

1 Objective turning measures improve diagnostic accuracy and relate to real-  
2 world mobility/combat readiness in chronic mild traumatic brain injury

3 Peter C. Fino<sup>1</sup>, Prokopios Antonellis<sup>2</sup>, Lucy Parrington,<sup>2,3</sup> Margaret M. Weightman<sup>4</sup>, Leland E.  
4 Dibble<sup>5</sup>, Mark E. Lester<sup>6</sup>, Carrie W. Hoppes<sup>7</sup>, Laurie A. King<sup>2, 8</sup>

5

6 <sup>1</sup>Department of Health & Kinesiology, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah, United States of  
7 America

8 <sup>2</sup>Department of Neurology, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, Oregon, United  
9 States of America

10 <sup>3</sup>Department of Dietetics, Human Nutrition and Sport, La Trobe University, Melbourne, Victoria,  
11 Australia

12 <sup>4</sup>Courage Kenny Research Center-Allina Health, Minneapolis, Minnesota, United States of  
13 America

14 <sup>5</sup>Department of Physical Therapy & Athletic Training, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah,  
15 United States of America

16 <sup>6</sup>Department of Physical Therapy, University of Texas Rio Grande Valley, Edinburg, Texas,  
17 United States of America

18 <sup>7</sup>Army-Baylor University Doctoral Program in Physical Therapy, Fort Sam Houston, Texas,  
19 United States of America

20 <sup>8</sup>National Center for Rehabilitative Auditory Research, Veterans Affairs Portland Health Care  
21 System, Portland, Oregon, United States of America

22

23 Corresponding Author:

24 Peter C. Fino, PhD  
25 250 S 1850 E, Rm 257, Salt Lake City, UT 84112, United States of America  
26 peter.fino@utah.edu  
27 801-213-1363

## 28 **ABSTRACT**

29 Introduction: Balance and mobility problems are common consequences after mild  
30 traumatic brain injury (mTBI). However, turning and non-straight locomotion, which are  
31 required for daily living, are rarely assessed in clinical tests of function after mTBI.  
32 Therefore, the primary goals of this study were to assess 1) the added value of clinic-  
33 based turning task variables, obtained using wearable sensors, over standard general  
34 assessments of mobility, and 2) assess the associations between general assessments  
35 of mobility, objective variables from clinic-based turning tasks, and ecologically-relevant  
36 functional tasks.

37 Materials and Methods: Fifty-three individuals with mTBI and 57 healthy controls  
38 participated across three sites. Participants were tested in a single session that  
39 encompassed self-reported questionnaires including demographic information and  
40 balance and mobility testing including the use of wearable sensors. Lasso regression  
41 models and the area under the receiver-operator characteristic curve (AUC) assessed  
42 diagnostic accuracy. Partial correlation coefficients assessed the relationship between  
43 each variable with ecologically-relevant functional tasks.

44 Results: Multivariate models revealed high diagnostic accuracy, with an AUC of 0.92,  
45 using multiple clinic-based turning variables. The complex turning course (CTC) yielded  
46 the highest multivariate AUC (95% CI) of 0.90 (0.84, 0.95) for single task, and the  
47 average lap time from the CTC had the highest univariate AUC (95% CI) of 0.70 (0.58,  
48 0.78). Turning variables provided added value, indicated by higher AUCs, over standard  
49 general assessments of mobility. Turning variables had strong associations with

50 ecologically-relevant functional tasks and outperformed general assessments of  
51 mobility.

52 Discussion: Clinic-based turning tasks, especially the CTC, have high diagnostic  
53 accuracy, strong associations with ecologically-relevant functional tasks, and require  
54 relatively short time(s) to complete. Compared to general assessments of mobility,  
55 clinic-based turning tasks may be more ecologically-relevant to daily function. Future  
56 work should continue to examine the CTC alongside other promising tools for return-to-  
57 activity assessments.

58 **KEY TERMS:** concussion; mild traumatic brain injury; assessment; turning measures

## 59 INTRODUCTION

60 Balance and mobility problems are common consequences after mild traumatic  
61 brain injury (mTBI), with variable presentations depending on the specific cognitive,  
62 motor, and sensory demands of the task as well as personal and injury factors of the  
63 individual with mTBI (1, 2). Consequently, results from objective assessments of  
64 balance and mobility are important clinical tools that can inform rehabilitation  
65 prescription and track recovery over time. Capturing deficits after mTBI and  
66 understanding their impact on a patient's life requires assessments of mobility that  
67 reflect the demands of daily living. While extensive literature on dual-task (DT) gait,  
68 where mobility tasks are combined with a simultaneous cognitive task to mirror  
69 everyday life, demonstrates diagnostic utility in people with mTBI (3-8), these tasks are  
70 often limited to straight-line walking and artificial, laboratory-based cognitive tasks such  
71 as serial 3 subtraction. Other multi-faceted clinical assessment batteries such as the  
72 Functional Gait Assessment (FGA) (9), High-level Mobility Assessment Tool (HiMAT)  
73 (10, 11), 4-Item Hybrid Assessment of Mobility for mTBI (HAM-4-mTBI) (12), and mini  
74 Balance Evaluation Systems Test (mini-BESTest) (13) include a variety of mobility  
75 tasks, such as walking with horizontal head turns, running, bounding, and reactive  
76 stepping with varying motor demands. The majority of individual test items within these  
77 general measures of mobility similarly focus on straight-line walking. Non-straight  
78 locomotion and ambulatory turning to navigate complex environments are rarely  
79 assessed in clinical tests of function after mTBI. Recognizing that work has begun to  
80 identify more complex and ecologically relevant tasks such as the Assessment of  
81 Military Multitasking Performance (AMMP) (14, 15), and more recently the Portable

82 Warrior Test of Tactical Agility (POWAR-TOTAL) (16) that may contribute to return to  
83 duty decisions in the military, tasks that identify issues with key components of everyday  
84 mobility such as those involving turning may provide important discriminatory ability for  
85 individuals with persistent deficits affecting function in a targeted fashion.

86 Ambulatory turning is an important characteristic of daily mobility as individuals  
87 inevitably must navigate through complex environments that do not permit straight-line  
88 travel. Approximately 40% of all steps are non-straight steps involving some degree of  
89 turning (17). Stable turning requires anticipatory postural control (18), asymmetrical  
90 loading across limbs (19), and dynamic reweighting of sensory information to account  
91 for time-varying gravito-inertial accelerations (20, 21). As turning is often enacted to get  
92 to a target object or location, people also reorient their gaze and stabilize visual  
93 information using sophisticated oculomotor and vestibulo-ocular reflexes, and use  
94 sequential rotations of the head, trunk, pelvis, and feet to reorient to the new direction of  
95 travel (22-24). These characteristics of turning are unique from straight gait, and models  
96 of mobility should include turning as a factor that is independent from other traditional  
97 measures of gait such as pace, rhythm, and variability (25, 26).

98 Preliminary work in a sample of individuals with persisting balance-related  
99 symptoms after mTBI (i.e., chronic mTBI) demonstrated slower turning speeds and  
100 more variable head-on-body coordination when walking along a complex turning course  
101 simulating turns performed in daily life (27). Other studies have reported abnormal  
102 balance control during turning in otherwise asymptomatic athletes recovering from mTBI  
103 (28). When selecting an optimized set of clinical items from the FGA and HiMAT, the  
104 Gait with Pivot Turn test item from the FGA was one of only four test items retained for

105 use in populations with chronic mTBI (12). These studies suggest assessments of  
106 turning may have clinical value in populations with mTBI. However, such results leave  
107 ambiguity over which assessment of turning, and which variables, are most relevant for  
108 assessing and monitoring people with mTBI. The clinical value of turning may depend  
109 on the specific demands, instructions, and outcomes of the turning task. For example,  
110 tasks requiring faster turning speeds can elicit more severe symptoms due to greater  
111 rates of change in visual and vestibular sensory stimulation (29-31), and this  
112 provocation of symptoms may affect performance. Other methodological considerations,  
113 like the sharpness of the turn angle (27), the height of objects such as cones versus  
114 lines on the ground outlining the course (32), or the cognitive complexity and modality of  
115 the task (33), can similarly affect turning behavior, such as turning speed and head-  
116 body coordination. These factors may affect the clinical value of turning measures for  
117 people with mTBI.

