

Effects of maximal speed locomotor training on spatiotemporal gait changes in individuals with chronic stroke: A secondary analysis of a randomized controlled trial

Daria Pressler PT, DPT;¹ Sarah M. Schwab-Farrell, PT, DPT, PhD;¹ Darcy S. Reisman, PT, PhD;² Sandra A. Billinger, PT, PhD;^{3,4,5,6} Pierce Boyne PT, DPT, PhD¹

¹Department of Rehabilitation, Exercise and Nutrition Sciences, College of Allied Health Sciences, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH

²Department of Physical Therapy, College of Health Sciences, University of Delaware; Newark, DE

³Department of Neurology, School of Medicine, University of Kansas Medical Center; Kansas City, KS

⁴Department of Cell Biology and Integrative Physiology, School of Medicine, University of Kansas Medical Center; Kansas City, KS

⁵University of Kansas Alzheimer's Research Disease Center, Fairway, KS

⁶Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, School of Medicine, University of Kansas Medical Center; Kansas City, KS

Corresponding author:

Daria Pressler, PT, DPT
3225 Eden Ave
Cincinnati, OH, 45267-0394
Email: King2d6@mail.uc.edu

ORCID:

Daria Pressler: <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-3824-3659>
Sarah M. Schwab-Farrell: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3835-5718>
Darcy S. Reisman: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6546-0863>
Sandra A. Billinger: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1618-7207>
Pierce Boyne: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3611-9057>

ABSTRACT

Objective: To investigate longitudinal changes in spatiotemporal gait parameters after maximal versus moderate speed locomotor training in chronic stroke, by comparing short-burst high-intensity interval training (HIIT) versus moderate-intensity aerobic training (MAT). Compared to MAT, short-burst HIIT was hypothesized to exhibit greater improvement in non-paretic step length.

Design: Secondary analysis from the HIT-Stroke randomized controlled trial

Setting: Three rehabilitation research centers

Participants: Individuals with chronic stroke and residual walking limitations (N=55)

Interventions: Participants were randomized to short-burst HIIT (N=27) or MAT (N=28) for 45 minutes of walking practice, 3 times weekly, over 12 weeks. HIIT involved 30-second bursts of maximum walking speed, targeting >60% heart rate reserve (HRR). MAT involved continuous walking, targeting 40%-60% HRR.

Main Outcome Measure(s): Mean spatiotemporal gait parameter changes between groups, averaging the 4-week, 8-week, and 12-week estimates minus baseline. The primary measure of interest was non-paretic step length, an indicator of paretic propulsion and biomechanical efficiency.

Results: Non-paretic step length increased significantly more in the HIIT group (+4.4 cm [95% CI, 1.9, 6.9]) compared to the MAT group (+0.1 [-2.5, 2.7]; HIIT vs. MAT $p = .01$). Both groups demonstrated significant increases in cadence, paretic step length, and bilateral single support time, and significant decreases in the coefficient of variation (CV) for stride velocity, stride time, and stride length. Symmetry measures did not significantly change in either group.

Conclusions: Greater increases in non-paretic step length with short-burst HIIT suggest that maximal speed training may yield greater increases in paretic propulsion, a marker of biomechanical efficiency. Both moderate and maximal speed training (MAT and HIIT) appear to reduce spatiotemporal variability, possibly indicating improved gait stability.

Key Words: gait, HIIT, locomotion, rehabilitation, biomechanics

Abbreviation List:

HIIT, high-intensity interval training

MAT, moderate-intensity aerobic training

HRR, heart rate reserve

CV, coefficient of variation

M-HIT, moderate to high-intensity gait training

INTRODUCTION

Moderate to high-intensity gait training (M-HIT) involves walking at faster than comfortable speeds to elicit aerobic training intensities ($\geq 40\%$ heart rate reserve). This approach is strongly recommended for enhancing walking capacity (i.e. speed and endurance) in individuals with chronic stroke,^{1,2} and evidence suggests that higher training intensities elicit greater gains.³ Walking capacity improvements with M-HIT are partly attributed to adaptive biomechanical changes, notably the restoration of propulsive forces generated by the lower limbs during the terminal stance phase of the gait cycle.⁴⁻⁷ These propulsive forces may increase bilaterally after M-HIT, and increased propulsion contribution from the paretic limb is thought to be a key indicator of improved biomechanical efficiency.^{8,9} Paretic propulsion also contributes to non-paretic step length, establishing non-paretic step length as a proxy measure for paretic propulsion.^{6,10,11}

