672 23. Kwakkel G, van Wegen EEH, Burridge JH, Winstein CJ, van Dokkum LEH, Alt
673 Murphy M, et al. Standardized measurement of quality of upper limb movement after
674 stroke: consensus-based core recommendations from the Second Stroke Recovery and
675 Rehabilitation Roundtable. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2019;33(11):951-958. doi:
676 10.1177/1545968319886477.
- 677 24. de Paiva Silva FP, Freitas SM, Silva PV, Banjai RM, Alouche SR. Ipsilesional arm
678 motor sequence performance after right and left hemisphere damage. *J Mot Behav*.
679 2014;46(6):407-414. doi: 10.1080/00222895.2014.924473.

- 680 25. Schwarz A, Veerbeek JM, Held JPO, Buurke JH, Luft AR. Measures of interjoint
681 coordination post-stroke across different upper limb movement tasks. *Front Bioeng*
682 *Biotechnol.* 2020;8:620805. doi: 10.3389/fbioe.2020.620805.
- 683 26. Woodbury ML, Velozo CA, Richards LG, Duncan PW. Rasch analysis staging
684 methodology to classify upper extremity movement impairment after stroke. *Arch Phys*
685 *Med Rehabil.* 2013;94(8):1527-1533. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2013.03.007.
- 686 27. Cirstea MC, Mitnitski AB, Feldman AG, Levin MF. Interjoint coordination dynamics
687 during reaching in stroke. *Exp Brain Res.* 2003;151(3):289-300. doi: 10.1007/s00221-
688 003-1438-0.
- 689 28. Yuji K, Makoto S, Akihisa O, Kazuhisa T, Yasuhiro T, Toyohiro H. Distinction of
690 students and expert therapists based on therapeutic motions on a robotic device using
691 support vector machine. *J Med Biol Eng.* 2020;40:790-797. doi: 10.1007/s40846-020-
692 00562-3
- 693 29. Limited VMS. Plug-in Gait reference guide. 2021 [accessed 2021 December 1].
694 Available from:
695 <https://docs.vicon.com/display/Nexus212/PDF+downloads+for+Vicon+Nexus>
- 696 30. Fugl-Meyer AR, Jääskö L, Leyman I, Olsson S, Steglind S. The post-stroke hemiplegic
697 patient. 1. a method for evaluation of physical performance. *Scand J Rehabil Med.*
698 1975;7(1):13-31. doi: 10.2340/1650197771331
- 699 31. Carroll D. A quantitative test of upper extremity function. *J Chronic Dis.* 1965;18:479-
700 491. doi: 10.1016/0021-9681(65)90030-5.
- 701 32. Desrosiers J, Bravo G, Hébert R, Dutil E, Mercier L. Validation of the Box and Block
702 Test as a measure of dexterity of elderly people: reliability, validity, and norms studies.
703 *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 1994;75(7):751-755. doi: 10.1016/0003-9993(94)90130-9

- 704 33. Mathiowetz V, Volland G, Kashman N, Weber K. Adult norms for the Box and Block
705 Test of manual dexterity. *Am J Occup Ther.* 1985;39(6):386-391. doi:
706 10.5014/ajot.39.6.386.
- 707 34. Bohannon RW, Smith MB. Interrater reliability of a modified Ashworth scale of muscle
708 spasticity. *Phys Ther.* 1987;67(2):206-207. doi: 10.1093/ptj/67.2.206.
- 709 35. Berg KO, Wood-Dauphinee SL, Williams JI, Maki B. Measuring balance in the elderly:
710 validation of an instrument. *Can J Public Health.* 1992;83 Suppl 2:S7-11.
- 711 36. Berg K. Measuring balance in the elderly: preliminary development of an instrument.
712 *Physiother Can.* 1989;41(6):304-311. doi: 10.3138/ptc.41.6.304
- 713 37. Duncan PW, Weiner DK, Chandler J, Studenski S. Functional reach: a new clinical
714 measure of balance. *J Gerontol.* 1990;45(6):M192-7. doi: 10.1093/geronj/45.6.m192.
- 715 38. Bell-Krotoski J, Tomancik E. The repeatability of testing with Semmes-Weinstein
716 monofilaments. *J Hand Surg Am.* 1987;12(1):155-161. doi: 10.1016/s0363-
717 5023(87)80189-2.
- 718 39. Hirai K. Maternal finger search test - examination of joint localization disorder (in
719 Japanese). *Clin Neurol.* 1986;26:448-454.
- 720 40. Mahoney FI, Barthel DW. Functional evaluation: the Barthel Index. *Md State Med J.*
721 1965;14:61-65. doi: 10.1037/t02366-000
- 722 41. Oldfield RC. The assessment and analysis of handedness: the Edinburgh inventory.
723 *Neuropsychologia.* 1971;9(1):97-113. doi: 10.1016/0028-3932(71)90067-4.
- 724 42. DeLong ER, DeLong DM, Clarke-Pearson DL. Comparing the areas under two or more
725 correlated receiver operating characteristic curves: a nonparametric approach.
726 *Biometrics.* 1988;44(3):837-845. doi: 10.2307/2531595
- 727 43. Tibshirani R, Walther G, Hastie T. Estimating the number of clusters in a data set via
728 the gap statistic. *J R Stat Soc Series B Stat Methodol.* 2001;63(2):411-423. doi:
729 10.1111/1467-9868.00293

