

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**Delayed cortical engagement associated with balance dysfunction after stroke**

Jacqueline A. Palmer, DPT, PhD<sup>1</sup>; Aiden M. Payne, PhD<sup>2</sup>; Jasmine L. Mirdamadi, PhD<sup>1</sup>; Lena H. Ting, PhD<sup>1,3</sup>; Michael R. Borich, DPT, PhD<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Division of Physical Therapy, Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, Emory University, 1441 Clifton Road NE, Atlanta, GA 30322 USA

<sup>2</sup> Department of Psychology, College of Arts and Sciences, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL, USA

<sup>3</sup>Department of Biomedical Engineering, Emory and Georgia Tech, 1760 Haygood Road, Atlanta, GA, 30322, USA

**\* Correspondence:**

Jacqueline A. Palmer  
420 Delaware St. S.E.  
Minneapolis, MN 55455

**Word counts:** 5,031

25 **Abstract**

26 Cortical resources are typically engaged for balance and mobility in older adults, but these resources  
27 are impaired post-stroke. Although slowed balance and mobility after stroke have been well-  
28 characterized, the effects of unilateral cortical lesions due to stroke on neuromechanical control of  
29 balance is poorly understood. Our central hypothesis is that stroke impairs the ability to rapidly and  
30 effectively engage the cerebral cortex during balance and mobility behaviors, resulting in  
31 asymmetrical contributions of each limb to balance control. Using electroencephalography (EEG),  
32 we assessed cortical N1 responses evoked over fronto-midline regions (Cz) during balance recovery  
33 in response to backward support-surface perturbations loading both legs, as well as posterior-lateral  
34 directions that preferentially load the paretic or nonparetic leg. Cortical N1 responses were smaller  
35 and delayed in the stroke group. While older adults exhibited weak or absent relationships between  
36 cortical responses and clinical function, stroke survivors exhibited strong associations between  
37 slower N1 latencies and slower walking, lower clinical mobility, and lower balance function. We  
38 further assessed kinetics of balance recovery during perturbations using center of pressure rate of  
39 rise. During backward support-surface perturbations that loaded the legs bilaterally, balance recovery  
40 kinetics were not different between stroke and control groups and were not associated with cortical  
41 response latency. However, lateralized perturbations revealed slower kinetic reactions during paretic  
42 loading compared to controls, and to non-paretic loading within stroke participants. Individuals post  
43 stroke had similar nonparetic-loaded kinetic reactions to controls implicating that they effectively  
44 compensate for impaired paretic leg kinetics when relying on the non-paretic leg. In contrast, paretic-  
45 loaded balance recovery revealed time-synchronized associations between slower cortical responses  
46 and slower kinetic reactions only in the stroke group, potentially reflecting the limits of cortical  
47 engagement for balance recovery revealed within the behavioral context of paretic motor capacity.  
48 Overall, our results implicate individuals after stroke may be uniquely limited in their balance ability

49 by the slowed speed of their cortical engagement, particularly under challenging balance conditions  
50 that rely on the paretic leg. We expect this neuromechanical insight will enable progress toward an  
51 individualized framework for the assessment and treatment of balance impairments based on the  
52 interaction between neuropathology and behavioral context.

53

54

## 55 1. Introduction

56 Despite our increasing knowledge of age-related shifts from primarily subcortically- to more  
57 cortically-mediated balance control, there is a limited understanding of how brain lesions, common in  
58 age-related diseases such as stroke, affect balance control. Slower motor reactions after stroke  
59 contribute to lower resilience to postural perturbations and increased fall risk.<sup>1-4</sup> An impaired ability  
60 to rapidly and effectively use the paretic leg may require compensatory use of the nonparetic leg for  
61 whole-body behaviors such as balance and walking after stroke.<sup>5-10</sup> From a neurophysiologic  
62 perspective, greater asymmetry in corticomotor excitability between paretic and nonparetic lower  
63 limbs, assessed in seated positions, is associated with greater reliance on the nonparetic leg to  
64 increase walking speed in individuals with chronic stroke.<sup>11</sup> However, it is unclear this asymmetry in  
65 corticomotor neurophysiology, measured during seated tasks, translates to the control of whole-body  
66 movements. Recordings of brain activity during whole-body behaviors such as balance and walking  
67 may provide neuromechanical insight to help understand interactions between cortical activity and  
68 control of balance in post-stroke lower limb hemiparesis.

69 Lesions affecting cortical and subcortical pathways in older adults after stroke may compromise  
70 the ability to engage cortical resources for rapid balance recovery following destabilization. Using  
71 electroencephalography (EEG) during standing balance recovery reactions, we recently found that  
72 balance destabilization elicited greater cortical beta activity during balance recovery in  
73 neurologically-intact older adults who had relatively lower balance function than their peers<sup>12</sup>. This  
74 finding in older adults suggests greater sensorimotor cortical reliance for postural stability in  
75 individuals with lower balance function. Likewise, in neurotypical younger adults, cortical  
76 compensation during balance recovery may be reflected in larger cortical evoked responses during  
77 reactive balance in individuals with relatively poor balance ability<sup>13</sup>, when taking compensatory steps  
78 following challenging balance perturbations,<sup>14,15</sup> and when perturbations are perceived as more

79 threatening.<sup>16,17</sup> Supporting this notion, individuals with lower post-stroke mobility commonly  
80 engage expansive cortical networks spanning sensorimotor and frontal regions during continuous  
81 walking tasks.<sup>18</sup> In stroke, those with lower mobility function also reached a “ceiling effect” of lower  
82 cortical activity compared to higher-functioning individuals when presented with more challenging  
83 dual-task walking conditions.<sup>18</sup> Together, these findings suggest individuals with stroke may increase  
84 reliance on cortically-mediated strategies for balance control, which may be compromised by lesions  
85 affecting cortical and subcortical structures.

86 Reactive balance control is essential to walking and mobility,<sup>19</sup> but cortical engagement during  
87 the production of rapid corrective balance reactions to postural destabilization has not been  
88 characterized after stroke. Here, we measure the cortical N1 response, a large negative-going peak in  
89 the EEG signal over midline sensorimotor areas ~150ms after a sudden disturbance to standing  
90 balance.<sup>20</sup> The N1 response is thought to reflect detection of a sudden error to balance or posture.<sup>21</sup>  
91 The N1 response has been localized to the supplementary motor area when constrained to a single  
92 source,<sup>22,23</sup> but synchronization of multiple sources including the supplementary motor area, the  
93 anterior cingulate cortex, sensorimotor areas, and parietal cortex has been suggested to underlie the  
94 N1 response in time-frequency analyses.<sup>24–26</sup> Neuromechanical investigation into cortical activity  
95 during balance reactions could also improve our understanding of temporal features of cortical  
96 engagement and relevance to behaviorally-relevant balance recovery responses necessary to prevent  
97 falls.

98 Delineating differences in cortical function involving paretic vs. nonparetic leg use during  
99 continuous mobility behaviors that involve bilateral use of lower limbs such as walking and balance  
100 is challenging. Individuals with lateralized cortical lesions due to stroke commonly present with limb  
101 hemiparesis, causing interlimb motor control deficits during balance and mobility behaviors.<sup>7,19</sup>  
102 Differential cortical mechanisms during paretic and nonparetic leg motor activity have been

