

# Running Title: Bilateral Motor Coordination in Stroke 1

Understanding Bilateral Motor Coordination in Stroke Using the Towel Folding Task: An 2  
Exploratory Biomechanical Study 3

Jingyi WU MSc<sup>1</sup>, Patrick Wai-Hang Kwong PhD<sup>1\*</sup>, Ananda Sidarta PhD<sup>2</sup>, Jack Jiaqi Zhang 4  
PhD<sup>1</sup>, Jingwen ZHUANG MSc<sup>1</sup>, Yining LI MSc<sup>3</sup>, Kenneth NK Fong PhD<sup>1</sup> 5

<sup>1</sup>Department of Rehabilitation Sciences, Faculty of Health and Social Sciences, The Hong 6  
Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong SAR, China. 7

<sup>2</sup>Rehabilitation Research Institute of Singapore, Nanyang Technological University, 8  
Singapore, Singapore. 9

<sup>3</sup>Department of Occupational Therapy, Shanghai Yang Zhi rehabilitation hospital (shanghai 10  
sunshine rehabilitation center), Shanghai, China 11

\*Corresponding author: 12

Patrick Wai-Hang Kwong, Ph.D. 13

Assistant Professor 14

Department of Rehabilitation Sciences, Faculty of Health and Social Sciences, The Hong 15  
Kong Polytechnic University 16

Email: wai-hang.kwong@polyu.edu.hk 17

Address: # 11 Yuk Choi Rd, Hung Hom, Hong Kong SAR, 999077, China 18

# Abstract

19

# Objectives

20

Coordination deficits in bilateral upper limbs make daily activities more difficult for stroke survivors. Previous studies showed worse kinematics during unilateral tasks compared to healthy individuals, but this was unclear for bimanual tasks. We aim to assess the potential of the towel folding task from the Wolf Motor Function Assessment as a measure of bimanual control by examining kinematic differences between stroke survivors and healthy individuals and correlating these differences with clinical parameters in the stroke group.

# Methods

27

This was a cross-sectional design. Seventeen people with stroke and sixteen healthy individuals participated. Vicon motion capture obtained kinematics of bilateral upper limbs during the task, including movement time, initiation delay, velocity, trunk displacement, smoothness, and inter-/intra-limb coordination. Statistical analyses compared groups and correlated kinematic variables with clinical parameters.

# Results

33

Stroke survivors had longer movement times ( $P < .001$ , Cohen's  $d = 1.396$ ), slower initiation ( $P < .001$ , Cohen's  $d = 0.797$ ), lower max velocity ( $P = .026$ , Cohen's  $d = -.815$ ;  $P < .001$ , Cohen's  $d = -2.156$ ; and  $P = .005$ , Cohen's  $d = -.736$ ; respectively), greater trunk displacement ( $P < .001$ , Cohen's  $d = 2.173$  and  $P < .001$ , Cohen's  $d = 1.727$ , respectively), less smoothness ( $P = .031$ , Cohen's  $d = 0.883$  and  $P < .001$ , Cohen's  $d = .725$ , respectively), and altered inter-

/intra-limb coordination. Regarding bilateral elbow-elbow coordination, stroke group exhibited decreased in-phase patterns ( $P < .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .368$ ) and increased anti-phase and non-hemiplegic elbow dominance patterns ( $P = .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .298$  and  $P = .004$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .244$ , respectively). Regarding bilateral shoulder-shoulder coordination, stroke group showed decreased hemiplegic shoulder leading patterns ( $P = .010$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .196$ ) and increased anti-phase and non-hemiplegic shoulder dominance patterns ( $P = .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .315$  and  $P < .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .463$ , respectively). For hemiplegic shoulder-elbow coordination, stroke group showed decreased anti-phase patterns ( $P < .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .382$ ) and increased elbow dominance patterns ( $P < .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .324$ ). Fugl-Meyer Assessment scores positively correlated with smoothness and hemiplegic shoulder-elbow coordination ( $r = -.500$ ,  $P = .039$  and  $r = .600$ ,  $P = .010$ , respectively), while Action Research Arm Test scores negatively correlated with movement initiation delay ( $r = -.600$ ,  $P = .010$ ).

## Conclusions

This study enhances understanding of the folding towel task and may provide metrics to quantify bilateral coordination task performance in stroke survivors.