118         The need for objective measurements of turning becomes evident due to the  
119 limitations of self-report questionnaires and the often subtle and diverse ways mTBI can  
120 manifest (4, 34-38). For instance, one of the most common scales used to assess  
121 balance following mTBI is the Balance Error Scoring System (BESS), in which  
122 healthcare and sports medicine professionals subjectively count errors and instances of  
123 loss of balance while the patient assumes various stance positions with their eyes  
124 closed (39). However, even when the BESS results appear normal, more objective  
125 measures such as the instrumented BESS (utilizing a single inertial sensor during the  
126 testing protocol) may reveal abnormalities (35, 36). Similarly, instrumented sway from  
127 the Clinical Test for Sensory Interaction in Balance (mCTSIB) reveal abnormalities

128 where clinical ratings show normal function after mTBI (40). Clinical scales that include  
129 turning, such as the Berg Balance Scale (41), often have ceiling effects and may not  
130 detect subtle deficits after mTBI especially in highly fit and athletic populations (34). In  
131 contrast, instrumented measures of turning, such as peak velocity and segmental  
132 coordination across various turn angles, provide reliable measures capable of detecting  
133 subtle deficits without relying on subjective visual ratings (42). Both the Veterans  
134 Affairs/Department of Defense (VA/DoD) Clinical Practice Guideline for the  
135 Management and Rehabilitation of Post-acute Mild Traumatic Brain Injury(43) and Sixth  
136 Consensus Statement on Concussion in Sport (44) recommend multimodal screenings  
137 that include gait, with the VA/DoD guidelines specifically calling for the evaluation of  
138 “walking, tandem walking, walking with head turns, and whole-body turning.” Official  
139 evaluation of sport-related concussion should include “timed tandem gait as a single  
140 task and a more complex dual-task with the addition of a cognitive task (such as serial  
141 7’s, months backwards or word recall backwards)” (44). The clinical recommendations  
142 for including gait, especially turning and DT measures, in mTBI screenings underscores  
143 the importance of such measurements, and emphasizes the need for objective tools  
144 that are able to detect residual and subtle deficits.

145 Beyond diagnostic accuracy, the degree to which objective measures of turning  
146 reflect a patient’s ability to return-to-duty (RTD), work, or sport remains unclear. This  
147 association with real-world function is particularly relevant for rehabilitation decisions  
148 that must determine whether subtle residual deficits after mTBI impact one’s readiness  
149 for duty, work, or sport. In military populations, where an individual must be able to  
150 perform warrior tasks and battle drills such as moving under fire, reacting to contact,

151 and maintaining situational awareness, performance on such duty-relevant tasks is  
152 essential to maintain combat effectiveness and ensure survival for themselves and their  
153 fellow service members. Common general measures of mobility such as the FGA and  
154 HiMAT may not represent the demands imposed by daily life, sports, or specific warrior  
155 tasks (urban assault, movement to contact, etc.) that require complex multi-segmental  
156 coordination while under cognitive load (45, 46). The clinical utility of turning metrics is  
157 jointly determined by the diagnostic accuracy and association with real-world mobility  
158 and combat readiness.

159         Therefore, the first goal of this larger study (37) was to assess diagnostic  
160 accuracy—the added value of objective turning measures over standard, general  
161 assessments of mobility in identifying concussed individuals who are not fully  
162 recovered. We expected that variables from clinic-based turning tasks would have  
163 better diagnostic accuracy for identifying individuals with mTBI, as indicated by a  
164 greater area under the receiver-operator characteristic (ROC) curve (AUC) compared to  
165 general measures of mobility. The second goal of this study was to support the validity  
166 of the turning variables and assess the associations between general measures of  
167 mobility and clinic-based turning tasks with performance in a community ambulatory  
168 task (CAT) and a military-relevant simulated urban patrol task (SUP) which we are  
169 designating as ecologically-relevant functional tasks. We hypothesized that objective  
170 turning variables obtained during the clinic-based turning tasks would be more strongly  
171 associated with performance in ecologically-relevant functional tasks compared to  
172 performance in general measures of mobility. Finally, we sought to provide  
173 recommendations on the best turning tasks and variables for future clinical



174 implementation based on the diagnostic accuracy, added value, and association with  
175 the ecologically-relevant functional tasks.

176

## 177 **MATERIALS and METHODS**

### 178 Participants

179 As part of the ReTURN study protocol (ClinicalTrials.gov: NCT03892291) (37), a  
180 total of 53 individuals with mTBI and 57 healthy controls (Table 1) were recruited from  
181 May 15, 2019 to October 20, 2020 across three sites (Oregon Health & Science  
182 University, Portland, OR; University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT; Courage Kenny  
183 Research Center - Allina Health, Minneapolis, MN). Inclusion criteria for those with  
184 mTBI were: (1) have a diagnosis of mTBI, (2) be between 18 and 50 years of age, and  
185 (3) be outside of the acute stage (>3 weeks post-concussion) but within 3 years of their  
186 most recent mTBI and still reporting symptoms. Control participants either had no  
187 history of mTBI or were more than 7 years removed from their most recent mTBI and  
188 had no reported residual symptoms. Potential participants were excluded if they: (1) had  
189 a history of any other injury, medical condition, or neurological illness that could  
190 potentially impair their balance (i.e., lower extremity injury, recent surgery, stroke), (2)  
191 had a current substance abuse disorder, (3) were pregnant, or (4) were unable to  
192 communicate in English. The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration  
193 of Helsinki (1964) and approved by the Institutional Review Board at each of the sites.  
194 Informed written consent was obtained prior to participation.

195

196

197

Table 1. Demographic characteristics for 53 individuals with mild traumatic brain injury (mTBI) and 57 healthy controls reported as mean (SD) unless otherwise noted.

		mTBI	Control
Demographics	N (% male)	53 (21%)	57 (28%)
	Age (years)	32.0 (9.6)	31.1 (9.5)
	Height (m)	1.7 (0.3)	1.7 (0.1)
	Mass (kg)	72.1 (21.6)	72.4 (17.1)
	Days since concussion <sup>a,b</sup>	261 [21-989]	4564 [1,441-6,105]
	Race/Ethnicity		
	Black/African American	0	1
	Hispanic/Latino	1	0
	White/ Caucasian	49	53
	Bi-racial	3	3
	Highest Education Level		
	High school graduate/GED	2	6
	Some college/Associate's	21	8
	Bachelor's degree	19	14
Some graduate school	3	3	
Master's degree	3	14	
Doctoral degree	5	12	
Comorbidities <sup>c</sup>	Anxiety	9 (17%)	2 (4%)
	Depression	6 (11%)	2 (4%)
	Attention deficit disorder	2 (4%)	2 (4%)
	Learning disability	2 (4%)	1 (2%)
	Post-traumatic stress	1 (2%)	0 (0%)
Self-reported symptoms <sup>a</sup>	Total DHI <sup>a</sup>	14 [0-58]	0 [0-10]
	Total NSI	27.7 (15.1)	5.1 (4.3)

<sup>a</sup>. Reported as median [min-max]; <sup>b</sup>. 7 of 57 healthy controls had a remote history of concussion; <sup>c</sup> Reported as n (percentage);  
DHI=Dizziness Handicap Inventory; NSI=Neurobehavioral Symptom Inventory;  
Note: This sample is part of a larger study (37) – the subjects included here are identical to the subjects included in other studies(47-49)

198            Procedures

199            Participants completed one testing session that encompassed self-reported  
200            questionnaires including demographic information and symptom checklists,  
201            neurocognitive testing, and balance and mobility testing including wearable sensors. For  
202            the primary purposes of this study, only the mobility procedures are further described in  
203            detail.