103 identified during seated and isometric lower limb muscle contractions in individuals with chronic  
104 stroke.<sup>11,27–29</sup> In particular, plantarflexor muscles<sup>27</sup> play a key role in post-stroke mobility  
105 function<sup>5,30–32</sup>, and show more severely impaired corticomotor excitability (i.e. lower motor evoked  
106 potentials) compared to post-stroke corticomotor impairments across other lower limb muscle groups  
107 (e.g., dorsiflexors).<sup>27</sup> Further, individuals with greater corticomotor excitability to plantarflexors in  
108 the nonparetic relative to the paretic leg show greater biomechanical reliance on the nonparetic leg to  
109 generate propulsive forces during walking, suggesting a link between corticomotor function and  
110 whole-body behaviors.<sup>12</sup> Reactive balance paradigms may provide a method to assess neural  
111 contributions to whole-body behaviors through use of external perturbations that elicit a time-locked  
112 behavioral response that successively recruits subcortical followed by cortical contributions to lower  
113 limb motor reactions.<sup>33–35</sup> Lateralized balance perturbations in stroke can mechanically load either the  
114 paretic or nonparetic leg during balance recovery, providing insight into lateralized deficits in  
115 balance recovery, in which individuals after stroke commonly sustain a fall.<sup>1,10,19,36</sup> In a previous case  
116 series report by Solis-Escalante et al., direction-specific spectral components in evoked cortical N1  
117 responses measured with EEG were present during reactive balance recovery in both older adults  
118 with stroke (n=3) and younger adult (n=6) participants.<sup>37</sup> Specifically, lateralized perturbations  
119 elicited directional-specific spatial and spectral features within EEG recordings during the balance  
120 recovery response.<sup>37</sup> However, whether these differences relate to clinical ability or balance  
121 impairment or potential differences in temporal versus spatial features of evoked cortical responses  
122 (e.g., timing and magnitude of response) during balance recovery in individuals post stroke has not  
123 been investigated. If changes in evoked cortical activity play a role in post-stroke balance impairment  
124 and increased fall risk, a better understanding of this role could help identify new therapeutic targets  
125 to reduce fall risk after stroke.

126 Our central hypothesis is that stroke impairs the ability to rapidly and effectively engage the  
127 cerebral cortex in balance-correcting behavior, resulting in asymmetrical interlimb contributions to  
128 post-stroke mobility behavior. In the present study, we used multidirectional standing balance  
129 perturbations to differentially challenge balance control between limbs. We assessed kinetic reactions  
130 and the speed and magnitude of cortical engagement during balance recovery in individuals with and  
131 without post-stroke lower limb hemiparesis. We further tested the effect of mechanical balance  
132 perturbations loading either the paretic or nonparetic leg during balance recovery on evoked cortical  
133 N1 responses and kinetic reactions and relationships to clinical balance and mobility function. We  
134 predicted that 1) stroke survivors would have later and attenuated perturbation-evoked cortical N1  
135 responses during balance recovery compared to neurotypical, age-matched controls, with the most  
136 impaired cortical N1 responses during paretic-loading conditions and 2) that longer latencies of  
137 perturbation-evoked cortical N1 responses would be associated with clinical balance deficits and  
138 slower kinetic reactions after stroke.

139

## 140 **2. Materials and methods**

### 141 **2.1. Study design and participants**

142 Eighteen individuals with chronic (>6 mo.) stroke (**Table 1**) and 17 age-matched controls were  
143 recruited. Inclusion criteria included above the age of 21, the ability to walk at least 10 meters  
144 without the assistance of another person, the ability to stand unassisted for at least 3 minutes, and the  
145 cognitive ability for informed consent. Participants were excluded for any diagnosed neurologic  
146 condition other than stroke or pain affecting standing or walking. The experimental protocol was  
147 approved by the Emory University Institutional Review Board and all participants provided written  
148 informed consent.

149 Participants completed a single visit of clinical balance and mobility testing (i.e.,  
150 miniBEST,<sup>38</sup> Timed-Up-and-Go (TUG),<sup>39</sup> 10-meter walk test) following standard clinical practice  
151 procedures and administered by the same licensed physical therapist. Participants were then subjected  
152 to a series of support-surface translational perturbations to assess EEG measures of evoked cortical  
153 activity and biomechanical reactions during standing balance recovery.  
154



155

156

## 157 **2.2. Standing balance perturbations**

158 Participants stood barefoot on a moving platform (Factory Automation Systems, Atlanta, GA) and  
159 were subjected to anterior, posterior, and left-ward and right-ward posterolateral support-surface  
160 translational perturbations that served to preferentially load either the paretic leg, the nonparetic leg,  
161 or equal legs during balance recovery. During the paretic-loaded condition, the support-surface  
162 moves posterolaterally towards the nonparetic leg, shifting a greater proportion of body weight  
163 support onto the paretic leg (**Figure 1**). Likewise, the nonparetic-loaded condition shifts a greater  
164 proportion of body weight support onto the nonparetic leg. In contrast, in the bilateral condition, the  
165 support-surface moves in the posterior direction with no lateralization (**Figure 1**), targeting  
166 plantarflexor agonist muscles to correct for postural destabilization. Anteriorly directed perturbations  
167 were also included to prevent participants from leaning backward in anticipation of posteriorly  
168 directed perturbations used in the analyses. Participants were instructed to stand with their typical,  
169 self-selected posture and foot placement, as similar motor response latencies are observed across a  
170 range of narrow and wider stances.<sup>40</sup> Twenty-four perturbations (7.5 cm, 16.0 cm/s, 0.12 g) within  
171 each of the four directions (total of 96 perturbations) were delivered in a pseudorandomized order at  
172 unpredictable inter-trial intervals (15 – 60s). Participants received instructions to recover balance  
173 with a feet-in-place strategy if possible and to keep arms folded at their chest. We selected this  
174 relatively low-level perturbation level because it could be successfully completed by most  
175 participants using a feet-in-place strategy. However, two participants in the stroke group and one  
176 control participant were unable to recover balance at this perturbation level with feet-in-place; for  
177 these participants the magnitude of balance perturbation was scaled down to (6.0 cm, 12.0 cm/s, 0.08  
178 g) while maintaining the same temporal characteristics of the perturbation. The perturbation series

179 was delivered in a pseudorandomized order, where a perturbation of the same direction had no more  
180 than 2 consecutive occurrences. Real-time EEG activity and ground reaction force levels were  
181 monitored by the experimenter to ensure that the participant returned to baseline body position and  
182 levels of cortical and muscle activity after each trial before the next perturbation was delivered.  
183 Instances of stepping were noted in real-time for offline confirmation and exclusion from analyses  
184 based on ground reaction forces.<sup>15</sup> Participants took a seated rest break every 8 minutes during  
185 balance perturbation testing, or more frequently if the participant requested a break or reported or  
186 showed signs of fatigue during testing.

### 187 **2.3. EEG data acquisition and analyses**

188 During balance perturbations, cortical activity was continuously recorded from EEG signals using a  
189 64-channel active electrode cap (actiCAP, actiCHamp amplifier, Brain Products, GmbH, Gilching,  
190 Germany). EEG signals were digitized with a 24-bit analog-to-digital converter and an online 20 kHz  
191 low-pass filter and before sampling at 1000 Hz and storing for offline analysis. All EEG data were  
192 preprocessed using freely available functions from the EEGLab toolbox and custom MATLAB  
193 scripts.<sup>41</sup> Continuous data time-locked to the perturbation onset were imported into EEGLab. Trigger  
194 labels for successful feet-in-place trials (i.e., no reactive step taken) were selected across all  
195 conditions. Continuous EEG data were high-pass filtered (cutoff 0.5 Hz, finite impulse response,  
196 filter order 3300) and downsampled to 500 Hz. Bad channels were identified through visual  
197 inspection, then removed and interpolated. Data were re-referenced to an average reference. Line  
198 noise was removed using the Cleanline plugin.<sup>41</sup> Data were then epoched -2 to 2 seconds around each  
199 perturbation (platform onset at  $t=0$  s), and decomposed into maximally independent components  
200 (ICs) using adaptive mixture component analysis algorithm (AMICA).<sup>42</sup> ICs from AMICA were  
201 categorized using the ICLabel plugin, an automated algorithm that identifies nonbrain sources (e.g.,  
202 eye, muscle, and cardiac activity) and brain sources,<sup>43</sup> and confirmed with visual inspection.

203 Nonbrain sources were removed. The remaining brain ICs were projected back into channel space.  
204 For one participant with a lower number of non-stepping trials, we aimed to maximize the number of  
205 trials for AMICA by including all trials (step and no step) in this part of the preprocessing pipeline  
206 before removing all stepping trials for N1 waveform computation and all subsequent analyses. Data  
207 were visually inspected and trials with excessive signal drift were removed.