Propulsion and biomechanical efficiency have been shown to be greater while individuals with stroke are walking at faster-than-comfortable speeds, and faster training speed during M-HIT appears to be a key mediator of these adaptive biomechanical changes and walking capacity gains.^{7,12-17} However, it remains to be explored whether training at *maximal* speeds could lead to even more pronounced biomechanical improvements. This is because previous studies assessing biomechanical changes from M-HIT have used longer bouts of continuous walking, whereas individuals with stroke can achieve significantly faster speeds during short walking bursts.¹⁸

Locomotor high-intensity interval training (HIIT) is a method of M-HIT that maximizes training speed using short bursts of walking activity interspersed with rest breaks.^{3,18,19} Despite its potential, no controlled studies have tested changes in paretic limb biomechanics associated with short-burst HIIT. Spatiotemporal gait measures, such as non-paretic step length, may provide valuable preliminary insights into these biomechanical changes, as paretic propulsion influences non-paretic step length, and improvements in paretic propulsion are thought to be an energetically efficient way to increase walking speed, thereby enhancing biomechanical efficiency.^{6,10,11} However, no previous studies have assessed changes in non-paretic step length or other limb-specific spatiotemporal changes following *maximal* speed locomotor training (short-burst HIIT) vs. moderate-intensity aerobic training (MAT).

Therefore, the purpose of this study was to assess changes in non-paretic step length after short-burst HIIT versus MAT in chronic stroke. Compared to MAT, we hypothesized HIIT would exhibit greater increases in non-paretic step length. Additionally, we evaluated the impact of HIIT and MAT on other spatiotemporal measures to provide a more comprehensive understanding of gait changes with these two types of training.

METHODS

This study analyzed data from the HIT-Stroke Trial, which randomized 55 participants to either short-burst HIIT (N=27) or MAT (N=28).³ Target training volume was 45 minutes, 3 times weekly, over 12 weeks, divided into three blocks, each lasting 4 weeks (12-sessions), with outcome testing after each block. The primary HIT-Stroke Trial analysis found a significantly larger improvement in 6-minute walk distance and gait speed for the HIIT group compared to the MAT group.³ The current study expanded on these previous findings by analyzing spatiotemporal and gait variability data from the HIT-Stroke Trial. This research was approved by the University of Cincinnati Institutional Review Board, and we used the CONSORT checklist when writing our report.²⁰

Participants

Participants were recruited from the community and provided written informed consent. Inclusion criteria were: age 40-80, single stroke between 6 months and 5 years prior, walking speed of ≥ 1.0 m/s, ability to walk 10 meters over ground without continuous assistance, ability to walk at least 3 minutes on a treadmill at ≥ 0.13 m/s (0.3 mph), stable cardiovascular condition (American Heart Association class B), and ability to follow instructions and communicate with investigators. Exclusion criteria were: cardiovascular contraindications to

vigorous exercise, implanted pacemaker or defibrillator, significant ataxia or neglect (National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale item scores >1), severe lower limb spasticity (Ashworth scale scores >2), foot drop or lower limb instability without adequate stabilization (e.g., ankle foot orthosis), other significant neurological disorders besides stroke, recent history of substance misuse, significant mental illness, unmanaged major poststroke depression (Patient health Questionnaire score ≥ 10), active participation in other physical therapy or research studies, botulinum toxin injection to the affected lower limb in the past 3 months or planned within the next 4 months, inability to walk outside the home prior to the stroke, other significant medical conditions which could hinder improvement or jeopardize safety, pregnancy, and experience with fast treadmill walking in the past year.

Intervention & Data Collection

The HIIT group followed a short-interval protocol with 30-second bursts of maximum walking speed, alternated with 30- to 60-second passive rests (standing or seated), targeting above 60% heart rate reserve (HRR). The MAT group performed continuous walking, adjusting speed to maintain $40\% \pm 5\%$ HRR and incrementally increasing by 5% every two weeks up to 60% HRR as tolerated.