- 730 44. Breiman L. Random forests. *Mach Learn*. 2001;45:5-32. doi:
731 10.1023/A:1010933404324
- 732 45. Schwarz G. Estimating the dimension of a model. *Ann Stat*. 1978;6(2):461-464. doi:
733 10.1214/aos/1176344136
- 734 46. Thorndike RL. Who belongs in the family? *Psychometrika*. 1953;18:267-276. doi:
735 10.1007/BF02289263
- 736 47. Tauchi Y, Kyougoku M, Takahashi K, Okita Y, Takebayashi T. Dimensionality and
737 item-difficulty hierarchy of the Fugl-Meyer assessment of the upper extremity among
738 Japanese patients who have experienced stroke. *Top Stroke Rehabil*. 2022;29(8):579-
739 587. doi: 10.1080/10749357.2021.1965797.
- 740 48. Collins KC, Kennedy NC, Clark A, Pomeroy VM. Getting a kinematic handle on reach-
741 to-grasp: a meta-analysis. *Physiotherapy*. 2018;104(2):153-166. doi:
742 10.1016/j.physio.2017.10.002.
- 743 49. Morrey BF, Askew LJ, Chao EY. A biomechanical study of normal functional elbow
744 motion. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 1981;63(6):872-877. doi: 10.2106/00004623-
745 198163060-00002
- 746 50. Schwarz A, Bhagubai MMC, Nies SHG, Held JPO, Veltink PH, Buurke JH, et al.
747 Characterization of stroke-related upper limb motor impairments across various upper
748 limb activities by use of kinematic core set measures. *J Neuroeng Rehabil*.
749 2022;19(1):2. doi: 10.1186/s12984-021-00979-0.
- 750 51. Roh J, Rymer WZ, Beer RF. Evidence for altered upper extremity muscle synergies in
751 chronic stroke survivors with mild and moderate impairment. *Front Hum Neurosci*.
752 2015;9:6. doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2015.00006.
- 753 52. Roh J, Rymer WZ, Perreault EJ, Yoo SB, Beer RF. Alterations in upper limb muscle
754 synergy structure in chronic stroke survivors. *J Neurophysiol*. 2013;109(3):768-781.
755 doi: 10.1152/jn.00670.2012.

- 756 53. Lackritz H, Parmet Y, Frenkel-Toledo S, Baniña MC, Soroker N, Solomon JM, et al.
757 Effect of post-stroke spasticity on voluntary movement of the upper limb. *J Neuroeng*
758 *Rehabil.* 2021;18(1):81. doi: 10.1186/s12984-021-00876-6.
- 759 54. Hijikata N, Kawakami M, Ishii R, Tsuzuki K, Nakamura T, Okuyama K, et al. Item
760 difficulty of Fugl-Meyer assessment for upper extremity in persons with chronic stroke
761 with moderate-to-severe upper limb impairment. *Front Neurol.* 2020;11:577855. doi:
762 10.3389/fneur.2020.577855.
- 763 55. Hugues A, Di Marco J, Ribault S, Ardaillon H, Janiaud P, Xue Y, et al. Limited
764 evidence of physical therapy on balance after stroke: A systematic review and meta-
765 analysis. *PLoS One.* 2019;14(8):e0221700. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0221700.
- 766 56. Sánchez N, Acosta AM, Lopez-Rosado R, Stienen AHA, Dewald JPA. Lower extremity
767 motor impairments in ambulatory chronic hemiparetic stroke: evidence for lower
768 extremity weakness and abnormal muscle and joint torque coupling patterns.
769 *Neurorehabil Neural Repair.* 2017;31(9):814-826. doi: 10.1177/1545968317721974.
- 770 57. Tomita Y, Mullick AA, Levin MF. Reduced kinematic redundancy and motor
771 equivalence during whole-body reaching in individuals with chronic stroke.
772 *Neurorehabil Neural Repair.* 2018;32(2):175-186. doi: 10.1177/1545968318760725.
- 773 58. Tomita Y, Feldman AG, Levin MF. Referent control and motor equivalence of reaching
774 from standing. *J Neurophysiol.* 2017;117(1):303-315. doi: 10.1152/jn.00292.2016.
- 775 59. Xiao X, Hu HJ, Li LF, Li L. Comparison of dominant hand to non-dominant hand in
776 conduction of reaching task from 3D kinematic data: Trade-off between successful rate
777 and movement efficiency. *Math Biosci Eng.* 2019;16(3):1611-1624. doi:
778 10.3934/mbe.2019077.
- 779 60. Gates DH, Walters LS, Cowley J, Wilken JM, Resnik L. Range of motion requirements
780 for upper-limb activities of daily living. *Am J Occup Ther.* 2016;70(1):7001350010p1-
781 7001350010p10. doi: 10.5014/ajot.2016.015487.

- 782 61. Mandon L, Boudarham J, Robertson J, Bensmail D, Roche N, Roby-Brami A. Faster
783 reaching in chronic spastic stroke patients comes at the expense of arm-trunk
784 coordination. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2016;30(3):209-220. doi:
785 10.1177/1545968315591704.
- 786 62. DeJong SL, Schaefer SY, Lang CE. Need for speed: better movement quality during
787 faster task performance after stroke. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2012;26(4):362-373.
788 doi: 10.1177/1545968311425926.

789

790

791 **Supporting information**

792 **S1 Table. Training methods devised from the pattern analysis results.**




Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 4




Figure 5




Figure 6




Figure 7




Figure 8




Figure 9




Figure 10