204 *Clinic-Based Turning Tasks*

205 Participants completed three clinic-based turning tasks in a randomized order  
206 (Figure 1): 1) a one-minute walk test (1MW) that involved walking at a comfortable pace  
207 between two lines on the ground marked 6 m apart and included 180° turns, 2) a  
208 modified Illinois Agility Test (mIAT) that involved running at a maximal safe speed  
209 around cones with multiple turns (end, slalom, and mid), and 3) a 140-second walk  
210 around a complex turning course (CTC) designed to mimic turns performed in daily life,  
211 which involved walking at a comfortable pace around 45°, 90°, and 135° turns. Each of  
212 the three turning tasks were completed twice (once under single-task (ST) and another  
213 time under DT conditions). The cognitive component for the 1MW and mIAT DT  
214 conditions was an 8-digit alpha-numeric grid coordinate memorization task that was  
215 introduced within the context of a civilian geocaching activity (15). The cognitive overlay  
216 for the CTC DT condition involved monitoring and responding to keywords in a custom-  
217 developed simulated radio chatter task designed to mimic demands of military service  
218 (14, 15).

219  
220 **Fig 1.** Schematic of the three clinic-based turning tasks with individual turns marked.  
221 Turn angles for the complex turning course (CTC) are with respect to straight walking.

222

223

224 *General Measures of Mobility*

225 In addition to the clinic-based turning tasks, participants completed two standard  
226 clinical assessments to obtain general measures of mobility including the FGA (9) and

227 the HiMAT (10). These two clinical assessments were completed and scored based on  
228 standard instructions.

### 229 *Ecologically-Relevant Functional Tasks*

230 The Community Ambulatory Task (CAT) involved participants walking at their  
231 self-selected pace while navigating through a building following landmark-based  
232 directions (e.g., “walk down the hallway towards the black doors”). Instructions were  
233 provided verbally by a researcher who walked behind the participant to avoid affecting  
234 the pace of the participant. The CAT was unique to each site, but all took approximately  
235 6-7 minutes to complete and contained a standardized set of components common to  
236 everyday ambulation (i.e., turns, stairs, use of signage).

237 The Simulated Urban Patrol (SUP) involved navigating a small subdivided room  
238 containing LED targets representing hostile (red) and friendly (blue) targets. The room  
239 was constructed using PVC pipe and 2.44 m tall black curtains. The LED targets were  
240 constructed using an Adafruit Circuit Playground Express circuit board (Adafruit  
241 Industries, LLC; New York, NY) programmed to display red or blue LEDs and to  
242 respond to an infrared LED signal from a laser-tag weapon (Model T1504, Dynasty  
243 Toys). Upon ‘tagging’ the targets with the laser-tag weapon, the targets were  
244 programmed to turn off. If a friendly target was tagged, the target was programmed to  
245 turn white. Three hostile targets were programmed to require multiple shots to fully clear  
246 – the target would illuminate 2/3 of the red LEDs (1/3 cleared) after one shot, 1/3 of the  
247 red LEDs (2/3 cleared) after two shots, and no LEDs (fully cleared) after three shots.  
248 Ten total targets were displayed in the subdivided room.

249 Using a laser-tag weapon, participants were instructed to clear all hostile targets  
250 as quickly as possible without tagging friendly targets. Participants were given one  
251 practice trial where all targets were set to hostile (red). Following the practice trial, three  
252 SUP trials were completed and recorded. The location of the targets was fixed  
253 throughout the test, but the configuration of each target (hostile vs. friendly) was  
254 changed between trials.

## 255 Data Analysis and Outcome Measures

### 256 *Clinic-Based Turning Tasks*

257 During all clinic-based turning tasks, inertial measurement units (128 Hz; APDM,  
258 a Clario Company, Portland, OR, USA) on the forehead, sternum, lumbar spine, and  
259 bilateral feet collected tri-axial acceleration and angular velocity data. During each of the  
260 turning tasks, peak angular rates for each segment, segmental coordination, and overall  
261 speed (e.g., lap times) were obtained from the inertial sensors using previously defined  
262 algorithms (42, 50). Briefly, body-fixed yaw angular velocities were extracted from each  
263 1MW, mIAT, and CTC test and filtered using a 1.5 Hz low-pass phaseless Butterworth  
264 filter. Specific turns for the mIAT and CTC were identified using a template-based  
265 approach based on the prescribed path (50), and each turn variable was matched to  
266 each turn type (slalom, mid, and end turns for mIAT; 45°, 90°, and 135° turns for CTC).  
267 Speed variables (PeakHeadV, PeakTrunkV, PeakLumbarV) were defined as the peak  
268 angular rate of each segment (Head, Trunk, Pelvis, respectively). Intersegmental  
269 coordination variables (Lumbar2Head, Lumbar2Trunk, Trunk2Head) were defined as  
270 the difference in time between peak angular rates of two segments where positive  
271 values indicate the superior segment led the inferior segment (e.g., a Lumbar2Head

272 value of +100 indicates the head reached its peak velocity 100 ms before the pelvis  
273 reached its peak velocity for a given turn type) (27). Since each task included multiple  
274 turns across each turn angle, variables were averaged within each turn angle. In  
275 addition to these measures, the task completion time for the mIAT, the average lap time  
276 for the CTC, and the variability (standard deviation) of lap time for the CTC were  
277 retained as variables. Therefore, all processing yielded a total of 6 variables (3 speed +  
278 3 coordination) for the 1MW, 19 variables (9 speed + 9 coordination + 1 completion  
279 time) for the mIAT, and 20 variables (9 speed + 9 coordination + 2 lap times) for the  
280 CTC. The greater number of variables for the mIAT and CTC was due to three different  
281 turn angles compared to only one turn angle ( $180^\circ$ ) for the 1MW.

282 Additional exploratory variables were also examined for each task. These  
283 exploratory variables included measures of head turn symmetry, range of motion, and  
284 variabilities of peak turning speed and intersegmental coordination. Head turn symmetry  
285 was defined as the ratio of peak turning speed of the head during turns to the left  
286 divided by peak turning speed of the head during turns to the right. Head range of  
287 motion was defined as the difference between the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile and 5<sup>th</sup> percentile of  
288 the head-on-trunk angle, obtained through cumulative trapezoidal integration (*cumtrapz*  
289 function in MATLAB) of the head-on-trunk angular velocity, over the duration of the  
290 entire trial. The variabilities of peak turning speed and intersegmental coordination  
291 variables were defined as the standard deviation of each outcome within a given trial.  
292 This yielded a total of 152 different turning variables. A list and description of all  
293 variables is provided in the supplemental material (Supplement A).

294 *General Measures of Mobility*

295 Clinical outcomes of FGA total score and HiMAT total score were calculated for  
296 each respective battery. The four-item HAM-4-mTBI was calculated from the FGA and  
297 HiMAT using the individual item scores of Walk with Pivot Turn, Walk with Horizontal  
298 Head Turns, Fast Forward Walk, and Fast Backward Walk (12). Additionally, to capture  
299 a traditional measure of self-selected walking speed, straight-path gait speed was  
300 extracted from the ST and DT 1MW tests using validated and automated Mobility Lab  
301 software (APDM, a Clario Company, Portland, OR, USA).

302 *Ecologically-Relevant Functional Tasks*

303 Performance on the CAT was quantified as the total time to complete the course.  
304 Performance on the SUP was quantified using a throughput score (total accuracy  
305 score/total time), where points were awarded based on the Comstock method that  
306 allows for unlimited rounds, but heavily penalizes shooting the wrong target (i.e.,  
307 shooting a friendly target is twice as bad as missing a hostile target). Each trial therefore  
308 had a total possible points [possible points = 2 \* (Number of friendly targets) + 1 \*  
309 (Number of hostile targets)] and an accuracy score [accuracy score = Possible points –  
310 2 \* (Number of tagged friendly targets) – 1 \* (Number of untagged hostile targets)].(51)  
311 The final measure for performance on the SUP was the total throughput, defined as the  
312 sum of the total points divided by the sum of trial times (*SUP Throughput* =

313 
$$\frac{\sum_{n=1}^3 Accuracy\ Score_n}{\sum_{n=1}^3 Trial\ Time_n}$$



314            Statistical Analysis

315            To determine the diagnostic accuracy of turning outcomes to discriminate  
316 between healthy controls and people with mTBI, we first conducted a variable reduction  
317 procedure on all 152 primary and exploratory variables using lasso regression with 10-  
318 fold cross-validation to minimize the model deviance. Next, we constructed separate  
319 logistic regression models for each variable retained by the lasso regression to  
320 investigate the AUC for each turning variable individually. Then, we constructed ROC  
321 curves for a) the lasso model including all retained variables and b) the univariate  
322 logistic regression model considering each retained variable separately. For each ROC  
323 curve, we calculated the AUC and the 95% confidence interval (CI) of the AUC using  
324 bootstrapping with 10,000 iterations.