208 EEG data from the midline sensorimotor region (Cz) for posterior and postero-laterally directed  
209 perturbations were selected and low-pass filtered at 30Hz for evoked cortical event-related potential  
210 analyses and baseline subtracted (-150 to -50ms).<sup>20,44</sup> The peak latency and amplitude of the cortical  
211 N1 response were extracted from the mean waveform across all trials as well as the mean waveform  
212 across each condition. The cortical N1 response was defined as the first local minimum point of  
213 negative value in the EEG waveform within 100-300ms post-perturbation. As individuals with stroke  
214 tended to show polyphasic perturbation-evoked cortical responses (**Figure 3C**), this automated  
215 selection criteria enabled consistency in selection of the cortical N1 response within-participants  
216 (between conditions) and between-participants. Two participants required an extended time window  
217 of 100-350ms post-perturbation because the first local minimum in the cortical response waveform  
218 occurred > 300ms post-perturbation (316 and 314ms post-perturbation for all conditions collapsed,  
219 respectively)

220

## 221 **2.4. Kinetic data acquisition and analysis**

222 Kinetic (AMTI OR6-6 force plates) and kinematic (10-camera Vicon Nexus 3D motion analysis  
223 system) data were recorded during balance perturbations (100 Hz sampling frequency). Reflective  
224 markers were placed on anatomical landmarks on the legs and trunk (e.g., head, neck, hips, knees,

225 ankles, feet) and were used as inputs to Vicon's plug-in-gait model to compute the body's center of  
226 mass velocity and displacement throughout balance recovery.

227 The corrective kinetic reaction during balance recovery following perturbations was quantified as  
228 the center of pressure (CoP) rate of rise (RoR). During the perturbation, the CoP initially moves  
229 passively as a result of the perturbation, and the individual must then rapidly counteract this effect to  
230 slow and reverse the direction of CoP movement to maintain upright stability (**Figure 1**).<sup>45</sup> The CoP  
231 RoR in the later 150-300ms phase of balance recovery occurs during a timeframe in which an  
232 individual's active contribution to reactive balance is possible and necessary for a successful feet-in-  
233 place balance recovery. As such, the average slope of this later phase CoP position trajectory indexes  
234 how quickly an individual generates corrective responses to the loss of balance. A slower CoP RoR  
235 relative to the support surface movement would result in a less effective neuromechanical  
236 stabilization strategy that may lead to loss of balance.<sup>45</sup> The CoP position was used to assess CoP  
237 RoR in the direction parallel to support-surface movement quantified as the linear slope (i.e., rate of  
238 change in CoP position) between 150-300 ms post-perturbation onset.

239

## 240 **2.5. Statistical analyses**

241 We confirmed normality and heterogeneity of variance of all data used for analyses using  
242 Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Levene's tests, respectively. We matched lateralized balance conditions of  
243 paretic-loading to left-loading and nonparetic-loading to right-loading in controls. First, we compared  
244 cortical N1 response latency and amplitudes collapsed across all conditions between stroke and  
245 control groups using independent t-tests. We then tested group (control, stroke) and condition  
246 (bilateral, paretic-loaded, nonparetic-loaded) main effects and interactions between group and  
247 condition for each cortical N1 metric (peak latency, peak amplitude) using a two-way analysis of

248 variance (ANOVA). We used Pearson product moment correlation coefficients to test for  
249 associations between cortical N1 peak metrics and clinical and biomechanical metrics. We used  
250 multiple linear regression (MLR) analyses (factors: group, N1, group-by-N1) to test whether the  
251 relationship between cortical N1 peak metrics (latency or amplitude) and clinical metrics (walking  
252 speed, TUG, or miniBEST) differed as a function of group in the collapsed N1 waveform and across  
253 each condition. We used a two-way ANOVA (factors: group, condition, group-by-condition) to test  
254 for group-by-condition interaction and main effects on CoP RoR. We used MLR analyses (factors:  
255 group, N1, group-by-N1) to test whether the relationship between cortical N1 peak metrics (latency  
256 or amplitude) and CoP RoR differed as a function of group across each condition. All analyses were  
257 performed using SPSS version 27 with an a-priori level of significance set to 0.05.

258

### 259 **3. Results**

260 One participant in the control group withdrew from the study due to fear of falling; this participant  
261 was unable to complete balance perturbation testing and was excluded from analysis. Due to fatigue  
262 and increased time necessary for balance testing, eight participants in the stroke group completed a  
263 shortened protocol (range of perturbations completed: 60-86 out of 96 perturbations in full protocol).  
264 Including those adopting the shortened protocol, EEG recordings from 18 individuals post-stroke and  
265 16 controls were included in analyses. Participants in the stroke group had lower clinical measures of  
266 balance function on the miniBEST ( $p < 0.001$ ), slower performance on the TUG-test ( $p < 0.001$ ) and  
267 slower walking speed ( $p < 0.001$ ) (**Table 2**). Technical issues involving biomechanical force data  
268 acquisition occurred in three participants (stroke,  $n=2$ ; control,  $n=1$ ); these participants were excluded  
269 from analyses involving CoP RoR, but are included in all other analyses.

270

271

272 **3.1. Effect of stroke on cortical N1 response and relationship to clinical balance and**  
273 **mobility**

274 Individuals post stroke exhibited delayed latencies to the cortical N1 peak (stroke =  $219 \pm 39$  ms;  
275 control =  $196 \pm 22$  ms,  $p = 0.025$ ) and reduced N1 amplitudes (stroke =  $14.9 \pm 11.9$   $\mu$ V; control =  
276  $21.7 \pm 11.0$   $\mu$ V,  $p = 0.047$ ) compared to age-matched controls across all conditions (**Figure 2A**). The  
277 relationship between N1 latencies and behavioral outcomes varied between groups. In the stroke  
278 group, delayed N1s correlated with lower miniBEST scores ( $r = -0.61$ ,  $p = 0.007$ ), slower Timed-Up-  
279 and Go-(TUG) test performance ( $r = 0.53$ ,  $p = 0.024$ ), and exhibited a trend with reduced walking  
280 speed ( $r = -0.46$ ,  $p = 0.055$ ) (**Figure 2B**). In the control group, delayed N1s were similarly associated  
281 with slower TUG test performance ( $r = 0.508$ ,  $p = 0.045$ ) and showed no correlation with miniBEST  
282 scores ( $r = -0.274$ ,  $p = 0.304$ ) or walking speed ( $r = -0.001$ ,  $p = 0.997$ ). Examining N1 response  
283 latency in each condition separately showed similar relationships across all conditions within the  
284 stroke and control groups (not shown). While the stroke group consistently showed stronger  
285 relationships between cortical N1 latency and clinical metrics compared to controls (**Figure 2B**),  
286 group-by-N1 latency interactions failed to meet our *a priori* level of significance across clinical  
287 metrics (miniBEST ( $t = -1.25$ ,  $p = 0.220$ ), TUG test performance ( $t = 1.00$ ,  $p = 0.325$ ), walking speed  
288 ( $t = -1.10$ ,  $p = 0.279$ ). There were no associations between N1 amplitude and any clinical metric in the  
289 stroke or control groups (all  $p > 0.11$ ). There were no significant group-by-N1 amplitude interactions  
290 for any clinical metric (miniBEST,  $p = 0.333$ ; TUG,  $p = 0.906$ ; gait speed,  $p = 0.979$ ) (**Figure 2B**).

291

292 **3.2. Effect of Lateralization of Balance Perturbations in Stroke and Controls**

293

294 Contrary to our initial hypotheses, the lateralization of balance perturbations did not exhibit  
295 any discernible impact on cortical N1 response latency or amplitude in either the stroke or control  
296 groups (**Figure 3A, B**). Despite considerable between-individual variability (Figure 3C), no  
297 significant interaction effects were observed for N1 latency ( $F_{2,64}=0.463, p=0.722$ ) or amplitude  
298 ( $F_{2,64}=0.624, p=0.516$ ) (**Figure 3B**).