## Keywords

stroke; interlimb coordination; intralimb coordination; kinematics; upper limbs

# Introduction

56

The deficit in the upper extremities' motor function is the most common sequelae resulting from stroke, which limits patients' activities of daily living abilities, results in permanent disability, and therefore brings a heavy burden to family and society (1). Recently, the majority of studies focused on the hemiplegic limbs and aimed to promote independence in activities of daily living (ADL) by improving the motor function of the hemiplegic limb (2-4). However, most daily activities deeply rely on the cooperation and coordination of bilateral upper extremities, such as operating the bottle and folding the towel. Some studies used motion capture to demonstrate movement quality in the non-hemiplegic upper limb was impaired, with respect to the healthy control (5), which may be partly explained through the corticospinal motor tract (CST) that remains 10-15% of fibers descend the same side of the cortical area between bi-hemispheres through the corpus callosum (6). In addition, compensatory strategies including the overuse of the trunk and non-hemiplegic upper limb after stroke have developed to assist perform ADL. Most importantly, coordination deficits in bilateral arms, including but not limited to impairments in smoothness and inter-/intra-limb coordination, have been observed in stroke patients, which make them complete everyday programs more difficult (7-11). Therefore, it is necessary to explore the changes in upper-limb bimanual coordination patterns after stroke for the advancement of an effective rehabilitation program.

57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73

Dysfunction in upper-limb bimanual coordination can be assessed using clinical scales like the Wolf Motor Function Test (WMFT). The WMFT includes 17 items that evaluate strength and task performance based on performance time and functional ability (12, 13). Of the WMFT items, folding a towel assesses upper-limb bimanual coordination by having the client grasp, and then fold the towel in half. However, clinical assessments face significant floor and ceiling effects (14) and are not sensitive enough to identify compensatory strategies like trunk

74

75  
76  
77  
78  
79

displacement and overuse of the non-hemiplegic limb (7). They also fail to capture motor  
quality variables, such as smoothness and inter/intra-limb coordination, due to the use of ordinal  
scales (15).

Kinematic assessments using motion capture systems overcome these disadvantages by  
providing objective parameters that capture movement quality and monitor compensatory  
movements without floor or ceiling effects (16). Recent studies have shown that features  
extracted from motion capture can clearly distinguish between healthy individuals and stroke  
patients during various functional movements (reaching, drinking water) and correlate with the  
severity of stroke-specific impairments (17-26). The Second Stroke Recovery and  
Rehabilitation Roundtable highlighted the benefits of using kinematic variables to assess upper  
extremity function in stroke patients during functional tasks (27). However, most studies focus  
on the hemiplegic upper limb, with no research exploring the feasibility of using kinematic data  
and motion capture to quantify bimanual coordination tasks in people with stroke. A  
standardized and widely used, folding towel could be valuable for assessing bilateral  
coordination. A comprehensive assessment of spatiotemporal variables and movement quality  
is essential for identifying specific issues with bimanual coordination in stroke patients (10,  
11). This approach allows for targeted, evidence-based plans to improve coordinated  
performance.

Based on the above, this study aimed to (1) use kinematic data from optical motion capture  
to quantify the movement quality of the towel folding, (2) explore the differences in kinematic  
parameters between stroke patients and healthy individuals during this bimanual task, and (3)  
determine the relationship between kinematic variables from towel folding and upper limb  
impairment or activity limitations assessed by clinical scales in people with stroke. This  
approach aims to provide precise rehabilitation interventions and quantitative assessments of

treatment outcomes. 104

## Materials and Methods 105

### Experimental design 106

This cross-sectional study enrolled a total of 33 participants, with 17 people with stroke and 16 healthy individuals between the ages of 18 and 75 years. Participants were recruited from local self-help organizations for stroke survivors from March 2022 to December 2022. Ethical approval was obtained from the Institute Review Board of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University (HSEARS20220125002). Written informed consent was obtained for all study participants enrolled in the study. The study was conducted in the university motion capture laboratory. 107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113

### Inclusion and exclusion criteria 114

All participants with stroke met all of the following criteria: (1) between 18 and 75 years of age, (2) diagnosed as first-ever stroke, confirmed by neuroimaging examination, (3) with mild or moderate motor impairment by Upper Limb Fugl Meyer Assessment ( $31 < \text{UE-FMA} < 66$ ) (19), (4) with post-acute stroke ( $> 3$  months after the ictus) (28); (5) able to follow instructions and carry out the experimental procedure with both arms. All healthy controls met all of the following criteria: (1) between 18 and 75 years of age, (2) right-hand dominant, (3) without a history of epilepsy or other psychiatric episodes. 115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121