Spatiotemporal Gait Outcome Testing

Outcomes were assessed at baseline (before randomization) and after 4, 8, and 12 weeks of training. During tests, participants used their usual orthotic and assistive devices. Participants made two passes across a sensor-embedded electronic walkway at a comfortable speed (GaitRite MAT, CIR Systems, Franklin, NJ; or Zeno Walkway, ProtoKinetics LLC, Havertown, PA). Passes were combined, and parameters were averaged across gait cycles. The primary measure of interest was non-paretic step length as a marker of paretic propulsion and indicator of biomechanical efficiency. To provide a more comprehensive view of the impact of HIIT and MAT on spatiotemporal measures, we also assessed changes in variability measures—including standard deviation (SD: absolute variability) and coefficient of variation (CV: relative variability) for stride velocity, time, and length. Additionally, we evaluated outcome data for cadence, single-limb support times, and symmetry measures. The paretic step ratio (relative step length) was calculated using the formula: Paretic / (Paretic + Nonparetic) step length.⁶ Values could range from 0 to 100%, where 50% represents perfect symmetry. Values above 50% indicate a longer non-paretic step length, while values below 50% indicate a longer paretic step length. Absolute symmetry measures were calculated for step length, step time and single support time using the formula: $(1 - | \text{Paretic} - \text{Nonparetic} | / (\text{Paretic} + \text{Nonparetic})) * 100\%$.²¹ Values could range from 0 to 100%, where 0% indicates complete asymmetry and 100% represents perfect symmetry.

Data Analysis

Linear models were obtained with each spatiotemporal gait parameter as the dependent variable in a separate model. Each model included fixed effects for treatment group, testing time point (baseline, 4-week, 8-week, and 12-week), group-by-time interaction, study site, study site-by-time interaction, baseline walking limitation severity, and baseline walking limitation severity-by-time interaction, with unconstrained covariance between repeated testing time points within the same participant. Contrasts were obtained for the average of the 4-week, 8-week, and 12-week estimates minus baseline. Intent-to-treat methods were followed.

RESULTS

Baseline characteristics were similar across groups (Table 1). Spatiotemporal outcomes were obtained at 192/220 planned timepoints (HIIT: baseline 26/27, 4-week 25/27, 8-week 23/27, and 12-week 18/27; MAT: baseline 27/28, 4-week 26/28, 8-week 24/28, and 12-week 23/28). Compared with the MAT group, the HIIT

group showed significantly greater increases in non-paretic step length (Figures 1-2, Table 2). There were no other significant differences in spatiotemporal changes between the groups.

Relative to baseline, both groups demonstrated a significant increase in cadence, paretic step length, and bilateral single support time (Figures 1-2, Table 2). Unlike the MAT group, the HIIT group also showed a significant increase in non-paretic step length. Additionally, both groups exhibited significant decreases in the coefficient of variation for stride velocity, stride time, and stride length, and the standard deviation for stride time. No significant changes in spatiotemporal symmetry measures were observed in either group.

DISCUSSION

In this analysis, we assessed changes in spatiotemporal gait parameters, specifically non-paretic step length, after short-burst HIIT versus MAT in chronic stroke, to compare the effects of maximal versus moderate speed locomotor training. Results indicate maximal speed locomotor training increased non-paretic step length significantly more than MAT, which showed no significant change. Given that non-paretic step length is an indicator of paretic propulsion,^{6,10,11} this finding suggests that short-burst HIIT could increase paretic propulsion more than MAT for the average participant. An increase in paretic propulsion is thought to be an energetically efficient way to increase walking speed, indicating more efficient gait biomechanics and enabling less effortful walking at a given speed.^{8,9} Although future studies are needed for confirmation, this appears to indicate that the faster speeds involved in short-burst HIIT may generally lead to increased biomechanical efficiency. Results also suggest that both moderate and maximal speed locomotor training appear to significantly improve limb-specific spatiotemporal parameters and reduce gait variability in chronic stroke, with no significant impact on spatiotemporal symmetry.