299 Interestingly, in the stroke group, the paretic-loaded condition tended to evoke faster N1  
300 response latencies ( $214 \pm 35$  ms) compared to the nonparetic-loaded ( $219 \pm 42$  ms) or bilateral  
301 condition ( $219 \pm 42$  ms) (**Table 3**) (**Figure 3C**). However, statistical analyses for N1 peak latency  
302 revealed significant main effects of group ( $F_{1,32}=5.27, p=0.028$ ) but not for condition ( $F_{1,32}=1.063,$   
303  $p=0.310$ ). Regarding N1 amplitude, a non-significant trend toward a main effect of group  
304 ( $F_{1,32}=2.932, p=0.097$ ) was observed, with no main effects of condition ( $F_{1,32}=1.47, p=0.292$ )  
305 (**Figure 3B**).

306

### 307 **3.3. Kinetic reactions during balance recovery and associations with cortical N1 response**

308 There was a group-by-condition interaction effect on the center of pressure (CoP) rate of rise (RoR)  
309 ( $F_{2,29}=3.054, p=0.026$ ), in which the stroke group had a slower CoP RoR than the control group only  
310 within the paretic-loaded condition ( $p=0.012$ ) (**Figure 4A&B**). Within the stroke group, the CoP  
311 RoR was faster in the nonparetic-loaded condition compared to each the paretic-loaded condition  
312 ( $p=0.004$ ) and the bilateral condition ( $p=0.002$ ), with no difference between the paretic-loaded and  
313 bilateral conditions ( $p=0.312$ ). Within the control group, the CoP RoR was slower in the bilateral  
314 condition compared to each the lateral loading conditions (left-loaded,  $p<0.001$ ; right-loaded,  
315  $p=0.012$ ). The lateral loading conditions in controls were not different from each other ( $p=0.312$ )

316 Within the stroke group, later N1 peak latencies were associated with slower CoP RoR within the  
317 paretic-loaded condition ( $r=-0.70$ ,  $p=0.003$ ), but not in the nonparetic-loaded condition ( $r=-0.41$ ,  
318  $p=0.11$ ) or the bilateral condition ( $r=-0.27$ ,  $p=0.313$ ) (**Figure 4B**). None of these associations were  
319 observed in the control group (all  $p>0.138$ ). When testing for group-by-N1 latency interaction effects  
320 on CoP RoR, there was a trend for interaction within the paretic-loaded condition ( $t= -1.803$ ,  
321  $p=0.083$ ) but not the nonparetic-loaded ( $t= -0.012$ ,  $p=0.991$ ) or bilateral conditions ( $t= -0.705$ ,  
322  $p=0.487$ ). For N1 amplitude, there were no group-by-N1 amplitude interaction effects in any balance  
323 condition (all  $p>0.598$ ) or relationships with CoP RoR for any condition in either group (all  
324  $p>0.491$ ).

#### 325 **4. Discussion**

326 The observed findings are the first to demonstrate that clinical and kinetic balance dysfunction in  
327 people with post-stroke lower limb hemiparesis is related to delayed cortical N1 responses evoked  
328 during reactive balance recovery. Our reactive balance paradigm provided a well-controlled probe of  
329 cortical reactivity during a functionally-relevant, whole-body behavior, demonstrating that balance  
330 perturbations elicit slower, smaller cortical responses after stroke compared to age-similar controls.  
331 These findings are consistent with the notion of generally impaired cortical engagement for balance  
332 control in people after stroke and may reflect altered cortical mechanisms underlying balance and  
333 gait dysfunction. In particular, a reduced ability to rapidly engage cortical resources during balance  
334 recovery may contribute to balance and mobility dysfunction post-stroke, supported by relationships  
335 between slower N1 responses and slower mobility/lower balance function that were present only in  
336 the stroke group. Further, while balance conditions loading the paretic leg resulted in slower kinetic  
337 reactions for balance recovery compared to controls,<sup>2-4</sup> balance conditions that positioned the  
338 nonparetic leg for recovery enabled individuals post stroke to achieve similar kinetic reactions to  
339 their age-matched peers. Relationships between time-synchronized cortical response speed and



340 kinetic reactivity during paretic-loaded balance recovery may reflect the constraints of rapid cortical  
341 engagement at the limits of paretic motor capacity (e.g., paretic leg loading) that are masked when  
342 the nonparetic leg is engaged in compensatory balance control (i.e., nonparetic leg loading and  
343 bilateral loading conditions). Together, our findings suggest that temporal features of evoked cortical  
344 N1 responses during reactive balance recovery may provide a useful biomarker of clinically-relevant  
345 balance and mobility behavior that may serve as a target for rehabilitation efforts aimed at  
346 maximizing independence and reducing fall risk in the chronic stage of stroke recovery.

347

#### 348 **4.1. Impaired cortical engagement may contribute to mobility deficits post stroke**

349

350 One of the most consistent neurophysiologic findings post-stroke is slowed and reduced cortical  
351 excitability within the lesioned primary motor cortex<sup>46</sup> that may explain, in part, the slower and lower  
352 magnitudes of evoked cortical N1 peak responses compared to controls. As such, stroke-related  
353 effects in older adults may compromise the typical engagement of cortical resources in the aging  
354 brain for balance control.<sup>13,20,47</sup> Longer latencies and smaller amplitudes of peak cortical N1  
355 responses in people with stroke (**Figure 2A**) are consistent with the presence of impaired cortical  
356 engagement in balance recovery, and were driven by individuals with the most impaired balance and  
357 mobility function (**Figure 2B**). Impaired cortical engagement may be particularly detrimental during  
358 abrupt and challenging balance perturbations that elicit greater corticomotor drive to for balance  
359 recovery compared to less abrupt balance perturbations, as evidenced in neurotypical individuals by  
360 increases in functional connectivity between cortical activity and reactive lower limb motor  
361 responses with more challenging perturbations.<sup>48</sup> Together, these findings suggest that the speed and  
362 effectiveness of sensorimotor error detection and information processing is compromised in  
363 individuals with cortical and subcortical lesions .

364 The presence of brain-behavioral relationships only in the stroke group may indicate a greater  
365 need to rapidly detect balance errors (i.e., reflected in the cortical N1 response latency)<sup>21</sup> for motor  
366 control influencing balance and mobility behaviors after stroke. The ability for rapid error detection,  
367 potentially reflected in the N1 response, may play a distinct role from that of other information  
368 encoded within the cortex. Cortical error detection speed (i.e., reflected in the cortical N1 latency)  
369 may be an aspect of balance control that limits stroke balance ability, but may not be the limiting  
370 factor in neurotypical older adults due to a wider range of heterogeneous factors (i.e., balance  
371 confidence, cognitive flexibility, attention ability, greater automaticity of balance control) that may  
372 contribute to brain-balance relationships.<sup>20</sup> Similarly, we recently observed relationships between  
373 measures of N1 timing and amplitude and measures of balance and mobility in a group of  
374 individuals with Parkinson's disease that were not present in the control group.<sup>44</sup> The presence of  
375 brain-behavioral relationships when collapsing data across all direction conditions in the stroke group  
376 (**Figure 2B**) may reflect the bilateral leg performance necessary during post-stroke balance and  
377 walking behavior assessed in clinical contexts. These relationships further suggest that the inability to  
378 engage the cortex rapidly and effectively for balance control may limit potential recovery of clinical  
379 balance and mobility function after stroke, as illustrated in the most severely impaired individuals  
380 after stroke (**Figure 2B**). The high within-group variability in cortical responses and clinical metrics  
381 is consistent with high variability in balance and walking function after stroke.<sup>49-51</sup> Together, the  
382 present findings reveal neurophysiologic features of cortical slowness that are linked to balance and  
383 mobility dysfunction after stroke, potentially contributing to increased falls risk in individuals post  
384 stroke.<sup>3</sup>

#### 385 **4.2. Lateralization of balance perturbations did not affect cortical responses**

386 Similar cortical N1 response latencies and amplitudes elicited during (more impaired) paretic  
387 versus (less impaired) nonparetic-loaded balance recovery conditions may reflect different