All participants who met any of the following criteria were excluded: (1) current use of central neural system-affect medications, (2) other diseases substantially affecting the motor function of upper extremities and hands. 122  
123  
124

## Experimental setup and procedure

This study used a Vicon's motion system with nine infrared cameras operating at 100 Hz to track the 3D movements of 50 reflective markers placed on a participant's trunk and bilateral upper limbs (Fig 1). Visual3D software (C-Motion, Rockville, MD, USA) was utilized to create a scaled human model for each participant. The movement analysis was based on an X-Y-Z coordinate system, where X represented lateral-to-medial direction, Y represented anterior-to-posterior direction, and Z represented vertical direction.

### Fig 1. Markers placement

Participants were seated without back support and performed a towel-folding task following specific steps:

1. First, they placed both arms on the table with hands flat, shoulders neutral, and elbows bent (Fig 2a). Next, they reached to grasp the towel's corners and folded it front to back (Fig 2b). Then, one hand (hemiplegic for participants with stroke, non-dominant for healthy individuals) grasped the towel's corners while the other returned to the initial position (Fig 2c). Following this, the towel was folded from side to side using the hemiplegic hand (Fig 2s). Finally, the hemiplegic hand returned to the initial position (Fig 2e).

2. A total of 5 trials was recorded, with 20 seconds between each trial, ensuring a self-paced and standardized procedure for data collection.

### Fig 2. Steps of folding the towel

## Outcome measures

The Upper Extremity Fugl-Meyer Assessment (UE-FMA) and the Action Research Arm Test (ARAT) were used for standardized assessments in people with stroke.

The UE-FMA is a validated measure of movement impairment in stroke individuals (29, 30). The scale consists of 33 items to assess movements, reflexes, and coordination of the shoulder, elbow, forearm, wrist, and hand. The UE-FMA ranges from 0-66 points, with a maximum score of 66 points indicating the least motor deficit, with a score >31 indicating moderate or mild upper limb impairment (19).

The ARAT is a validated measure of upper limb functional limitations and activity levels in stroke individuals (31, 32). The scale comprises 19 items where 0 indicates no movement and 3 indicates normal movement. Items are categorized into 4 subscales (grasp, grip, pinch, and gross movement) to assess upper extremity performance of coordination, dexterity, and functioning. The ARAT total score ranges from 0 to 57, with a higher score indicating better performance (33).

## Data reduction and analysis

Reflective markers were labeled, and missing data were gap-filled using Nexus software (version 2.5). Visual 3D software (C-Motion, Rockville, MD, USA) was used to perform biomechanical modeling. Joint angles and joint velocity were extracted for further analysis. VectorCodeR package was used to calculate the coupling angle (CA) in the sagittal plane. Definitions of different kinematics variables were represented in detail in Table 1.

**Peak velocities** were determined based on the whole process of the task as follows:

$$\text{Peak velocity} = \max (\sqrt{(x_i)^2 + (y_i)^2 + (z_i)^2}) \quad (1)$$

where  $x_i$ ,  $y_i$ , and  $z_i$  are the coordinates of a marker, and  $i$  is the index of a frame.



**The total displacement of the trunk** was defined as the sum of absolute displacements

166

in all frames as follows:

167

**Table 1.** Definitions of kinematics variables used in the study.

Parameter		units	Description
Spatiotemporal variables	Joint angles	deg	Using Visual 3D finish calculating targeted and interested joint angles, including shoulder flexion and extension, elbow flexion and extension, wrist flexion and extension, and trunk flexion, extension, and lateral flexion.
	Movement time	s	Movement time referred to the entire process of folding the towel, including phase I: the time of folding the towel from anterior to posterior using bilateral upper limbs and releasing the non-hemiplegic hand (i.e., replacing the non-hemiplegic hand with the dominant hand for healthy individuals); phase II: the time of folding the towel from the same side to the opposite side using the non-hemiplegic hand (i.e., replacing the non-hemiplegic hand with dominant hand for healthy individuals) and returning the initial position. Repeating five times.  $\text{Total time} = \frac{1}{5} \sum_{i=1}^5 (\text{phase } I_i + \text{phase } II_i)$