Conversely, we found no significant changes in step length symmetry, single limb support time symmetry, and paretic step ratio in either group (Table 2). However, previous studies have suggested that increased spatiotemporal symmetry may not be an optimal benchmark of biomechanical function, since more symmetrical walking does not necessarily improve metabolic gait efficiency or stability in individuals post-stroke.^{9,22-25} Further, a return to neurotypical gait symmetry is not a universal goal of individuals with stroke,²⁶⁻³⁰ and some “alternative” movement strategies often viewed as “compensation” may actually represent the discovery of adaptive movement solutions given the new constraints placed on the motor control system post-stroke.³¹⁻³³ For example, both HIIT and MAT demonstrated improvements in metabolic gait efficiency³ and stability (increased bilateral single-limb support time; Table 2), even in the absence of more symmetrical walking.

In addition to these findings, both groups exhibited significant decreases in relative variability (CV) for stride velocity, stride time, and stride length, and absolute variability (SD) for stride time. Higher gait variability has been correlated with instability and fall risk post-stroke,³⁴⁻³⁶ and people post-stroke commonly demonstrate increased gait variability compared to what is considered an “optimal” level for functional task performance.^{33,37} Therefore, one possible interpretation of the results is that the observed reductions in variability measures may reflect improvements in balance and a reduction in fall risk.³⁴⁻³⁶ However, this inference is based on correlational studies, and it is unclear how much change in variability, if any, may be needed to have a meaningful impact (e.g. on fall risk). Thus, additional research is needed to better interpret the observed changes in gait variability.

It is also important to recognize that motor variability is a task dependent complex construct which is not inherently positive or negative. Reduced variability is often seen as beneficial in stroke recovery as too much variability may indicate neuromuscular instability, poor balance control, and unsteady walking.^{34-36,38} However, too little variability may suggest a lack of flexibility and adaptability in some walking parameters.³⁹ People with neurological disability often (counterintuitively) exhibit highly stable motor patterns characterized by deterministic structure (i.e., regularity), as opposed to noisier fluctuations associated with the flexible, adaptive ability to switch more easily among movement patterns.^{32,40} Therefore, while our findings of reduced

variability appear to be a positive change in the context of the current study, future research is needed for confirmation.^{33,41,42}

Study Limitations

A primary limitation of this study was the lack of kinetic and kinematic measures, which would have provided a more comprehensive assessment of the underlying biomechanical forces and joint movements associated with the observed improvements in gait. Future studies should include these variables to better understand the differences between HIIT and MAT locomotor training. Another limitation is lack of blinding of personnel who collected the spatiotemporal measures. However, this is less concerning with automated measurements such as these. Additionally, the study was not initially powered for the current ancillary analysis, so it may have been underpowered for some estimates. We also did not control the false discovery rate across the different spatiotemporal measures, since they were each assessing distinct gait features.

Conclusions

Greater increases in non-paretic step length with short-burst HIIT suggest that training at maximal speeds may yield greater increases in paretic propulsion, a marker of biomechanical efficiency. In addition, both moderate and maximal speed locomotor training (MAT and HIIT) appear to improve other spatiotemporal gait parameters and variability measures in chronic stroke, without significantly altering gait symmetry. Future studies are warranted to explore the impact of maximal speed training on gait mechanics and their relationship to functional outcomes and mobility in individuals with chronic stroke.