388 neuromechanical features of balance recovery after stroke. While the lateralization of perturbations  
389 towards paretic and nonparetic legs generated asymmetrical limb loading and balance recovery  
390 (**Figure 1**), it was surprising that perturbation loading condition did not affect cortical responses  
391 within the stroke group (**Figure 3A-B**). While nonparetic-loaded cortical N1 response speeds may  
392 reflect relatively faster sensorimotor integration and motor reactivity of the nonparetic leg (**Figure 4**),  
393 paretic-loaded cortical N1 response speeds may reflect heightened surprise, threat, and/or error  
394 detection<sup>17,21</sup> that occurs with increased loading towards the more undesirable leg for weight bearing  
395 and motor control.<sup>7</sup> The latter may explain the (non-significant) tendency for individuals post-stroke  
396 to show faster cortical N1 response latencies during paretic-loaded conditions (**Figure 3B**).  
397 Nonetheless, one previous study found preliminary evidence (n=3) for direction-specific effects of  
398 balance perturbations on spectral features of evoked cortical N1 responses after stroke,<sup>37</sup> supporting  
399 the possibility that directional information may be encoded in spatial and spectral features of EEG  
400 recordings during balance recovery not assessed in the present study and others reporting no  
401 directional effect.<sup>52</sup> Together these findings illustrate the behavioral relevance of temporal features of  
402 evoked cortical activity and motivate future studies investigating event-related spatial and spectral  
403 features, which may identify potential subgroups within a larger cohort of people with post-stroke  
404 lower limb hemiparesis during lateralized balance recovery.

#### 405 **4.3. Impaired and compensatory post-stroke kinetic reactions occur during lateralized** 406 **balance recovery**

407 The present findings provide evidence that people post stroke can achieve similar kinetic  
408 reactive balance performance to their age-matched peers when they are mechanically positioned to  
409 compensate with the nonparetic leg. While the stroke group demonstrated slower kinetic balance  
410 reactions during paretic loading compared to controls (**Figure 4**), they showed faster and comparable  
411 kinetic balance reactions to their age-matched peers during nonparetic loading. This finding during  
412 reactive balance builds upon previous research showing some individuals post-stroke demonstrate

413 slower paretic leg balance reactions,<sup>2-4</sup> yet are able to effectively compensate for severe paretic leg  
414 impairment through increased nonparetic leg postural reliance, with a shift towards more lateralized  
415 balance control with the nonparetic leg.<sup>7</sup> Slower kinetic CoP RoR responses during bilateral leg  
416 recovery compared to the lateralized conditions within the control group may reflect different  
417 biomechanical conditions presented by medial-lateral compared to anterior-posterior balance  
418 perturbations, which may differ in difficulty.<sup>53</sup> Notably, the slower kinetic reactions in bilateral  
419 compared to lateralized perturbations within the control group was in contrast to the stroke group,  
420 which demonstrated comparable kinetic reactions in the bilateral and lateralized paretic-loaded  
421 condition (**Figure 4A**). Thus, it is possible that controlling for biomechanical differences and balance  
422 challenge presented by medial-lateral and anterior-posterior directional postural perturbations (e.g.,  
423 adopting tandem stance in baseline standing posture) could reveal the effect of paretic leg loading on  
424 kinetic reactions for balance recovery after stroke in anterior-posterior conditions. The present  
425 findings provide a foundation for future rehabilitation studies to test whether therapeutic strategies  
426 aimed at accelerating nonparetic leg balance reactions could effectively improve the post-stroke  
427 balance recovery ability, particularly in individuals with limited recovery potential of the paretic  
428 lower limb.

#### 429 **4.4. Paretic-loaded balance recovery reveals cortical-kinetic interactions after stroke**

430 Regardless of the neural origin, the present results suggest that faster cortical engagement in  
431 response to balance perturbations is linked to more rapid speed of the subsequent kinetic reactions  
432 during balance recovery. While there was not an effect of balance condition on cortical N1 responses  
433 or relationships to clinical ability, paretic-loaded balance recovery revealed time-synchronized  
434 relationships between the speed of cortical N1 responses and the speed of corrective kinetic reactions  
435 (**Figure 4**), potentially linked to lower resilience to postural destabilization.<sup>19,33</sup> Cortical-kinetic  
436 relationships were absent in controls and in bilateral and nonparetic-loaded conditions in stroke,

437 suggesting that positioning the paretic leg for balance recovery unmasks the cortical limits of balance  
438 recovery after stroke. Future studies are needed to test whether manipulation of threat or  
439 somatosensory information differentially influence the speed of evoked cortical N1 responses and its  
440 effect on time-synchronized kinetic reactions when biasing paretic or nonparetic legs for balance  
441 recovery.

442 Different relationships in time-synchronized cortical-kinetic responses across balance  
443 conditions further suggest that post-stroke lower limb hemiparesis may drive individuals to engage  
444 different neural strategies for balance recovery compared to controls. While not statistically  
445 significant, a similar relationship between cortical N1 responses and kinetic reactions during the  
446 nonparetic-loaded condition is interesting because it suggests that individuals post stroke may  
447 achieve similar reactive balance performance through more cortically-mediated balance responses to  
448 their age-matched counterparts, potentially with compensatory use of their nonparetic leg (**Figure**  
449 **4B**). The direction specificity of cortical-kinetic relationships is in line with the context-specific  
450 nature of cortically-mediated balance control,<sup>33</sup> that may have less flexibility to adapt to changing  
451 environments (i.e., cortical engagement may reflect differing neural processes during paretic-loaded  
452 recovery, yielding less effective kinetic responses). These cortical-kinetic relationships provide an  
453 individualized framework for the clinical assessment and treatment of post-stroke balance  
454 impairment, showing individual differences in the nature and degree of impairment that can  
455 potentially be used to assess individuals, prescribe, and track treatment.

#### 456 **Conclusions:**

457 Our well-controlled reactive balance paradigm revealed that stroke-induced lesions may lead to  
458 slower and smaller cortical responses compared to age-matched controls, and illustrates a link  
459 between compromised engagement of cortical resources and post-stroke balance dysfunction.

460 Specifically, our results suggest that individuals after stroke may be uniquely limited in their balance  
461 ability by slower cortical engagement, particularly under challenging balance conditions that rely on  
462 the paretic leg. These findings highlight the potential of temporal features of evoked cortical N1  
463 responses to provide a biomarker of clinically-relevant balance and mobility behavior, offering a  
464 possible targeted avenue for rehabilitation efforts during stroke recovery.

465

## 466 **5. Acknowledgements**

467 We would like to acknowledge Michelle Goto, Pam Inglett, and Annie Goldman for their assistance  
468 with data collection for this project.

469

## 470 **6. Funding**

471 This work was supported by the National Institutes of Health [F32HD096816, K99AG075255] to JP,  
472 [F32HD105458] to JLM, [F32MH129076, Udall Pilot award P50NS098685] to AMP,  
473 [K12HD055931] to MRB, [5T90DA032466, 1P50NS098685, R01 HD46922] to LHT, and [R01  
474 AG072756] to LHT and MRB.