	Movement initiation delay	s	<p>Referred to the difference in time between the initiation of the movement by the non-hemiplegic (or dominant) upper limb and that of the hemiplegic (or non-dominant) upper limb.</p> <p>The initiation was defined as the start of phase I when the subjects moved faster than 5cm/s (34).</p>
	Peak velocity	m/s	<p>Peak velocity was closely related to the angular velocity of each segment. A peak velocity of the shoulder, elbow, and hand joint was obtained during a maximum angular velocity (35).</p>
	Trunk displacement	m	<p>The displacement of the trunk contained the max displacement and the total displacement. Of those, the former was defined as the maximum displacement during folding the towel. The latter was defined to be the sum of absolute displacements in all frames (36).</p>
Movement quality-related variables	Smoothness	deg/s <sup>3</sup>	<p>Using jerk square mean value (JSM) described the upper limb joint movement smoothness index during the folding towel (25).</p>
	Inter-limb Coordination	deg	<p>Vector coding was also known as an angle-angle coordination diagram (37), including angle changes of bilateral elbow flexion extension and angle changes of bilateral shoulder flexion</p>

---

extension.

Intra-limb  
Coordination

deg

Vector coding was also known as an angle-angle coordination diagram. Angle changes of shoulder flexion extension and elbow flexion extension of the hemiplegic upper limb.

---

$$\text{Total displacement} = \sum_{i=1}^n \sqrt{(x_{i+1}-x_i)^2 + (y_{i+1}-y_i)^2} \quad (2)$$

**Maximum displacement of the trunk** was defined as the maximum absolute displacement in all frames as follows:

$$\text{Maximum displacement} = \sqrt{(x_{\max}-x_i)^2 + (y_{\max}-y_i)^2} \quad (3)$$

where  $x_i$  and  $y_i$  were the coordinates of a marker, and  $i$  was the index of a static frame.

**Smoothness** was quantified using the jerk square mean value (JSM) (25). JSM served as the average of the square of the joint angle third derivative value, according to the jerk third derivative of the position data as follows. Each subject's JSM values were calculated for the shoulder, elbow, and wrist joints. Movement smoothness seemed to decrease when JSM increased:

$$\text{JSM} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i^2 \quad (4)$$

$$f_i = \text{degree/s}^3 \quad (5)$$

$f_i$  represented the jerk value of joint angles that were calculated by the third derivative of the joint angles.  $n$  served as the number of data points.

**Coordination** between and within limbs was quantified using the vector coding techniques described by Needham et al. (37, 38). Vector coding measured the continuous interaction between two adjacent segments by analyzing the vector orientation between consecutive data points on the angle-angle diagram. This vector orientation, known as the coupling angle (CA), ranges from 0-360°. This study focused on bilateral elbow flexion-extension, bilateral shoulder flexion-extension, and hemiplegic shoulder and elbow flexion-

extension couplings. Each coordination included four patterns (39).

186

For each instant (i) during folding the towel cycle, the coupling angles ( $\gamma_i$ ) were obtained based on the consecutive proximal segment angles (shoulder) or hemiplegic side angle (non-dominant for healthy individuals) ( $\theta_{P(i)}$ ,  $\theta_{P(i+1)}$ ) and consecutive distal segment angles (elbow) or non-hemiplegic side (dominant for healthy individuals) ( $\theta_{D(i)}$ ,  $\theta_{D(i+1)}$ ) as follows:

187

188

189

190

$$\gamma_i = \text{Arctan}\left(\frac{\theta_{D(i+1)} - \theta_{D(i)}}{\theta_{P(i+1)} - \theta_{P(i)}}\right) \cdot \frac{180}{\pi} \quad \theta_{P(i+1)} - \theta_{P(i)} > 0 \quad (6)$$

$$\gamma_i = \text{Arctan}\left(\frac{\theta_{D(i+1)} - \theta_{D(i)}}{\theta_{P(i+1)} - \theta_{P(i)}}\right) \cdot \frac{180}{\pi} + 180 \quad \theta_{P(i+1)} - \theta_{P(i)} < 0 \quad (7)$$

The following conditions were applied as follows:

191

$$\gamma_i = 90 \quad \theta_{P(i+1)} - \theta_{P(i)} = 0 \ \& \ \theta_{D(i+1)} - \theta_{D(i)} > 0 \quad (8)$$

$$\gamma_i = -90 \quad \theta_{P(i+1)} - \theta_{P(i)} = 0 \ \& \ \theta_{D(i+1)} - \theta_{D(i)} < 0 \quad (8)$$

$$\gamma_i = -180 \quad \theta_{P(i+1)} - \theta_{P(i)} < 0 \ \& \ \theta_{D(i+1)} - \theta_{D(i)} = 0 \quad (8)$$

$$\gamma_i = \text{Undefined} \quad \theta_{P(i+1)} - \theta_{P(i)} = 0 \ \& \ \theta_{D(i+1)} - \theta_{D(i)} = 0 \quad (8)$$

The coupling angle ( $\gamma_i$ ) was corrected to present a value between 0 and 360 as follows (37, 40).

192

193

$$\gamma_i = \begin{cases} \gamma_i + 360 & \gamma_i < 0 \\ \gamma_i & \gamma_i \geq 0 \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

For ease of analysis and visualization, the similarity among three coordination patterns (bilateral elbow-elbow, bilateral shoulder-shoulder, and hemiplegic shoulder-elbow) between stroke and healthy individuals was calculated using the unit vector scalar product (DOT). DOT

194

195

196

was maximum when the angles between two vectors were 0° (Fig 3). DOT was zero when the angle between two vectors was 90° as follows:

$$UV_i = \frac{X_i}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^N X_i^2}} \quad (10)$$

$$DOT = \frac{\overrightarrow{UV_{i\_stroke}} * \overrightarrow{UV_{i\_healthy}}}{||\overrightarrow{UV_{i\_stroke}}|| ||\overrightarrow{UV_{i\_healthy}}||} \quad (11)$$

$X_i$  is the  $i$ th percentage of  $N$  basic vectors. 199

**Fig 3. DOT between individuals with stroke and health.** 200

## Statistical analysis 201

R software v.4.2.2 (R Development Core Team, 2010) served as performing data analysis. The normality of the distribution of all variables was tested using Shapiro-Wilk's test (41). Two-independent sample t-test, Mann-Whitney  $U$  test, and chi-squared test to examine the differences in demographic, kinematic variables, and clinical parameters between the two groups. 202 203 204 205 206

To determine whether the mean differences in inter-/intra-limb coordination (each coordination included four patterns) were significant between the two groups, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed. Multiple comparisons were performed via Bonferroni adjustments at  $p < 0.0125$ . 207 208 209 210

Pearson's  $r$  correlation or Spearman rank order correlation was applied to test the correlation between kinematic variables and clinical parameters, depending on the data 211 212

distribution. The statistics level was set at  $p < 0.05$ . The effect size of the difference between groups was calculated by Cohen's  $d$  and partial eta squared, where 0.2, 0.5, 0.8, and 0.01, 0.06, and 0.14 demonstrated small, medium, and large effect sizes, respectively, and the corresponding values for  $r$  were 0.1, 0.3, and 0.5 (42).

## Results

### Participants characteristics

Seventeen post-acute stroke individuals with mild-moderate motor impairment and sixteen right-handed healthy individuals were enrolled. There were no significant differences in age and gender between the two groups (Table 2).

**Table 2. Demographic data and clinical assessments between stroke and healthy group**

Demographic data	Stroke Group (n = 17)	Healthy Group (n = 16)	<i>P</i> value
Age	63.0 (5.3)	62.3 (6.3)	0.892
Sex (M/F)	9/8	9/7	1.000
Hemiplegic side/Handedness (R/L)	7/11	R:16; L:0	NA
Post-stroke duration (month)	4.6 (1.9)	NA	NA
<b>Clinical parameters</b>			
UE-FMA	43.0 (19.0)	NA	NA
ARAT	50.0 (28.0)	NA	NA

Mean (SD); SD: standard deviation; M: male; F: female; R: right; L left.

UE-FMA: Upper Extremity Fugl-Meyer Assessment; ARAT: Action research arm test.