TABLES

Table 1. Baseline Participant Characteristics. Values are mean (SD) or N (%).			
	HIIT (N=27)	MAT (N=28)	<i>p</i>-value
Age, years	63.8 (9.9)	61.5 (9.9)	0.38
Females, N (%)	11 (40.7%)	8 (28.6%)	0.40
Side of paresis, N (%)			1.00
Left	14 (51.9%)	14 (50.0%)	
Right	13 (48.1%)	14 (50.0%)	
Stroke chronicity, years	2.7 (1.4)	2.2 (1.2)	0.13
Functional ambulation category, 2-4+	3.3 (0.6)	3.4 (0.8)	0.90
Orthotic device use, N (%)	12 (44.4%)	12 (42.9%)	1.00
Solid ankle foot orthosis	4 (14.8%)	2 (7.1%)	0.42
Articulated/flexible ankle foot orthosis	7 (25.9%)	7 (25.0%)	1.00
Assistive device use, N (%)	16 (59.3%)	18 (64.3%)	0.78
Single point cane	8 (29.6%)	11 (39.3%)	0.33
Narrow-based quad cane	5 (18.5%)	1 (3.6%)	
Wide-based quad cane	3 (11.1%)	5 (17.9%)	
Front-wheeled walker	0 (0.0%)	1 (3.6%)	
Fugl-Meyer lower limb motor score, 0-34	23.8 (5.1)	22.8 (5.1)	0.44
Self-selected gait speed, m/s	0.65 (0.29)	0.62 (0.33)	0.75
Self-selected gait speed, % predicted	50.5 (23.3)	47.3 (25.1)	0.63
Self-selected gait speed <0.4 m/s, N (%)	7 (25.9%)	7 (25.0%)	1.00
6-minute walk test, m	248 (136)	230 (130)	0.61
6-minute walk test, % predicted	48.5 (26.3)	44.3 (26.8)	0.56
<i>Between-group p-values are from independent t-tests or Fisher exact tests.</i>			

Table 2. Comparison of changes in spatiotemporal gait parameters between short-burst HIIT and MAT in chronic stroke

		N				Mean Difference (HIIT - MAT)
		Observations		Mean HIIT	Mean MAT	
		HIIT	MAT			
Non-paretic step length (cm)	Baseline	26	27	32.8 [27.5, 38.2]	32.7 [27.4, 38.0]	0.1 [-6.9, 7.1]
	Mean Δ	66	73	4.4 [1.9, 6.9]	0.1 [-2.5, 2.7]	4.3 [1.0, 7.6]
Paretic step length (cm)	Baseline	26	27	43.5 [38.4, 48.6]	38.2 [33.1, 43.2]	5.4 [-1.3, 12.0]
	Mean Δ	66	73	4.8 [2.7, 6.8]	4.6 [2.5, 6.7]	0.2 [-2.6, 2.9]
Step length symmetry	Baseline	26	27	76.5 [69.1, 83.8]	76.2 [68.9, 83.4]	0.3 [-9.3, 9.9]
	Mean Δ	66	73	2.5 [-1.9, 6.9]	-2.5 [-7.0, 2.1]	5.0 [-0.9, 10.8]
Cadence (steps/min)	Baseline	26	27	72.4 [67.4, 77.5]	66.9 [61.9, 71.8]	5.6 [-1.0, 12.2]
	Mean Δ	66	73	9.1 [5.0, 13.2]	6.4 [2.1, 10.6]	2.7 [-2.7, 8.2]