325            Since it is possible that retained variables all originate from separate tests (i.e.,  
326 1MW vs. mIAT vs. CTC), we further investigated the diagnostic accuracy of *individual*  
327 *tests* by running three separate lasso regressions, each with the same 10-fold cross-  
328 validation to minimize model deviance. Each lasso regression model included only  
329 variables from a single test (e.g., 1MW vs. mIAT vs. CTC), but included both ST and DT  
330 conditions. AUCs and 95% CIs were generated for each test using the same process  
331 described above.

332            To determine if turning outcomes have added value over standard clinical  
333 assessment batteries, forward stepwise logistic regression models were implemented  
334 using each clinical assessment as the base predictor. Variables were added to the base  
335 model in order of their univariate AUC (highest AUC added first). Separate models were  
336 fit for each clinical assessment (FGA, HiMAT, gait speed). Stopping criteria were

337 determined using the Akaike Information Criteria (AIC). AUC values and 95% CIs were  
338 determined from the final model using bootstrapping with 10,000 iterations.

339 To assess the capacity of objective turning measures to predict performance in  
340 the ecologically-relevant functional tasks (CAT or SUP), partial correlation coefficients  
341 assessed the linear relationship between each variable and the performance outcome  
342 for the CAT (time to completion) and SUP (throughput score) while adjusting for age,  
343 body mass index (BMI), sex, mTBI status, and site. A 0.05 significance level with  
344 Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rate (FDR) correction (52) was used throughout.

## 345 RESULTS

346 Descriptive statistics for each variable and tests for between-group differences  
347 are presented in the supplemental material (Supplement B).

### 348 Diagnostic Accuracy

349 A total of 22 of the possible 152 turning variables were retained following the  
350 lasso regression (Figure 2). The multivariate lasso model yielded an AUC (95% CI) of  
351 0.92 (0.85, 0.96). Of the 22 retained turning variables, the average lap time during the  
352 ST CTC had the single largest AUC (95% CI) of 0.70 (0.58, 0.78). When lasso models  
353 were run as individual tests, the model initially including all 1MW outcomes yielded an  
354 AUC (95% CI) of 0.71 (0.61, 0.81) with 6 variables retained in the final model, the mIAT  
355 yielded an AUC (95% CI) of 0.78 (0.69, 0.86) with 8 retained variables, and the CTC  
356 yielded an AUC (95% CI) of 0.90 (0.84, 0.95) with 16 retained variables (Figure 3).

357 **Fig 2.** Areas under the receiver-operator characteristic curve (AUC) for the final lasso  
358 model (black) and univariate AUCs for each term included in the lasso model.  
359 Univariate AUCs are presented in different symbols for the type of variable (circle =  
360 speed, triangle = segmental coordination), different colors for the different tests (blue =  
361 complex turning course, yellow = modified Illinois Agility Test, red = one-minute walk  
362 test), and different fills for single- or dual-task (filled shape = single-task, empty shape =  
363 dual-task). Whiskers indicate the 95% confidence interval for each AUC.

364

365 **Fig 3.** Areas under the receiver-operator characteristic curve (AUC) for the lasso  
366 models for individual tests. Each panel includes the final lasso model (black) and  
367 univariate AUCs for each term included in the lasso models. Univariate AUCs are  
368 presented in different symbols for the type of variable (circle = speed, triangle =  
369 segmental coordination), different colors for the different tests (blue = complex turning  
370 course, yellow = modified Illinois Agility Test, red = one-minute walk test), and different  
371 fills for single- or dual-task (filled shape = single-task, empty shape = dual-task).  
372 Whiskers indicate the 95% confidence interval for each AUC.

373 Added Value of Clinic-Based Turning Tasks

374 The forward stepwise logistic models achieved stopping criteria (local minimum  
 375 in AIC) after three turning variables for the FGA, HiMAT, and HAM-4-mTBI models  
 376 (Table 2). The model based on the FGA achieved a final AUC (95% CI) of 0.80 (0.70,  
 377 0.87). The model based on the HiMAT achieved a final AUC (95% CI) of 0.79 (0.70,  
 378 0.86). The model based on the HAM-4-mTBI achieved a final AUC (95% CI) of 0.81  
 379 (0.73, 0.88). Stopping criteria was achieved after the addition of four turning variables  
 380 for ST and DT gait speed, with final AUCs (95% CI) of 0.82 (0.72, 0.88) and 0.82 (0.73,  
 381 0.89), respectively. Comparatively, the AUC (95% CI) was 0.68 (0.57, 0.77) for the  
 382 FGA, 0.65 (0.53, 0.74) for the HiMAT, 0.71 (0.61, 0.80) for the HAM-4-mTBI, 0.63 (0.52,  
 383 0.74) for ST gait speed, and 0.64 (0.53, 0.75) for DT gait speed.

**Table 2.** Results of the area under the receiver operator characteristic curve (AUC) from the stepwise logistic regression models to evaluate the added value of turning variables over standard mobility assessments. Base models included the Functional Gait Assessment (FGA), High-level Mobility Assessment Tool (HiMAT), 4-Item Hybrid Assessment of Mobility for mild Traumatic Brain Injury (HAM-4-mTBI), single-task (ST) gait speed, and dual-task (DT) gait speed. Each model included the following terms added, in order, to the base model: average lap time for the ST complex turning course (CTC); lumbar-to-trunk coordination during the middle turn on the ST modified Illinois Agility Test (mIAT); lumbar-to-trunk coordination during 45° turns of the DT CTC; and completion time for the DT mIAT.

Model	FGA			HiMAT			HAM-4-mTBI			ST Gait Speed			DT Gait Speed		
	AUC	95% CI		AUC	95% CI		AUC	95% CI		AUC	95% CI		AUC	95% CI	
Base	0.68	0.57	0.77	0.65	0.53	0.74	0.71	0.61	0.80	0.63	0.52	0.74	0.64	0.53	0.75
Base+1	0.75	0.64	0.84	0.74	0.63	0.83	0.78	0.68	0.86	0.70	0.59	0.79	0.70	0.60	0.79
Base+2	0.78	0.67	0.86	0.79	0.70	0.86	0.80	0.70	0.87	0.73	0.63	0.82	0.73	0.63	0.82
Base+3	0.80	0.70	0.87	0.81	0.72	0.88	0.81	0.73	0.88	0.77	0.67	0.84	0.77	0.66	0.84
Base+4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.82	0.72	0.88	0.82	0.73	0.89

384

385 Association with Ecologically-Relevant Functional Tasks (CAT and SUP)

386 Descriptive statistics for the CAT and SUP are presented in the supplemental  
 387 material (Supplement C). Better performance on the CAT was significantly associated  
 388 with faster overall lap times of the ST and DT CTC ( $|r| = 0.53$ ,  $p < 0.0001$  and  $|r| = 0.47$ ,  
 389  $p < 0.0001$ , respectively) and faster peak turning speed of the sternum and lumbar

390 spine during the 1MW and CTC tasks ( $|r| = 0.27-0.42$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) (Figure 4 and Table 3).  
391 Instrumented measures from ST and DT straight gait were similarly associated with  
392 CAT completion time ( $|r| = 0.30-0.51$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), with DT gait speed having the strongest  
393 association. Performance on the CAT was not significantly associated with performance  
394 on the FGA, HiMAT, or HAM-4 ( $|r| = 0.19-0.24$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ).

395 **Figure 4.** Partial Pearson correlation coefficients for each turning variable obtained  
396 from the complex turning course (CTC), modified Illinois Agility Test (mIAT), and one-  
397 minute walk test (1MW) with completion time on the community ambulatory task (CAT;  
398 left) and simulated urban patrol (SUP; right). Correlation coefficients are shown in  
399 different symbols for the type of variable (circle = speed, triangle = segmental  
400 coordination), different colors for the different tests (blue = complex turning course,  
401 yellow = modified Illinois Agility Test, red = one-minute walk test), and different fills for  
402 single- or dual-task (filled shape = single-task, empty shape = dual-task).