Median (IQR); IQR: interquartile range



## Exploring Kinematic Variables and Clinical Parameters

226

### Time and Velocity

227

Compared to the healthy group, the stroke group had significantly longer movement time (mean 228  
difference = 27.9 s;  $P < .001$ ; Cohen's  $d = 1.396$ ) and movement initiation delay (mean 229  
difference = .3 s;  $P < .001$ ; Cohen's  $d = .797$ ) while folding the towel. In addition, compared 230  
with the healthy group, the stroke group had significantly lower peak velocities on non- 231  
hemiplegic elbow and bilateral shoulder joints (Tables 3 and 4). We found no notable 232  
differences in hemiplegic elbow velocity of stroke patients and non-dominant elbow velocity 233  
of healthy controls (Table 4). 234

**Table 3. Kinematic variables between stroke and healthy group**

235

Kinematic Variables	Stroke Group		Healthy Group	
	(n = 17)		(n = 16)	
	Hemiplegic	Non- hemiplegic	Non-dominant (Left)	Dominant (Right)
Time and Peak velocity /units				
Movement time /s	45.3 (26.9)		17.4 (5.9)	
Movement initiation delay /s	0.3 (0.5)		0.1 (0.1)	
Max elbow velocity /ms <sup>-1</sup>	174.2 (110.8)	128.0 (87.1)	181.8 (40.9)	164.4 (49.6)
Max shoulder velocity/ms <sup>-1</sup>	127.1 (61.6)	107.2 (63.2)	213.3 (24.8)	137.5 (55.0)
Compensatory Trunk Displacement /units				
Total displacement of trunk/m	0.6 (0.2)		0.2 (0.1)	
Max displacement of trunk/m	0.1 (0.1)		0.1 (0.1)	
Smoothness – JSM value (JSM increased, smoothness decreased) /units				
JSM value of elbow /deg*s <sup>-3</sup>	1131.5 (940.1)	810.5 (2502.9)	1930.6 (913.3)	884.7 (391.8)
JSM value of shoulder /deg*s <sup>-3</sup>	322.3	237.0	116.5	67.1

		(324.9)	(690.8)	(93.7)	(48.6)
	<b>JSM value of wrist /deg*s<sup>-3</sup></b>	2.5	1.9	0.3	4.2
		(4.2)	(2.3)	(0.1)	(11.0)
<b>Inter-limb and intra-limb coordination patterns /units</b>					
<b>Elbow-elbow coordination (frequency)</b>	In phase	32.9 (8.3)		45.6 (8.8)	
	Anti-phase	18.2 (8.5)		9.3 (4.0)	
	Hemiplegic/Non-dominant elbow joint leading	31.8 (4.8)		35.7 (10.4)	
	Non-hemiplegic/Dominant elbow joint leading	17.0 (7.5)		9.4 (7.2)	
<b>Shoulder- shoulder coordination (frequency)</b>	In phase	41.7 (21.7)		51.5 (6.6)	
	Anti-phase	14.1 (5.7)		7.3 (3.9)	
	Hemiplegic/Non-dominant shoulder joint leading	24.6 (12.7)		34.1 (7.1)	
	Non-hemiplegic/Dominant shoulder joint leading	19.7 (8.2)		7.1 (5.0)	
<b>Hemiplegic/ Non-dominant shoulder-elbow coordination (frequency)</b>	In phase	14.2 (5.8)		12.1 (4.1)	
	Anti-phase	38.7 (9.5)		52.3 (7.9)	
	shoulder joint leading	26.5 (8.7)		23.1 (6.6)	
	elbow joint leading	20.7 (5.9)		12.4 (6.3)	
Mean (SD); SD: standard deviation; JSM: jerk square mean value.					

236

**Table 4. Difference of kinematic variables between stroke and healthy group during the folding towel task.**

237

238

Variables	Mean difference	<i>P</i> value	Effect size (d)
<b>Time and Velocity/units</b>			
<b>Movement time / s</b>	27.9	0.000*	1.396
<b>Movement initiation delay / s</b>	0.3	0.000*	0.797