Paretic Step Ratio	Baseline	26	27	59.9 [55.0, 64.8]	56.6 [51.8, 61.5]	3.3 [-3.1, 9.7]
	Mean Δ	66	73	-0.5 [-4.8, 3.8]	3.7 [-0.7, 8.1]	-4.3 [-9.9, 1.4]
Non-paretic step time (s)	Baseline	26	27	0.8 [0.7, 0.9]	0.9 [0.8, 1.0]	-0.1 [-0.3, 0.0]
	Mean Δ	66	73	-0.2 [-0.3, -0.0]	-0.2 [-0.3, -0.1]	0.0 [-0.1, 0.2]
Paretic step time (s)	Baseline	26	27	1.1 [0.9, 1.4]	1.2 [1.0, 1.4]	-0.1 [-0.3, 0.2]
	Mean Δ	66	73	-0.1 [-0.2, 0.0]	-0.03 [-0.2, 0.1]	-0.09 [-0.3, 0.1]
Step time symmetry	Baseline	26	27	79.3 [73.9, 84.8]	74.3 [68.9, 79.7]	5.0 [-2.1, 12.2]
	Mean Δ	66	73	-1.0 [-5.1, 3.2]	2.8 [-1.5, 7.0]	-3.7 [-9.3, 1.8]
Non-paretic single-support time (%)	Baseline	26	26	29.8 [28.2, 31.4]	28.1 [26.5, 29.7]	1.7 [-0.4, 3.8]
	Mean Δ	66	73	4.0 [2.7, 5.4]	2.5 [1.1, 4.0]	1.5 [-0.3, 3.3]
Paretic single-support time (%)	Baseline	26	26	22.0 [20.0, 24.0]	20.0 [18.0, 22.0]	2.0 [-0.7, 4.6]
	Mean Δ	66	73	1.7 [0.6, 2.8]	1.6 [0.4, 2.8]	0.1 [-1.3, 1.6]
Single-support symmetry	Baseline	26	26	82.2 [78.6, 85.9]	80.2 [76.6, 83.8]	2.0 [-2.7, 6.8]
	Mean Δ	66	73	-1.8 [-4.5, 0.9]	-0.5 [-3.4, 2.4]	-1.3 [-4.9, 2.3]
Stride velocity CV (%)	Baseline	26	25	10.5 [8.4, 12.7]	11.7 [9.4, 13.9]	-1.1 [-4.0, 1.7]
	Mean Δ	66	71	-2.7 [-4.3, -1.1]	-2.6 [-4.3, -0.9]	-0.1 [-2.2, 2.0]
Stride time CV (%)	Baseline	26	26	8.1 [6.2, 10.0]	9.6 [7.7, 11.5]	-1.5 [-4.0, 1.0]
	Mean Δ	66	73	-2.4 [-3.7, -1.0]	-2.3 [-3.7, -0.9]	-0.1 [-1.9, 1.7]
Stride length CV (%)	Baseline	26	27	7.8 [5.8, 9.8]	9.2 [7.2, 11.2]	-1.4 [-4.1, 1.2]
	Mean Δ	65	72	-1.5 [-2.5, -0.5]	-1.4 [-2.5, -0.4]	-0.0 [-1.4, 1.3]
Stride velocity SD (cm/s)	Baseline	26	25	3.4 [2.8, 4.1]	3.4 [2.7, 4.1]	0.0 [-0.9, 0.9]
	Mean Δ	66	71	0.2 [-0.5, 0.9]	0.1 [-0.6, 0.9]	0.1 [-0.8, 1.1]
Stride time SD (s)	Baseline	26	26	0.2 [0.1, 0.3]	0.3 [0.2, 0.3]	-0.1 [-0.2, 0.0]
	Mean Δ	66	73	-0.07 [-0.12, -0.03]	-0.10 [-0.15, -0.05]	0.03 [-0.04, 0.09]
Stride length SD (cm)	Baseline	26	27	4.5 [3.8, 5.2]	4.8 [4.1, 5.4]	-0.2 [-1.1, 0.6]
	Mean Δ	65	72	-0.3 [-0.9, 0.3]	-0.3 [-0.9, 0.3]	-0.0 [-0.8, 0.7]
Abbreviations: HIIT, high-intensity interval training; MAT, moderate intensity aerobic training						