403

**Table 3. Partial correlation coefficients between variables from the clinic-based turning tasks, general measures of mobility, and the community ambulation task (CAT). All variables are ranked by magnitude of correlation coefficient. Variables from clinic-based turning tasks are noted with an \* and only variables with significant associations (adjusted  $p < 0.05$ ) are shown.**

	Partial Correlation Coefficient ( $r$ )	Adjusted $p$ value
<u>Clinic-Based Turning Tasks</u>		
ST CTC - Avg Lap Time*	0.533	<0.001
DT CTC - Avg Lap Time*	0.470	<0.001
ST CTC - Peak Lumbar V (90°)*	-0.420	<0.001
ST CTC - Peak Lumbar V (45°)*	-0.366	0.003
ST CTC - Peak Lumbar V (135°)*	-0.363	0.003
ST CTC - Peak Trunk V (135°)*	-0.341	0.006
ST CTC - Peak Lumbar V SD (45°)*	-0.322	0.011
DT CTC - Peak Lumbar V (90°)*	-0.321	0.011
ST 1MW - Trunk2Head*	0.312	0.013
ST CTC - Peak Trunk V (90°)*	-0.308	0.015
DT 1MW - Peak Lumbar V*	-0.296	0.021
ST CTC - Peak Trunk V (135°)*	-0.295	0.021
DT mIAT - Completion Time*	0.280	0.033
DT 1MW - Peak Trunk V*	-0.278	0.033
ST CTC - Peak Trunk V (45°)*	-0.273	0.037
DT CTC - Peak Trunk V (45°)*	-0.273	0.037
DT CTC - Peak Lumbar V (135°)*	-0.272	0.037
ST 1MW - Peak Lumbar V*	-0.270	0.038
DT CTC - Peak Lumbar V (45°)*	-0.265	0.043
<u>General Measures of Mobility</u>		
Dual-task Gait Speed	-0.508	<0.001
Single-task Gait Speed	-0.455	<0.001
FGA Total Score	-0.235	0.083
HiMAT Total Score	-0.228	0.095
HAM-4-mTBI	-0.188	0.210

1MW = one-minute walk test; CTC = complex turning course; FGA = Functional Gait Assessment; HAM-4-mTBI = 4-Item Hybrid Assessment of Mobility for mild Traumatic Brain Injury; HiMAT = High-level Mobility Assessment Tool; mIAT = modified Illinois Agility Test; ST = single-task; DT = dual-task; SD = standard deviation

404

405 Better performance on the SUP was only significantly associated with faster DT

406 mIAT times ( $|r| = 0.34$ ,  $p = 0.031$ ). The association between SUP performance and

407 head-body coordination variability and peak trunk turning speed during the CTC

408 approached but failed to reach significance ( $|r| = 0.29-0.30$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ; Figure 4 and Table

409 4). No clinical measure (FGA, HiMAT, HAM-4-mTBI) was significantly associated with  
410 SUP performance ( $|r| = 0.15-0.29$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ). Amongst clinical measures, the HiMAT  
411 score was most strongly associated with SUP performance ( $|r| = 0.29$ ,  $p = 0.061$ ).

**Table 4. Partial correlation coefficients between variables from the clinic-based turning tasks (\*), general measures of mobility, and the simulated urban patrol (SUP) task.** All measures are ranked by magnitude of correlation coefficient. Instrumented turning measures are noted with an \* and only instrumented turning measures with significant associations (adjusted  $p < 0.05$ ) are shown.

	Partial Correlation Coefficient ( $r$ )	Adjusted $p$ value
<u>Clinic-Based Turning Tasks</u>		
Dual-task mIAT - Completion Time*	-0.336	0.031
<u>General Measures of Mobility</u>		
HiMAT Total Score	0.291	0.061
Dual-task Gait Speed	0.243	0.136
Single-task Gait Speed	0.234	0.156
HAM-4-mTBI	0.166	0.432

*HAM-4-mTBI = 4-Item Hybrid Assessment of Mobility for mild Traumatic Brain Injury;  
HiMAT = High-level Mobility Assessment Tool; mIAT = modified Illinois Agility Test*

412

## 413 **DISCUSSION**

414           This study sought to assess the clinical utility, including the diagnostic accuracy  
415 and associations with real-world performance, of objective turning measures from clinic-  
416 based turning tasks. Our results indicate that individual, objective turning measures  
417 from clinic-based turning tasks offer similar diagnostic capacities to standard clinical  
418 batteries such as the FGA, HiMAT, and HAM-4-mTBI. The value of instrumented clinic-  
419 based turning tasks, however, stems from the ability to capture multi-dimensional  
420 variables at once. Regression models using multiple variables from the same test  
421 yielded higher AUCs compared to standard clinical assessments (e.g., CTC AUC of  
422 0.90 vs. FGA AUC of 0.68). Further, objective outcomes, including lap time from the ST  
423 CTC and segmental coordination from the ST mlAT and DT CTC provided added value  
424 by improving the AUC of the FGA, HiMAT, HAM-4-mTBI, and standard assessments of  
425 ST or DT gait speed. This superior diagnostic capacity and added value of clinic-based  
426 turning tasks, with time commitments (<10 minutes) that are similar or shorter than  
427 standard clinical batteries, suggests instrumented, clinic-based turning tasks could  
428 improve clinical decisions, including RTD decisions. The military's Progressive Return to  
429 Activity: Primary Care for Acute Concussion Management outlines a physical and  
430 cognitive RTD screening "to objectively measure readiness for return to duty." However,  
431 the physical RTD screening only requires two minutes of supervised aerobic activity at  
432 an exertion rate of 16 or greater on the Borg Rate of Perceived Exertion scale. Overt  
433 symptom provocation is the only metric for determining readiness to progress to the  
434 cognitive RTD screening, the final step before returning a service member to full duty.  
435 Clinic-based turning tasks, especially when instrumented, could better inform readiness



436 for RTD than a service member's display of overt symptom provocation or self-report of  
437 worsening symptoms with exertion.

438 Objective turning variables were strongly associated with real-world function on  
439 the CAT or SUP, indicating a highly desirable feature for informing RTD decisions. A  
440 summary of key stakeholders, including rehabilitation specialists and military command  
441 leaders, reported that RTD decisions are primarily based on whether an individual can  
442 complete the required duties of their position.(53) Yet, few clinical assessments  
443 accurately reflect the demands of daily living, especially specialized military tasks.(53)  
444 Out of the standard clinical assessments, only ST and DT gait speed associated with  
445 the CAT, while 19 turning measures were associated with CAT performance. Given the  
446 nature of the CAT (walking and navigating through a building), it is unsurprising that gait  
447 speed was associated with CAT performance. However, lap time from the ST CTC  
448 exhibited a slightly stronger association with CAT performance. This result indicates that  
449 assessments of ambulatory turning may be more relevant to a person's daily life than  
450 straight-line walking. Similarly, completion time on the DT mIAT was the only variable  
451 associated with performance on the SUP; no standard clinical assessments were  
452 associated with this military-relevant activity. These results suggest the maximum  
453 running and turning speed during the mIAT better reflects high-demand simulated battle  
454 drills and may be more important than standard clinical assessments for extrapolating  
455 an individual's performance in combat. Movements during the mIAT may be similar to  
456 individual movement techniques service members must perform, like the 3-5 second  
457 rush (moving under fire).

458           Using inertial sensors to capture multiple objective measures of turning enabled  
459 individual tasks to achieve high diagnostic capacity, but isolated variables of CTC lap  
460 time and mIAT completion time had the strongest clinical utility. Average lap time from  
461 the ST CTC had the largest AUC of any clinic-based turning variable and the strongest  
462 association with CAT performance. Similarly, DT mIAT completion time had the fourth  
463 highest AUC and was the only variable associated with SUP performance. Both these  
464 measures reflect an overall performance on the CTC and mIAT task, respectively. While  
465 other variables such as peak turning speed and segmental coordination are isolated to  
466 specific turns within a task, these measures of lap / completion time include all aspects  
467 of the task. Specific features, such as the anticipatory adjustments when initiating or  
468 terminating a turn, and the walking or running in between turns, were not quantified by  
469 our selected variable set and may be important to understanding an individual's deficits,  
470 particularly during daily life. Notably, these lap time and completion time variables are  
471 reliable and do not require instrumentation (42). Both CTC lap time and mIAT  
472 completion time could be obtained from a stopwatch for rapid implementation in military  
473 and civilian clinics without access to inertial sensors.