475

476

## 477 **7. Competing interests**

478 The authors report no competing interests.

479

## 480 **8. Supplementary material**

481 None.

482

## 483 **References**

- 484 1. Schmid AA, Yaggi HK, Burrus N, et al. Circumstances and consequences of falls among people  
485 with chronic stroke. *J Rehabil Res Dev*. 2013;50(9):1277-1286. doi:10.1682/JRRD.2012.11.0215
- 486 2. Garland SJ, Gray VL, Knorr S. Muscle Activation Patterns and Postural Control Following  
487 Stroke. *Motor Control*. 2009;13(4):387-411. doi:10.1123/mcj.13.4.387
- 488 3. Marigold DS, Eng JJ. Altered timing of postural reflexes contributes to falling in persons with  
489 chronic stroke. *Exp Brain Res*. 2006;171(4):459-468. doi:10.1007/s00221-005-0293-6
- 490 4. Marigold DS, Eng J, Inglis J. Modulation of ankle muscle postural reflexes in stroke: influence of  
491 weight-bearing load. *Clinical Neurophysiology*. 2004;115:2789-2797.
- 492 5. Hsiao H, Awad LN, Palmer JA, Higginson JS, Binder-Macleod SA. Contribution of Paretic and  
493 Nonparetic Limb Peak Propulsive Forces to Changes in Walking Speed in Individuals Poststroke.  
494 *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2016;30(8):743-752. doi:10.1177/1545968315624780
- 495 6. Hsiao H, Gray VL, Creath RA, Binder-Macleod SA, Rogers MW. Control of lateral weight  
496 transfer is associated with walking speed in individuals post-stroke. *Journal of Biomechanics*.  
497 2017;60:72-79.
- 498 7. Roerdink M, Geurts ACH, de Haart M, Beek PJ. On the relative contribution of the paretic leg to  
499 the control of posture after stroke. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2009;23(3):267-274.  
500 doi:10.1177/1545968308323928
- 501 8. Bhatt T, Dusane S, Patel P. Does severity of motor impairment affect reactive adaptation and  
502 fall-risk in chronic stroke survivors? *J NeuroEngineering Rehabil*. 2019;16(1):43.  
503 doi:10.1186/s12984-019-0510-3
- 504 9. Kajrolkar T, Bhatt T. Falls-risk post-stroke: Examining contributions from paretic versus non  
505 paretic limbs to unexpected forward gait slips. *Journal of Biomechanics*. 2016;49(13):2702-2708.  
506 doi:10.1016/j.jbiomech.2016.06.005
- 507 10. Patel PJ, Bhatt T. Fall risk during opposing stance perturbations among healthy adults and  
508 chronic stroke survivors. *Exp Brain Res*. 2018;236(2):619-628. doi:10.1007/s00221-017-5138-6
- 509 11. Palmer JA, Hsiao HY, Awad LN, Binder-Macleod SA. Symmetry of corticomotor input to  
510 plantarflexors influences the propulsive strategy used to increase walking speed post-stroke.  
511 *Clinical Neurophysiology*. 2016;127(3):1837-1844. doi:10.1016/j.clinph.2015.12.003
- 512 12. Palmer JA, Kesar TM, Wolf SL, Borich MR. Motor Cortical Network Flexibility is Associated  
513 With Biomechanical Walking Impairment in Chronic Stroke. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*.  
514 2021;35(12):1065-1075. doi:10.1177/15459683211046272
- 515 13. Payne AM, Ting LH. Worse balance is associated with larger perturbation-evoked cortical  
516 responses in healthy young adults. *Gait & Posture*. 2020;80:324-330.

- 517 14. Solis-Escalante T, Stokkermans M, Cohen MX, Weerdesteijn V. Cortical responses to whole-  
518 body balance perturbations index perturbation magnitude and predict reactive stepping behavior.  
519 *Eur J Neurosci*. Published online September 15, 2020. doi:10.1111/ejn.14972
- 520 15. Payne AM, Ting LH. Balance perturbation-evoked cortical N1 responses are larger when  
521 stepping and not influenced by motor planning. *Journal of Neurophysiology*. 2020;124(6):1875-  
522 1884. doi:10.1152/jn.00341.2020
- 523 16. Mochizuki G, Boe S, Marlin A, McIlroy WE. Perturbation-evoked cortical activity reflects both  
524 the context and consequence of postural instability. *Neuroscience*. 2010;170(2):599-609.  
525 doi:10.1016/j.neuroscience.2010.07.008
- 526 17. Adkin AL, Campbell AD, Chua R, Carpenter MG. The influence of postural threat on the cortical  
527 response to unpredictable and predictable postural perturbations. *Neurosci Lett*. 2008;435(2):120-  
528 125. doi:10.1016/j.neulet.2008.02.018
- 529 18. Chatterjee SA, Fox EJ, Daly JJ, et al. Interpreting Prefrontal Recruitment During Walking After  
530 Stroke: Influence of Individual Differences in Mobility and Cognitive Function. *Front Hum*  
531 *Neurosci*. 2019;13:194. doi:10.3389/fnhum.2019.00194
- 532 19. Allen JL, Kesar TM, Ting LH. Motor module generalization across balance and walking is  
533 impaired after stroke. *Journal of Neurophysiology*. 2019;122(1):277-289.  
534 doi:10.1152/jn.00561.2018
- 535 20. Payne AM, Palmer JA, McKay JL, Ting LH. Lower Cognitive Set Shifting Ability Is Associated  
536 With Stiffer Balance Recovery Behavior and Larger Perturbation-Evoked Cortical Responses in  
537 Older Adults. *Front Aging Neurosci*. 2021;13:742243. doi:10.3389/fnagi.2021.742243
- 538 21. Adkin AL, Quant ÆS, Maki ÆBE, Mcilroy WE. Cortical responses associated with predictable  
539 and unpredictable compensatory balance reactions. Published online 2006:85-93.  
540 doi:10.1007/s00221-005-0310-9
- 541 22. Marlin A, Mochizuki G, Staines WR, McIlroy WE. Localizing evoked cortical activity associated  
542 with balance reactions: does the anterior cingulate play a role? *Journal of Neurophysiology*.  
543 2014;111(12):2634-2643. doi:10.1152/jn.00511.2013
- 544 23. Mierau A, Hülsdünker T, Strüder HK. Changes in cortical activity associated with adaptive  
545 behavior during repeated balance perturbation of unpredictable timing. *Frontiers in Behavioral*  
546 *Neuroscience*. 2015;9(October):1-12. doi:10.3389/fnbeh.2015.00272
- 547 24. Peterson SM, Ferris DP. Differentiation in Theta and Beta Electrocortical Activity between  
548 Visual and Physical Perturbations to Walking and Standing Balance. *Eneuro*.  
549 2018;5(4):ENEURO.0207-18.2018. doi:10.1523/eneuro.0207-18.2018
- 550 25. Peterson SM, Ferris DP. Group-level cortical and muscular connectivity during perturbations to  
551 walking and standing balance. *NeuroImage*. 2019;PREPRINT.  
552 doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2019.05.038



- 553 26. Varghese JP, Staines WR, McIlroy WE. Activity in Functional Cortical Networks Temporally  
554 Associated with Postural Instability. *Neuroscience*. 2019;401:43-58.  
555 doi:10.1016/j.neuroscience.2019.01.008
- 556 27. Palmer JA, Zarzycki R, Morton SM, Kesar TM, Binder-Macleod SA. Characterizing differential  
557 poststroke corticomotor drive to the dorsi- and plantarflexor muscles during resting and volitional  
558 muscle activation. *Journal of Neurophysiology*. 2017;117(4):1615-1624.  
559 doi:10.1152/jn.00393.2016
- 560 28. Kautz SA, Patten C. Interlimb Influences on Paretic Leg Function in Poststroke Hemiparesis.  
561 *Journal of Neurophysiology*. 2005;93(5):2460-2473. doi:10.1152/jn.00963.2004
- 562 29. Kautz SA, Patten C, Neptune RR. Does Unilateral Pedaling Activate a Rhythmic Locomotor  
563 Pattern in the Nonpedaling Leg in Post-Stroke Hemiparesis? *Journal of Neurophysiology*.  
564 2006;95(5):3154-3163. doi:10.1152/jn.00951.2005
- 565 30. Awad LN, Reisman DS, Kesar TM, Binder-Macleod SA. Targeting Paretic Propulsion To  
566 Improve Post-Stroke Walking Function: A Preliminary Study. *Archives of physical medicine and  
567 rehabilitation*. 2014;95(5):840-848. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2013.12.012.Targeting
- 568 31. Bowden MG, Balasubramanian CK, Behrman AL, Kautz SA. Validation of a Speed-Based  
569 Classification System Using Quantitative Measures of Walking Performance Poststroke.  
570 *Neurorehabilitation and Neural Repair*. 2008;22(6):672-675. doi:10.1177/1545968308318837
- 571 32. Roelker SA, Bowden MG, Kautz SA, Neptune RR. Paretic propulsion as a measure of walking  
572 performance and functional motor recovery post-stroke: a review. *Gait & Posture*. 2019;68:6-14.  
573 doi:10.1016/j.gaitpost.2018.10.027.Paretic
- 574 33. Jacobs JV, Horak FB. Cortical control of postural responses. *J Neural Transm (Vienna)*.  
575 2007;114(10):1339-1348. doi:10.1007/s00702-007-0657-0
- 576 34. Taube W, Schubert M, Gruber M, Beck S, Faist M, Gollhofer A. Direct corticospinal pathways  
577 contribute to neuromuscular control of perturbed stance. *J Appl Physiol*. 2006;101(2):420-429.  
578 doi:10.1152/jappphysiol.01447.2005
- 579 35. Boebinger S, Payne A, Martino G, et al. Precise cortical contributions to feedback sensorimotor  
580 control during reactive balance. Published online October 4, 2023:2023.10.02.560626.  
581 doi:10.1101/2023.10.02.560626
- 582 36. Handelzalts S, Kenner-Furman M, Gray G, Soroker N, Shani G, Melzer I. Effects of  
583 Perturbation-Based Balance Training in Subacute Persons With Stroke: A Randomized  
584 Controlled Trial. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2019;33(3):213-224.  
585 doi:10.1177/1545968319829453
- 586 37. Solis-Escalante T, De Kam D, Weerdesteyn V. Classification of rhythmic cortical activity  
587 elicited by whole-body balance perturbations suggests the cortical representation of  
588 directionspecific changes in postural stability. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and  
589 Rehabilitation Engineering*. Published online 2020:1-1. doi:10.1109/TNSRE.2020.3028966