Abbreviations: HIIT, high-intensity interval training; MAT, moderate intensity aerobic training

FIGURES

Figure 1. Mean estimates across timepoints (PRE, 4WK, 8WK, 12WK) during 12 weeks of high-intensity interval training (HIIT) or moderate-intensity aerobic training (MAT) in chronic stroke. Error bars are 95% CI. Abbreviations: PRE, pre-testing (baseline); WK, week; CV, coefficient of variation; SD, standard deviation





Figure 2. Mean changes from the average of the 4-week, 8-week, and 12-week estimates minus baseline for high-intensity interval training (HIIT) or moderate-intensity aerobic training (MAT) in chronic stroke. Error bars are 95% CI. Abbreviations: CV, coefficient of variation; SD, standard deviation.



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Conflicts of Interests: The authors declare no conflicts of interest

Funding: This research was supported by grant R01HD093694 from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

Clinical Trial Registration Number: ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT03760016

REFERENCES

1. Hornby TG, Reisman DS, Ward IG, et al. Clinical practice guideline to improve locomotor function following chronic stroke, incomplete spinal cord injury, and brain injury. *J Neurol Phys Ther.* 2020;44(1):49–100. doi: 10.1097/NPT.0000000000000303 [doi].
2. Boyne P, Miller A, Kubalak O, Mink C, Reisman DS, Fulk G. Moderate to vigorous intensity locomotor training after stroke: A systematic review and meta-analysis of mean effects and response variability. *J Neurol Phys Ther.* 2024;48(1):15–26. doi: 10.1097/NPT.0000000000000456.
3. Boyne P, Billinger SA, Reisman DS, et al. Optimal intensity and duration of walking rehabilitation in patients with chronic stroke: A randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Neurol.* 2023;80(4):342–351. doi: 10.1001/jamaneurol.2023.0033.
4. Hsiao H, Awad LN, Palmer JA, Higginson JS, Binder-Macleod SA. Contribution of paretic and nonparetic limb peak propulsive forces to changes in walking speed in individuals poststroke. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair.* 2016;30(8):743–52.
5. Bowden MG, Balasubramanian CK, Neptune RR, Kautz SA. Anterior-posterior ground reaction forces as a measure of paretic leg contribution in hemiparetic walking. *Stroke.* 2006;37(3):872–876.
6. Balasubramanian CK, Bowden MG, Neptune RR, Kautz SA. Relationship between step length asymmetry and walking performance in subjects with chronic hemiparesis. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2007;88(1):43–49.
7. Ardestani MM, Kinnaird CR, Henderson CE, Hornby TG. Compensation or recovery? altered kinetics and neuromuscular synergies following high-intensity stepping training poststroke. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair.* 2019;33(1):47–58.
8. Awad LN, Reisman DS, Pohlig RT, Binder-Macleod SA. Reducing the cost of transport and increasing walking distance after stroke: A randomized controlled trial on fast locomotor training combined with functional electrical stimulation. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair.* 2016;30(7):661–670.
9. Padmanabhan P, Rao KS, Gulhar S, Cherry-Allen KM, Leech KA, Roemmich RT. Persons post-stroke improve step length symmetry by walking asymmetrically. *Journal of neuroengineering and rehabilitation.* 2020;17(1):105.
10. Clark DJ, ScD, Neptune RR, PhD, Behrman AL, PhD, Kautz SA, PhD. Locomotor adaptability task promotes intense and task-appropriate output from the paretic leg during walking. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2016;97(3):493–496.
11. Tsushima Y, Fujita K, Miaki H, et al. Effects of increasing non-paretic step length on paretic leg movement during hemiparetic gait: A pilot study. *Journal of Physical Therapy Science.* 2022;34(8):590–595.
12. Tyrell CM, Roos MA, Rudolph KS, Reisman DS. Influence of systematic increases in treadmill walking speed on gait kinematics after stroke. *Phys Ther.* 2011;91(3):392–403.
13. Lamontagne A, Fung J. Faster is better: Implications for speed-intensive gait training after stroke. *Stroke.* 2004;35(11):2543–2548.
14. Kettlety SA, Finley JM, Reisman DS, Schweighofer N, Leech KA. Speed-dependent biomechanical changes vary across individual gait metrics post-stroke relative to neurotypical adults. *J Neuroeng Rehabil.* 2023;20(1):14–2. doi: 10.1186/s12984-023-01139-2.
15. Awad LN, Palmer JA, Pohlig RT, Binder-Macleod SA, Reisman DS. Walking speed and step length asymmetry modify the energy cost of walking after stroke. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair.* 2015;29(5):416–423.