<b>Max hemiplegic/non-dominant elbow</b>			
velocity /ms <sup>-1</sup>	-7.6	0.179	-0.148
<b>Max non-hemiplegic/dominant elbow</b>			
velocity /ms <sup>-1</sup>	-36.4	0.026*	-0.815
<b>Max hemiplegic/non-dominant shoulder</b>			
velocity /ms <sup>-1</sup>	-86.1	0.000*	-2.156
<b>Max non-hemiplegic/dominant shoulder</b>			
velocity /ms <sup>-1</sup>	-30.3	0.005*	-0.736
<hr/>			
<b>Compensatory trunk displacement/units</b>			
Total displacement of the trunk <sup>a</sup> /m	0.4	0.000*	2.173
Max displacement of the trunk <sup>a</sup> /m	0.1	0.000*	1.727
<hr/>			
<b>Smoothness - JSM value (JSM increased, smoothness decreased) / units</b>			
<b>Hemiplegic/non-dominant elbow</b>			
smoothness <sup>a</sup> /deg*s <sup>-3</sup>	-799.1	0.014*	-0.909
<b>Non-hemiplegic/dominant elbow</b>			
smoothness /deg*s <sup>-3</sup>	-74.3	0.000*	-2.177
<b>Hemiplegic/non-dominant shoulder</b>			
smoothness /deg*s <sup>-3</sup>	205.7	0.031*	0.883
<b>Non-hemiplegic/dominant shoulder</b>			
smoothness /deg*s <sup>-3</sup>	169.9	0.958	0.128
<b>Hemiplegic/non-dominant wrist</b>			
smoothness /deg*s <sup>-3</sup>	2.2	0.000*	0.725
<b>Non-hemiplegic/dominant wrist</b>			
smoothness /deg*s <sup>-3</sup>	-2.3	0.003*	-0.331
<hr/>			
<b>Variables</b>	<b>Mean difference</b>	<b>P value</b>	<b>Effect size</b>

			(Partial $\eta^2$ )
<b>Elbow-elbow coordination * / frequency (<math>p &lt; 0.01</math>, <math>\eta^2 = 0.428</math>)</b>			
In phase	-12.7	0.000*	0.368
Anti phase	8.9	0.001*	0.298
Hemiplegic/Non-dominant			
elbow joint leading	-3.9	0.166	0.061
Non-hemiplegic/Dominant			
elbow joint leading	7.6	0.004*	0.244
<b>Shoulder-shoulder coordination* / frequency (<math>p &lt; 0.01</math>, <math>\eta^2 = 0.552</math>)</b>			
In phase	-9.8	0.147	0.067
Anti phase	6.7	0.001*	0.315
Hemiplegic/Non-dominant			
shoulder joint leading	-9.5	0.010*	0.196
Non-hemiplegic/Dominant			
shoulder joint leading	12.5	0.000*	0.463
<b>Hemiplegic/Non-Dominant Shoulder-Elbow Coordination* / Frequency (<math>p &lt; 0.01</math>, <math>\eta^2 = 0.516</math>)</b>			
In phase	2.0	0.391	0.024
Anti phase	-13.6	0.000*	0.382
Shoulder joint leading	3.4	0.169	0.060
Elbow joint leading	8.2	0.000*	0.324
Mean difference = value of variables in stroke - the value of variables in healthy			239
a. indicated the results analyzed by the independent t-test.			240
* Difference was significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).			241
JSM: jerk square mean value.			242
<b>Compensatory Trunk Displacement</b>			243

Compared to the healthy group, the stroke group exhibited notably larger total and peak trunk  
displacements (mean difference = 36.0 mm;  $P < .001$ ; Cohen's  $d = 2.173$  and mean difference  
= 7.7 mm;  $P = .014$ ; Cohen's  $d = -0.909$ , respectively) (Tables 3 and 4).

## Smoothness

We found that compared to the healthy group, the stroke group showed significantly increased  
JSM values (i.e., decreased smoothness) in the bilateral shoulder (mean difference = 205.7  
 $\text{deg} \cdot \text{s}^{-3}$ ;  $P = .031$ ; Cohen's  $d = .883$  and mean difference = 169.9  $\text{deg} \cdot \text{s}^{-3}$ ;  $P = .958$ ; Cohen's  $d$   
= .128, respectively), and hemiplegic wrist joints (mean difference = 2.2  $\text{deg} \cdot \text{s}^{-3}$ ;  $P < .001$ ;  
Cohen's  $d = .725$ ). However, compared to the healthy group, we found that the stroke group  
had notably decreased JSM values in bilateral elbow (mean difference = -799.1  $\text{deg} \cdot \text{s}^{-3}$ ;  $P$   
= .014; Cohen's  $d = -.909$  and mean difference = -74.3  $\text{deg} \cdot \text{s}^{-3}$ ;  $P < .001$ ; Cohen's  $d = -2.177$ ,  
respectively) and non-hemiplegic wrist (mean difference = -2.3  $\text{deg} \cdot \text{s}^{-3}$ ;  $P = .003$ ; Cohen's  $d =$   
-.331) (Tables 3 and 4).