- 590 38. Marques A, Almeida S, Carvalho J, Cruz J, Oliveira A, Jácome C. Reliability, Validity, and  
591 Ability to Identify Fall Status of the Balance Evaluation Systems Test, Mini-Balance Evaluation  
592 Systems Test, and Brief-Balance Evaluation Systems Test in Older People Living in the  
593 Community. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2016;97(12):2166-2173.e1.  
594 doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2016.07.011
- 595 39. Tang PF, Yang HJ, Peng YC, Chen HY. Motor dual-task Timed Up & Go test better identifies  
596 prefrailty individuals than single-task Timed Up & Go test. *Geriatr Gerontol Int.*  
597 2015;15(2):204-210. doi:10.1111/ggi.12258
- 598 40. Henry SM, Fung J, Horak FB. Effect of stance width on multidirectional postural responses. *J*  
599 *Neurophysiol.* 2001;85(2):559-570. doi:10.1152/jn.2001.85.2.559
- 600 41. Delorme A, Makeig S. EEGLAB: an open source toolbox for analysis of single-trial EEG  
601 dynamics including independent component analysis. *J Neurosci Methods.* 2004;134(1):9-21.  
602 doi:10.1016/j.jneumeth.2003.10.009
- 603 42. Palmer JA, Makeig S, Kreutz-Delgado K, Rao BD. Newton method for the ICA mixture model.  
604 In: *2008 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing.* ;  
605 2008:1805-1808. doi:10.1109/ICASSP.2008.4517982
- 606 43. Pion-Tonachini L, Kreutz-Delgado K, Makeig S. ICLabel: An automated  
607 electroencephalographic independent component classifier, dataset, and website. *Neuroimage.*  
608 2019;198:181-197. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2019.05.026
- 609 44. Payne AM, McKay JL, Ting LH. The cortical N1 response to balance perturbation is associated  
610 with balance and cognitive function in different ways between older adults with and without  
611 Parkinson's disease. *Cereb Cortex Commun.* 2022;3(3):tgac030. doi:10.1093/texcom/tgac030
- 612 45. Horak FB, Dimitrova D, Nutt JG. Direction-specific postural instability in subjects with  
613 Parkinson's disease. *Exp Neurol.* 2005;193(2):504-521. doi:10.1016/j.expneurol.2004.12.008
- 614 46. McDonnell MN, Stinear CM. TMS measures of motor cortex function after stroke: A meta-  
615 analysis. *Brain Stimul.* 2017;10(4):721-734. doi:10.1016/j.brs.2017.03.008
- 616 47. Palmer JA, Payne AM, Ting LH, Borich MR. Cortical Engagement Metrics During Reactive  
617 Balance Are Associated With Distinct Aspects of Balance Behavior in Older Adults. *Frontiers in*  
618 *Aging Neuroscience.* 2021;13:410. doi:10.3389/fnagi.2021.684743
- 619 48. Kitatani R, Maeda A, Umehara J, Yamada S. Different modulation of oscillatory common neural  
620 drives to ankle muscles during abrupt and gradual gait adaptations. *Exp Brain Res.*  
621 2022;240(3):871-886. doi:10.1007/s00221-021-06294-3
- 622 49. Balasubramanian CK, Neptune RR, Kautz SA. Variability in spatiotemporal step characteristics  
623 and its relationship to walking performance post-stroke. *Gait Posture.* 2009;29(3):408-414.  
624 doi:10.1016/j.gaitpost.2008.10.061
- 625 50. Lamontagne A, Stephenson JL, Fung J. Physiological evaluation of gait disturbances post stroke.  
626 *Clin Neurophysiol.* 2007;118(4):717-729. doi:10.1016/j.clinph.2006.12.013


- 627 51. Kim WS, Choi H, Jung JW, Yoon JS, Jeoung JH. Asymmetry and Variability Should Be  
628 Included in the Assessment of Gait Function in Poststroke Hemiplegia With Independent  
629 Ambulation During Early Rehabilitation. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2021;102(4):611-618.  
630 doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2020.10.115
- 631 52. Goel R, Ozdemir RA, Nakagome S, Contreras-Vidal JL, Paloski WH, Parikh PJ. Effects of speed  
632 and direction of perturbation on electroencephalographic and balance responses. *Experimental*  
633 *Brain Research.* 2018;236(7):2073-2083. doi:10.1007/s00221-018-5284-5
- 634 53. Bolger D, Ting LH, Sawers A. Individuals with transtibial limb loss use interlimb force  
635 asymmetries to maintain multi-directional reactive balance control. *Clinical Biomechanics.*  
636 2014;29(9):1039-1047. doi:10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2014.08.007

637

638

639

640 **1 Figure Legends**




641

642 **Figure 1: Perturbation conditions and resulting kinetic reactions for balance recovery.**

643 Across each of the perturbation conditions, the support surface moved in the direction by  
644 the colored arrows, displacing the center of mass towards the paretic leg, bilateral legs, or nonparetic  
645 leg (A), necessitating rapid corrective shifts in center of pressure to prevent imbalance. Mechanical  
646 effects of each condition on center of pressure displacement trajectories (condition-averaged across  
647 trials) and postural loading are depicted in an exemplar stroke (A) and control (B) participant. In  
648 lateralized conditions, the center of pressure trajectory was shifted towards the paretic or nonparetic  
649 legs (green and orange), while the bilateral condition showed no lateralized bias (blue). Note that the  
650 paretic-loaded condition refers to movement of the support surface and feet in the direction of the  
651 nonparetic limb, consequently shifting the center of pressure beneath of paretic limb and loading the  
652 paretic limb during the rapid kinetic reaction. Condition-averaged center of pressure trajectories are  
653 shown from an example participant in each group.


654

655




656

657 **Figure 2: Impaired cortical responses associated with clinical balance and mobility after stroke.**  
 658 (A) Evoked cortical N1 response waveforms during balance recovery are shown collapsed across all  
 659 perturbation conditions in each group. Means  $\pm$  SEMs are depicted in the shaded regions (top). In  
 660 participants after stroke, cortical N1 responses showed later peak latencies (stroke= $219 \pm 39$  ms;  
 661 control= $196 \pm 22$  ms, \* $p=0.025$ ) and attenuated peak amplitudes (stroke= $14.9 \pm 11.9$ ;  
 662 control= $21.7 \pm 11.0$ , \*\* $p=0.047$ ) compared to age-matched controls (bottom). (B) Relationships  
 663 between evoked cortical N1 peak latency (left column) and peak amplitude (right column) during  
 664 reactive balance across all conditions versus miniBEST score (top row), single-task timed-up-and-go  
 665 (TUG) test (middle row), and walking speed (bottom row), in individuals post stroke and age-  
 666 matched controls. For the miniBEST, slower cortical N1 response latencies were associated with  
 667 lower miniBEST score in the stroke group ( $r=-0.61, p=0.007$ ) while showing no relationship in  
 668 controls ( $r=-0.274, p=0.304$ ). (A). For the TUG, both groups showed an association between later  
 669 cortical N1 latency and slower TUG performance (stroke: ( $r=0.53, p=0.024$ ; controls:  $r=0.508,$   
 670  $p=0.045$ ). For gait speed, slower cortical N1 response latencies showed a trend for association with  
 671 slower gait speed in the stroke group ( $r=-0.46, p=0.055$ ), a relationship that was absent in controls  
 672 ( $r=-0.001, p=0.997$ ). Cortical N1 peak amplitude (right column) was not significantly associated with  
 673 any clinical balance or mobility function metric in the stroke and control groups ( $p>0.11$ ).