16. Boyne P, Miller A, Schwab SM, et al. Training parameters and longitudinal adaptations that most strongly mediate walking capacity gains from high-intensity interval training post-stroke. *medRxiv [preprint]*. 2023:23286194.
17. Reisman DS, Rudolph KS, Farquhar WB. Influence of speed on walking economy poststroke. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2009;23(6):529–534.
18. Boyne P, Scholl V, Doren S, et al. Locomotor training intensity after stroke: Effects of interval type and mode. *Top Stroke Rehabil*. 2020;27(7):483–493. doi: 10.1080/10749357.2020.1728953 [doi].
19. Boyne P, Dunning K, Carl D, Gerson M, Khoury J, Kissela B. Within-session responses to high-intensity interval training in chronic stroke. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2015;47(3):476–484. doi: 10.1249/MSS.0000000000000427 [doi].
20. Schulz KF, Altman DG, Moher D, CONSORT Grp, CONSORT Group, for the CONSORT Group. CONSORT 2010 statement: Updated guidelines for reporting parallel group randomised trials. *PLoS medicine*. 2010;7(3):1–7.
21. Boyne P, Doren S, Scholl V, et al. Preliminary outcomes of combined treadmill and overground high-intensity interval training in ambulatory chronic stroke. *Frontiers in Neurology*. 2022;13:812875.
22. Sánchez N, Finley JM. Individual differences in locomotor function predict the capacity to reduce asymmetry and modify the energetic cost of walking poststroke. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2018;32(8):701–713.
23. Park S, Liu C, Sánchez N, Tilson JK, Mulroy SJ, Finley JM. Using biofeedback to reduce step length asymmetry impairs dynamic balance in people poststroke. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2021;35(8):738–749.
24. Roemmich RT, Leech KA, Gonzalez AJ, Bastian AJ. Trading symmetry for energy cost during walking in healthy adults and persons post-stroke. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2019;33(8):602–613.
25. Ryan HP, Husted C, Lewek MD. Improving spatiotemporal gait asymmetry has limited functional benefit for individuals poststroke. *Journal of neurologic physical therapy*. 2020;44(3):197–204.
26. Feldner HA, Evans HD, Chamblin K, et al. Infusing disability equity within rehabilitation education and practice: A qualitative study of lived experiences of ableism, allyship, and healthcare partnership. *Frontiers in rehabilitation sciences*. 2022;3:947592.
27. Schwab SM, Silva PL. Intellectual humility: How recognizing the fallibility of our beliefs and owning our limits may create a better relationship between the physical therapy profession and disability. *Phys Ther*. 2023;103(8).
28. Silva PL, Schwab SM. Disability through the lens of affordances: A promising pathway for transforming physical therapy practice. In: *The modern legacy of gibbon's affordances for the sciences of organisms*. 2024:291–326. 10.4324/9781003396536-21.
29. Gibson B. *Rehabilitation: A post-critical approach*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press; 2016.
30. Dokumaci A. *Activist affordances: How disabled people improvise more habitable worlds*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press; 2023.
31. Guccione AA, Neville BT, George SZ. Optimization of movement: A dynamical systems approach to movement systems as emergent phenomena. *Phys Ther*. 2019;99(1):3–9.
32. Schwab SM, Pinto VA, Kloos H, Riley MA, Silva PL. Unpredictable task demands and motor performance in individuals with neuromotor disability: A scoping review. *Physical therapy reviews*. 2021;26(3):177–187.

33. Stergiou N, Harbourne RT, Cavanaugh JT. Optimal movement variability: A new theoretical perspective for neurologic physical therapy. *Journal of neurologic physical therapy*. 2006;30(3):120–129.
34. Koren Y, Barzel O, Shmuelof L, Handelzalts S. Spatiotemporal variability after stroke reflects more than just slow walking velocity. *Gait Posture*. 2024;110:59–64.
35. Balasubramanian CK, Neptune RR, Kautz SA. Variability in spatiotemporal step characteristics and its relationship to walking performance post-stroke. *Gait Posture*. 2009;29(3):408–414.
36. Sheikh M, Hosseini HA. Investigating the relationship between spatiotemporal gait variability and falls self-efficacy in individuals with chronic stroke. *Physiotherapy theory and practice*. 2022;38(4):543–551.
37. Patel P, Enzastiga D, Casamento-Moran A, Christou EA, Lodha N. Increased temporal stride variability contributes to impaired gait coordination after stroke. *Scientific reports*. 2022;12(1):12679.
38. Hausdorff JM. Gait variability: Methods, modeling and meaning. *Journal of neuroengineering and rehabilitation*. 2005;2(1):19.
39. König N, Taylor WR, Baumann CR, Wenderoth N, Singh NB. Revealing the quality of movement: A meta-analysis review to quantify the thresholds to pathological variability during standing and walking. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*. 2016;68:111–119.
40. Schmit JM, Riley MA, Dalvi A, et al. Deterministic center of pressure patterns characterize postural instability in parkinson's disease. *Experimental brain research*. 2006;168(3):357–367.
41. Riley MA, Turvey MT. Variability and determinism in motor behavior. *J Mot Behav*. 2002;34(2):99–125.
42. Stergiou N, Decker LM. Human movement variability, nonlinear dynamics, and pathology: Is there a connection? *Human movement science*. 2011;30(5):869–888.