474           A final goal of this study was to provide recommendations for future clinical  
475 adoption. Based on the available evidence from this study and prior studies on test-  
476 retest reliability, the CTC likely offers the best clinical utility. The CTC yielded the largest  
477 AUC values as a combined test, the individual variables with the largest univariate  
478 AUCs (ST CTC average lap time), and the individual variables with the strongest  
479 association with daily living. Combined, this suggests that the CTC may be a valuable  
480 addition to clinical mTBI evaluations, particularly if objective measures from inertial

481 sensors are available to generate the full variable set. However, before CTC variables  
482 can be used for clinical decisions, future research should examine changes to the CTC  
483 over the course of rehabilitation and whether better performance on the CTC associates  
484 with RTD outcomes such as faster RTD in the military population, return to sport in  
485 athletic populations, risk for musculoskeletal injuries that are common after mTBI (54-  
486 59), and overall performance in one's military occupational specialty.

487         While the CTC may offer the best clinical utility out of the tasks examined here, it  
488 is unlikely to be a panacea for RTD assessments. Complex and ecologically valid  
489 assessment techniques incorporating DT and multitask methods may prove useful in  
490 validating return-to-activity requirements in civilian and military populations as they more  
491 closely mimic real-world activity and are a step beyond single domain measures of  
492 impairment that do not capture the full picture of function (14). There are trade-offs to  
493 using more complex functional performance testing for return to activity decisions based  
494 on environment (e.g., deployed or garrison environment for military) and timeframe or  
495 operational needs for decisions to be made. Recently developed assessments like the  
496 Portable Warrior Test of Tactical Agility (POWAR-TOTAL) may be useful for testing  
497 military populations with combat roles, given its ability to discriminate service members  
498 with mTBI from controls and its responsiveness to rehabilitation (16, 60). However, such  
499 tasks may not be relevant for individuals with non-combat roles, including civilian  
500 populations. While the POWAR-TOTAL established construct validity using the HiMAT  
501 (60), the present CAT results suggest that the HiMAT lacks construct validity for  
502 functional tasks for civilians. Rather than reliance on a single assessment, the continued

503 development of multiple complementary, short, and clinically useful assessments that  
504 serve as a 'menu' based on the patient's needs may be ideal.

### 505 Limitations

506 A primary limitation of this study is the inclusion of only civilians with symptoms  
507 persisting beyond 3 weeks post-injury; military service members were not included. This  
508 study's patient population was selected because they represent individuals who seek  
509 rehabilitation and where return to work or sport decisions can be most complicated and  
510 were accessible to the study team at each site. However, these patients may not  
511 represent all individuals, including active-duty military personnel, law enforcement  
512 officers, or other tactical athletes for whom the SUP task is most ecologically-relevant.  
513 This limitation may explain the relatively weak associations we observed between the  
514 SUP and all variables, especially when compared to the CAT. A second limitation of this  
515 work was not considering mechanisms of injury in our analyses. It is possible that  
516 differences in the mechanisms of injury (e.g., motor-vehicle accident vs. sport-related  
517 vs. fall, etc.) may influence performance differently. Finally, this study did not assess  
518 other aspects that may influence an individual's ability to return to pre-injury activity,  
519 such as their psychological readiness. Prior work in athletes has identified transient  
520 changes in psychological readiness, including a lack of confidence in their ability to  
521 handle the demands of competition (61, 62). While objective measures of turning offer a  
522 valuable clinical tool for measuring behavioral outcomes, RTD decisions should also  
523 evaluate the individual's confidence to handle the task demands, which may also affect  
524 their readiness to return.

## 525 **CONCLUSION**

526           Simple turning outcomes can discriminate individuals with persistent mTBI  
527 symptoms from healthy controls as well as standard clinical batteries. Instrumented  
528 outcomes that quantify intersegmental coordination during these turning tasks provide  
529 even more benefit and can increase the diagnostic accuracy of these tests. For the  
530 civilian participants in this study, turning outcomes were strongly associated with real-  
531 world ambulation and military-relevant battle drills; standard clinical assessments  
532 exhibited weaker, or non-significant, associations with these CAT and SUP tasks.  
533 Predicting real-world performance requires assessments that match the cognitive and  
534 physical demands of the operational environment. Future work should quantify the  
535 ambulatory demands of real-world tasks (such as ecological assessments during  
536 training tasks performed in the field) and compare them to normative performance on  
537 clinically-feasible turning tasks to further establish their validity.

538

## 539 **DATA AVAILABILITY**

540 Data is available through the Federal Interagency Traumatic Brain Injury Research  
541 (FITBIR) Informatics System ([doi.org/10.23718/study/390](https://doi.org/10.23718/study/390)).

542

## 543 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

544 The authors wish to acknowledge Ben Cassidy and Ryan Pelo, PT, DPT from the  
545 University of Utah, Lindsey Lee and Josh Koch from Oregon Health & Science  
546 University, Patrick Michielutti PT, DPT and Max Klaiman from Courage Kenny Research

547 Center-Allina Health, as well as Holly Richard, PT, DPT and CPT Stefanie Faull, PT,  
548 DPT who collected data at Fort Sam Houston. Clinical Trials:  
549 <https://clinicaltrials.gov/study/NCT03892291>.

550

## 551 **DISCLOSURES / CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

552 The views expressed in this manuscript are those of the authors and do not necessarily  
553 represent the official policy or position of the U.S. Army Medical Center of Excellence,  
554 the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command, Department of the Army, Department  
555 of Defense, or any other U.S. Government agency. The authors declare that the  
556 research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that  
557 could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

558

## 559 **FUNDING**

560 This work was supported by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs  
561 endorsed by the Department of Defense, through the Congressionally Directed Medical  
562 Research Program under Award No. W81XWH1820049 (LK). An integrated SQL  
563 database at Oregon Health & Science University has housed all the data and is  
564 supported by the Oregon Clinical and Translational Research Institute funded by a grant  
565 from the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences (NCATS), National  
566 Institutes of Health, through Grant Award Number UL1TR002369.