674

675 **Figure 3: Cortical N1 responses within each balance perturbation conditions.** (A) Cortical N1  
 676 response waveforms evoked during symmetrical bilateral (top) and lateralized perturbation  
 677 conditions loading each the left/paretic (middle) and right/nonparetic legs (bottom) are shown in each  
 678 the stroke and control groups. Means  $\pm$  SEMs are depicted in the shaded regions. (B) There was a  
 679 main effect of group, in which stroke showed later N1 peak latencies ( $F_{1,32}=5.27$ ,  $*p=0.028$ ) (top)  
 680 and a trend towards lower N1 peak amplitudes ( $F_{1,32}=2.932$ ,  $\alpha p=0.097$ ) (bottom) compared to  
 681 controls. While the paretic-loaded condition tended to elicit faster N1 response latencies ( $214\pm 35$  ms)  
 682 compared to the nonparetic-loaded ( $219\pm 42$  ms) or bilateral condition ( $219\pm 42$  ms) within the stroke  
 683 group, among high between-participant variability (C) there were no main effects of condition for N1  
 684 peak latency ( $F_{1,32}=1.063$ ,  $p=0.310$ ) (top) or amplitude ( $F_{1,32}=1.47$ ,  $p=0.292$ ) (bottom). Means  $\pm$  SDs  
 685 depicted in figure bar plots.



686

687 **Figure 4. Balance recovery kinetics and relationship to time-synchronized cortical N1 response**  
 688 **latency.** (A) Center of pressure displacement across bilateral, nonparetic-loaded, and paretic-loaded  
 689 perturbation conditions are shown as mean waveforms for each group. The center of pressure rate of  
 690 rise (CoP RoR) was calculated as the linear slope of the CoP displacement between 150-300 ms  
 691 (black vertical lines) post-perturbation onset (time=0). During paretic-loaded balance recovery  
 692 (middle), participants with stroke showed slower CoP RoR compared to nonparetic-loaded recovery  
 693 (bottom) ( $p=0.004$ ) and controls ( $p=0.012$ ) and no difference compared to the bilateral condition  
 694 (top). During nonparetic-loaded balance recovery, there was no difference in CoP RoR between  
 695 groups (bottom). Mean  $\pm$  SD are shown for CoP RoR. (B) During paretic-loaded balance recovery  
 696 (middle), there was a relationship between later cortical N1 peak latencies and slower CoP RoR in

697 stroke ( $r=-0.70$ ,  $p=0.003$ ) while no effect was observed in controls. During nonparetic-loaded  
698 recovery (bottom) and bilateral conditions (top), there was no relationship between cortical N1  
699 latency and CoP RoR. No relationships were observed between N1 amplitude and CoP RoR in any  
700 condition or group (not shown).

701

702

703



704 **Table 1 Stroke participant characteristics (n=18)**

Age (yrs)	Gender (M/F)	PSD (months)	Paretic side	Lesion Location	Gait speed (m/s)	TUG (s)	miniBEST
65-69	M	122	R leg	L BG	1.25	8.61	23
75-79	F	43	L leg	R IC/BG	0.99	12.42	21
60-64	M	56	R leg	L IC/BG	0.33	37.00	11
65-69	F	24	L leg	L Striatum, IC, Caudate	1.14	9.73	23
55-59	F	14	L leg	N/A	0.45	20.94	14
65-69	F	128	L leg	R CR, MI, SI	0.70	12.96	25
80-84	M	89	L leg	R MCA	0.70	19.59	12
45-49	F	41	L leg	R PLIC	0.80	11.70	22
65-69	F	85	R leg	L IC	1.06	11.83	19
55-59	M	56	L leg	R ACA	0.37	35.55	2
75-79	M	40	R leg	L Pons	0.52	22.55	14
55-59	M	86	L leg	R frontal, parietal	0.64	20.04	11
90-94	M	6	L leg	N/A	0.48	24.55	13
40-44	F	36	R leg	L MCA	0.83	11.56	20
55-59	M	49	L leg	N/A	1.36	8.93	21
50-54	M	48	L leg	R PLIC	1.00	21.53	15
70-74	F	114	L leg	R ACA	0.55	28.19	10
65-69	F	83	R leg	L PLIC, striatum	0.53	21.60	11

705  
706  
707  
708  
709

PSD = post stroke duration; TUG=Timed-Up-and-Go; m/s=meters per second; MI: primary motor cortex; SI: primary somatosensory cortex; IC: internal capsule; BG: basal ganglia; ACA: anterior cerebral artery; MCA: middle cerebral artery; PLIC: posterior limb IC; CR: corona radiata  
N/A = not available.

710

711

712 **Table 2 Participant group characteristics**

	Stroke, n=18	Older adult controls, n=16 <sup>a</sup>	P-value (t-test)
Age, years	65 ± 12	69 ± 8	0.241
Gender, male/female	9/9	4/12	0.126 <sup>b</sup>
miniBEST score	16 ± 6 [2-25]	24 ± 2 [20-28]	<0.001
TUG-test, seconds	18.8 ± 8.7 [8.6-37.0]	8.8 ± 1.9 [5.7 – 11.8]	<0.001
Walking speed, m/s	0.76 ± 0.31 [0.33 – 1.36]	1.22 ± 0.16 [1.02 – 1.56]	<0.001

713  
714  
715  
716  
717

TUG=Timed-Up-and-Go; m/s=meters per second;

<sup>a</sup>Excludes control participant (n=1) who withdrew from the study and was not included in analyses.

Values are depicted in mean ± standard deviation [range: minimum - maximum].

<sup>b</sup> Fisher's exact test

718

719 **Table 3 Group and condition differences in cortical and kinetic responses**

	Stroke, n=18	Older adult controls, n=16 <sup>a</sup>	P-value
<b>Cortical NI response latency (ms)</b>			0.722 (interaction)
Collapsed	219±39	196±22	0.025 (between-group t-test)
Bilateral leg loaded	219±36*	195±19*	0.310 (condition main effect)
Paretic leg loaded	214±35*	195±19*	NA
Nonparetic leg loaded	219±42*	194±20*	NA
<b>Cortical NI response amplitude (µV)</b>			0.516 (interaction)
Collapsed	14.9±11.9	21.7±11.0	0.047 (between-group t-test)
Bilateral leg loaded	15.1±11.1 <sup>∞</sup>	21.4±11.2 <sup>∞</sup>	0.292 (condition main effect)
Paretic leg loaded	15.1±12.0 <sup>∞</sup>	22.3±10.8 <sup>∞</sup>	
Nonparetic leg loaded	15.5±12.5 <sup>∞</sup>	22.3±11.4 <sup>∞</sup>	
<b>Kinetic CoP Rate of Rise (cm/s)</b>			<b>0.026</b> (interaction)
Bilateral leg loaded	28.8±7.8	31.6±4.6	0.312 (vs. P loaded)
Paretic leg loaded	27.6±9.3**	35.2±5.9**	
Nonparetic leg loaded	35.2±12.2	35.7±5.7	<b>0.004</b> (vs P loaded), <b>0.002</b> (vs. bilateral)

720 Main effect of group indicated by \* at p=0.028 and <sup>∞</sup> at p=0.097. Between-group post-hoc testing \*\*p=0.012; mean ± standard deviation.

721

722