## 567 REFERENCES

- 568 1. Fino PC, Dibble LE, Wilde EA, Fino NF, Johnson P, Cortez MM, et al. Sensory Phenotypes for  
569 Balance Dysfunction After Mild Traumatic Brain Injury. *Neurology*. 2022;99(5):e521-35.
- 570 2. Haran FJ, Slaboda JC, King LA, Wright WG, Houlihan D, Norris JN. Sensitivity of the Balance Error  
571 Scoring System and the Sensory Organization Test in the Combat Environment. *J Neurotrauma*.  
572 2016;33(7):705-11.
- 573 3. Buttner F, Howell DR, Ardern CL, Doherty C, Blake C, Ryan J, et al. Concussed athletes walk  
574 slower than non-concussed athletes during cognitive-motor dual-task assessments but not during single-  
575 task assessments 2 months after sports concussion: a systematic review and meta-analysis using  
576 individual participant data. *Br J Sports Med*. 2020;54(2):94-101.
- 577 4. Fino PC, Parrington L, Pitt W, Martini DN, Chesnutt JC, Chou LS, et al. Detecting gait  
578 abnormalities after concussion or mild traumatic brain injury: A systematic review of single-task, dual-  
579 task, and complex gait. *Gait Posture*. 2018;62:157-66.
- 580 5. Howell DR, Beasley M, Vopat L, Meehan WP, 3rd. The Effect of Prior Concussion History on Dual-  
581 Task Gait following a Concussion. *J Neurotrauma*. 2017;34(4):838-44.
- 582 6. Howell DR, Osternig LR, Chou LS. Single-task and dual-task tandem gait test performance after  
583 concussion. *Journal of science and medicine in sport / Sports Medicine Australia*. 2017;20(7):622-6.
- 584 7. Lee H, Sullivan SJ, Schneiders AG. The use of the dual-task paradigm in detecting gait  
585 performance deficits following a sports-related concussion: a systematic review and meta-analysis.  
586 *Journal of science and medicine in sport / Sports Medicine Australia*. 2013;16(1):2-7.
- 587 8. Register-Mihalik J, Littleton A, Guskiewicz K. Are Divided Attention Tasks Useful in the  
588 Assessment and Management of Sport-Related Concussion? *Neuropsychol Rev*. 2013;23(4):300-13.
- 589 9. Wrisley DM, Marchetti GF, Kuharsky DK, Whitney SL. Reliability, internal consistency, and  
590 validity of data obtained with the functional gait assessment. *Phys Ther*. 2004;84(10):906-18.
- 591 10. Williams G, Pallant J, Greenwood K. Further development of the High-level Mobility Assessment  
592 Tool (HiMAT). *Brain Inj*. 2010;24(7-8):1027-31.
- 593 11. Williams GP, Greenwood KM, Robertson VJ, Goldie PA, Morris ME. High-Level Mobility  
594 Assessment Tool (HiMAT): interrater reliability, retest reliability, and internal consistency. *Phys Ther*.  
595 2006;86(3):395-400.
- 596 12. Fino PC, Michielutti PG, Pelo R, Parrington L, Dibble LE, Hoppes CW, et al. A Hybrid Assessment  
597 of Clinical Mobility Test Items for Evaluating Individuals With Mild Traumatic Brain Injury. *Journal of*  
598 *neurologic physical therapy : JNPT*. 2023;47(2):84-90.
- 599 13. Franchignoni F, Horak F, Godi M, Nardone A, Giordano A. Using psychometric techniques to  
600 improve the Balance Evaluation Systems Test: the mini-BESTest. *Journal of rehabilitation medicine*.  
601 2010;42(4):323-31.
- 602 14. Scherer MR, Weightman MM, Radomski MV, Davidson LF, McCulloch KL. Returning service  
603 members to duty following mild traumatic brain injury: exploring the use of dual-task and multitask  
604 assessment methods. *Phys Ther*. 2013;93(9):1254-67.
- 605 15. Weightman MM, McCulloch KL, Radomski MV, Finkelstein M, Cecchini AS, Davidson LF, et al.  
606 Further Development of the Assessment of Military Multitasking Performance: Iterative Reliability  
607 Testing. *PLoS One*. 2017;12(1):e0169104.
- 608 16. McCulloch KL, Oh AS, Cecchini AS, Zhang W, Harrison C, Favorov O. Validity and Responsiveness  
609 of the Portable Warrior Test of Tactical Agility After Rehabilitation in Service Members With Mild  
610 Traumatic Brain Injury. *Phys Ther*. 2023;103(11).
- 611 17. Glaister BC, Bernatz GC, Klute GK, Orendurff MS. Video task analysis of turning during activities  
612 of daily living. *Gait Posture*. 2007;25(2):289-94.



- 613 18. Xu D, Carlton LG, Rosengren KS. Anticipatory postural adjustments for altering direction during  
614 walking. *J Mot Behav.* 2004;36(3):316-26.
- 615 19. Taylor M, Dabnichki P, Strike S. A three-dimensional biomechanical comparison between turning  
616 strategies during the stance phase of walking. *Human Movement Science.* 2005;24(4):558-73.
- 617 20. Imai T, Moore ST, Raphan T, Cohen B. Interaction of the body, head, and eyes during walking  
618 and turning. *Exp Brain Res.* 2001;136(1):1-18.
- 619 21. Raphan T, Imai T, Moore ST, Cohen B. Vestibular compensation and orientation during  
620 locomotion. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences.* 2001;942:128-38.
- 621 22. Bernardin D, Kadone H, Bennequin D, Sugar T, Zaoui M, Berthoz A. Gaze anticipation during  
622 human locomotion. *Exp Brain Res.* 2012;223(1):65-78.
- 623 23. Grasso R, Prevost P, Ivanenko YP, Berthoz A. Eye-head coordination for the steering of  
624 locomotion in humans: an anticipatory synergy. *Neurosci Lett.* 1998;253(2):115-8.
- 625 24. Hollands MA, Patla AE, Vickers JN. "Look where you're going!": gaze behaviour associated with  
626 maintaining and changing the direction of locomotion. *Exp Brain Res.* 2002;143(2):221-30.
- 627 25. Stuart S, Parrington L, Morris R, Martini DN, Fino PC, King LA. Gait measurement in chronic mild  
628 traumatic brain injury: A model approach. *Hum Mov Sci.* 2020;69:102557.
- 629 26. Powell D, Godfrey A, Parrington L, Campbell KR, King LA, Stuart S. Free-living gait does not  
630 differentiate chronic mTBI patients compared to healthy controls. *Journal of neuroengineering and  
631 rehabilitation.* 2022;19(1):49.
- 632 27. Fino PC, Parrington L, Walls M, Sippel E, Hullar TE, Chesnutt JC, et al. Abnormal Turning and Its  
633 Association with Self-Reported Symptoms in Chronic Mild Traumatic Brain Injury. *J Neurotrauma.*  
634 2018;35(10):1167-77.
- 635 28. Fino PC, Nussbaum MA, Brolinson PG. Locomotor deficits in recently concussed athletes and  
636 matched controls during single and dual-task turning gait: preliminary results. *Journal of  
637 neuroengineering and rehabilitation.* 2016;13(1):65.
- 638 29. Ellis MJ, Cordingley D, Vis S, Reimer K, Leiter J, Russell K. Vestibulo-ocular dysfunction in  
639 pediatric sports-related concussion. *Journal of neurosurgery Pediatrics.* 2015;16(3):248-55.
- 640 30. Kolev OI, Sergeeva M. Vestibular disorders following different types of head and neck trauma.  
641 *Functional neurology.* 2016;31(2):75-80.
- 642 31. Mucha A, Collins MW, Elbin RJ, Furman JM, Troutman-Enseki C, DeWolf RM, et al. A Brief  
643 Vestibular/Ocular Motor Screening (VOMS) assessment to evaluate concussions: preliminary findings.  
644 *Am J Sports Med.* 2014;42(10):2479-86.
- 645 32. Fino PC, Lockhart TE, Fino NF. Corner height influences center of mass kinematics and path  
646 trajectory during turning. *J Biomech.* 2015;48(1):104-12.
- 647 33. Hollands KL, Agnihotri D, Tyson SF. Effects of dual task on turning ability in stroke survivors and  
648 older adults. *Gait Posture.* 2014;40(4):564-9.
- 649 34. Fino PC, Wilhelm J, Parrington L, Stuart S, Chesnutt JC, King LA. Inertial Sensors Reveal Subtle  
650 Motor Deficits When Walking With Horizontal Head Turns After Concussion. *The Journal of head trauma  
651 rehabilitation.* 2019;34(2):E74-E81.
- 652 35. King LA, Horak FB, Mancini M, Pierce D, Priest KC, Chesnutt J, et al. Instrumenting the balance  
653 error scoring system for use with patients reporting persistent balance problems after mild traumatic  
654 brain injury. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2014;95(2):353-9.
- 655 36. King LA, Mancini M, Fino PC, Chesnutt J, Swanson CW, Markwardt S, et al. Sensor-Based Balance  
656 Measures Outperform Modified Balance Error Scoring System in Identifying Acute Concussion. *Ann  
657 Biomed Eng.* 2017.
- 658 37. Fino PC, Weightman MM, Dibble LE, Lester ME, Hoppes CW, Parrington L, et al. Objective Dual-  
659 Task Turning Measures for Return-to-Duty Assessment After Mild Traumatic Brain Injury: The ReTURN  
660 Study Protocol. *Front Neurol.* 2020;11:544812.



- 661 38. Buckley TA, Oldham JR, Caccese JB. Postural control deficits identify lingering post-concussion  
662 neurological deficits. *J Sport Health Sci.* 2016;5(1):61-9.
- 663 39. Riemann BL, Guskiewicz KM. Effects of mild head injury on postural stability as measured  
664 through clinical balance testing. *J Athl Train.* 2000;35(1):19-25.
- 665 40. Gera G, Chesnutt J, Mancini M, Horak FB, King LA. Inertial Sensor-Based Assessment of Central  
666 Sensory Integration for Balance After Mild Traumatic Brain Injury. *Mil Med.* 2018;183(suppl\_1):327-32.
- 667 41. Berg K, Wood-Dauphinee S, Williams JI. The Balance Scale: reliability assessment with elderly  
668 residents and patients with an acute stroke. *Scand J Rehabil Med.* 1995;27(1):27-36.
- 669 42. Weston AR, Antonellis P, Fino PC, Hoppes CW, Lester ME, Weightman MM, et al. Quantifying  
670 Turning Tasks with Wearable Sensors: A Reliability Assessment. *Phys Ther.* 2023;104(2), pzd134.
- 671 43. VA/DoD Clinical Practice Guideline for the Management and Rehabilitation of Post-Acute Mild  
672 Traumatic Brain Injury. [www.healthquality.va.gov/guidelines/Rehab/mtbi](http://www.healthquality.va.gov/guidelines/Rehab/mtbi): Department of Veterans  
673 Affairs and Department of Defense; 2021 June 2021.
- 674 44. Patricios JS, Schneider KJ, Dvorak J, Ahmed OH, Blauwet C, Cantu RC, et al. Consensus statement  
675 on concussion in sport: the 6th International Conference on Concussion in Sport-Amsterdam, October  
676 2022. *Br J Sports Med.* 2023;57(11):695-711.
- 677 45. Lieberman HR, Bathalon GP, Falco CM, Morgan CA, 3rd, Niro PJ, Tharion WJ. The fog of war:  
678 decrements in cognitive performance and mood associated with combat-like stress. *Aviat Space Environ  
679 Med.* 2005;76(7 Suppl):C7-14.
- 680 46. Palmer CJ, Bigelow C, Van Emmerik RE. Defining soldier equipment trade space: load effects on  
681 combat marksmanship and perception-action coupling. *Ergonomics.* 2013;56(11):1708-21.
- 682 47. Antonellis P, Weightman MM, Fino PC, Chen S, Lester ME, Hoppes CW, et al. Relation Between  
683 Cognitive Assessment and Clinical Physical Performance Measures After Mild Traumatic Brain Injury.  
684 *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2023.
- 685 48. Loyd BJ, Dibble LE, Weightman MM, Pelo R, Hoppes CW, Lester M, et al. Volitional Head  
686 Movement Deficits and Alterations in Gait Speed Following Mild Traumatic Brain Injury. *The Journal of  
687 head trauma rehabilitation.* 2023;38(3):E223-E32.
- 688 49. Parrington L, King LA, Hoppes CW, Klaiman MJ, Michielutti P, Fino PC, et al. Exploring Vestibular  
689 Ocular Motor Screening in Adults With Persistent Complaints After Mild Traumatic Brain Injury. *The  
690 Journal of head trauma rehabilitation.* 2022;37(5):E346-E54.
- 691 50. Parrington L, King LA, Weightman MM, Hoppes CW, Lester ME, Dibble LE, et al. Between-site  
692 equivalence of turning speed assessments using inertial measurement units. *Gait Posture.* 2021;90:245-  
693 51.
- 694 51. USPSA Competition Rules, 9.2.2 (2019).
- 695 52. Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y. Controlling the False Discovery Rate - a Practical and Powerful  
696 Approach to Multiple Testing. *J R Stat Soc B.* 1995;57(1):289-300.
- 697 53. Radomski MV, Weightman MM, Davidson LF, Finkelstein M, Goldman S, McCulloch K, et al.  
698 Development of a measure to inform return-to-duty decision making after mild traumatic brain injury.  
699 *Mil Med.* 2013;178(3):246-53.
- 700 54. Brooks MA, Peterson K, Biese K, Sanfilippo J, Heiderscheid BC, Bell DR. Concussion Increases  
701 Odds of Sustaining a Lower Extremity Musculoskeletal Injury After Return to Play Among Collegiate  
702 Athletes. *Am J Sports Med.* 2016;44(3):742-7.
- 703 55. Lynall RC, Mauntel TC, Pohlig RT, Kerr ZY, Dompier TP, Hall EE, et al. Lower Extremity  
704 Musculoskeletal Injury Risk After Concussion Recovery in High School Athletes. *J Athl Train.*  
705 2017;52(11):1028-34.
- 706 56. McPherson AL, Nagai T, Webster KE, Hewett TE. Musculoskeletal Injury Risk After Sport-Related  
707 Concussion: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Am J Sports Med.* 2019;47(7):1754-62.

- 708 57. Fino PC, Becker LN, Fino NF, Griesemer B, Goforth M, Brolinson PG. Effects of Recent Concussion  
709 and Injury History on Instantaneous Relative Risk of Lower Extremity Injury in Division I Collegiate  
710 Athletes. *Clin J Sport Med*. 2019;29(3):218-23.
- 711 58. Reneker JC, Babl R, Flowers MM. History of concussion and risk of subsequent injury in athletes  
712 and service members: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Musculoskelet Sci Pract*. 2019;42:173-85.
- 713 59. Kardouni JR, Shing TL, McKinnon CJ, Scofield DE, Proctor SP. Risk for Lower Extremity Injury After  
714 Concussion: A Matched Cohort Study in Soldiers. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*. 2018;48(7):533-40.
- 715 60. Cecchini AS, Prim J, Zhang W, Harrison CH, McCulloch KL. The Portable Warrior Test of Tactical  
716 Agility: A Novel Functional Assessment That Discriminates Service Members Diagnosed With Concussion  
717 From Controls. *Mil Med*. 2023;188(3-4):e703-e10.
- 718 61. Crofts RM. Psychological Readiness to Return to Play After Concussion: The University of Utah;  
719 2023.
- 720 62. van Ierssel J, Pennock KF, Sampson M, Zemek R, Caron JG. Which psychosocial factors are  
721 associated with return to sport following concussion? A systematic review. *J Sport Health Sci*.  
722 2022;11(4):438-49.

723




Fig 1

# LASSO Model

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.11.24304109>; this version posted March 13, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. This article is a US Government work. It is not subject to copyright under 17 USC 105 and is also made available for use under a CC0 license.





Fig 2



### 1MW LASSO Model


- ST 1MW - Trunk2Head
- DT 1MW - Peak Lumbar V
- DT 1MW - Lumbar2Head
- DT 1MW - Lumbar2Trunk
- DT 1MW - Peak Lumbar V SD
- ST 1MW - Peak Head V SD



### mlAT LASSO Model


- ST mlAT - Lumbar2Trunk (Mid)
- DT mlAT - Completion Time
- ST mlAT - Peak Head V (Ends)
- ST mlAT - Lumbar2Head (Mid)
- ST mlAT - Peak Trunk V (Mid)
- DT mlAT - Peak Head V (Platform)
- ST mlAT - Lumbar2Trunk (Ends)
- DT mlAT - Peak Head V (Mid)

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.11.24304109>; this version posted March 13, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. This article is a US Government work. It is not subject to copyright under 17 USC 105 and is also made available for use under a CC0 license.



### CTC LASSO Model


- ST CTC - Avg Lap Time
- DT CTC - Lumbar2Trunk (45°)
- ST CTC - Lumbar2Trunk (45°)
- ST CTC - Peak Lumbar V SD
- DT CTC - Lap Time Var
- DT CTC - Lumbar2Trunk SD (45°)
- DT CTC - Head Turn Symmetry (135°)
- DT CTC - Trunk2Head (90°)
- ST CTC - Head Turn Symmetry (45°)
- DT CTC - Peak Trunk V SD (135°)
- ST CTC - Peak Head V (45°)
- ST CTC - Lumbar2Head SD (135°)
- DT CTC - Lumbar2Trunk (90°)
- ST CTC - Lap Time Var
- DT CTC - Head Turn Symmetry (45°)
- DT CTC - Peak Head V SD (45°)



0.4 0.6 0.8 1  
AUC

Fig 3

Partial Correlation  
with CAT



Partial Correlation  
with SUP




Fig 4