## Inter-limb and Intra-limb Coordination

We found significantly different coordination patterns between the two groups (Tables 3 and 4  
and Fig 4). Regarding the bilateral elbow-elbow coordination pattern frequency (Fig 4a), we  
observed that compared to the healthy group, the stroke group showed significantly decreased  
frequency distribution for the in-phase (mean difference = -12.7;  $P < .001$ ; partial  $\eta^2 = .368$ )  
and increased frequency distribution for the anti-phase and the non-hemiplegic elbow  
dominancy (mean difference = 8.9;  $P = .001$ ; partial  $\eta^2 = .298$  and mean difference = 7.6;  $P$   
= .004; partial  $\eta^2 = .244$ , respectively). Regarding the bilateral shoulder-shoulder coordination  
pattern frequency (Fig 4b), we observed that compared to the healthy group, the stroke group  
showed significantly decreased frequency distribution for the hemiplegic shoulder leading

(mean difference = -9.5;  $P = .010$ ; partial  $\eta^2 = .196$ ) and increased frequency distribution for the anti-phase and the non-hemiplegic shoulder dominance (mean difference = 6.7;  $P = .001$ ; partial  $\eta^2 = .315$  and mean difference = 12.5;  $P < .001$ ; partial  $\eta^2 = .463$ , respectively). For the hemiplegic shoulder-elbow coordination pattern frequency (Fig 4c), we observed that compared to the healthy group, the stroke group showed significantly decreased frequency distribution for the anti-phase (mean difference = -13.6;  $P < .001$ ; partial  $\eta^2 = .382$ ) and increased frequency distribution for the elbow dominance (mean difference = 8.2;  $P < .001$ ; partial  $\eta^2 = .324$ ).

#### **Fig 4. Differences in coordination pattern frequency between stroke and healthy group.**

(a). Elbow-elbow; (b) Shoulder-shoulder; (c) Hemiplegic shoulder-elbow.

#### **Correlation coefficient**

In the stroke group, we observed statistically significant positive associations between UE-FMA and movement-quality kinematic variables (Table 5). Specifically, the JSM value of the bilateral elbow decreased when UE-FMA score increased ( $r = -.500$ ;  $P = .039$  and  $r = -.670$ ;  $P = .004$ , respectively). The JSM value of the hemiplegic shoulder and wrist decreased when UE-FMA score increased ( $r = -.540$ ;  $P = .024$  and  $r = -.520$ ;  $P = .033$ , respectively). Additionally, stroke individuals showed greater hemiplegic shoulder-elbow coordination as UE-FMA score increased ( $r = .600$ ;  $P = .010$ ).

Negative associations of ARAT with both the JSM values of the non-hemiplegic elbow ( $r = -.650$ ;  $P = .005$ ) and movement initiation delay ( $r = -.600$ ;  $P = .010$ ) were observed.

No significant relationships of clinical parameters with both trunk displacements and velocity were observed. Additionally, there was no notable association between UE-FMA and interlimb coordination patterns and between ARAT and inter-/intra-limb coordination patterns (Table 5).

**Table 5. Correlation coefficient between kinematic variables and clinical assessment in stroke group**

289

290

Kinematic Variables	Clinical Assessment	Correlation Coefficient [95%CI]	P value
<b>Time and Velocity</b>			
<b>Movement time</b>	UE-FMA	-0.320 [-0.694, 0.190]	0.217
	ARAT	-0.350 [-0.711, 0.157]	0.174
<b>Movement initiation delay</b>	UE-FMA	-0.340 [-0.705, 0.168]	0.179
	ARAT	-0.600 [-0.839, -0.168]	0.010*
<b>Max hemiplegic elbow velocity</b>	UE-FMA	-0.130 [-0.575, 0.374]	0.607
	ARAT	0.210 [-0.301, 0.627]	0.425
<b>Max non-hemiplegic elbow velocity</b>	UE-FMA	-0.038 [-0.509, 0.451]	0.884
	ARAT	0.230 [-0.282, 0.640]	0.370
<b>Max hemiplegic shoulder velocity</b>	UE-FMA	-0.260 [-0.659, 0.252]	0.311
	ARAT	-0.130 [-0.575, 0.374]	0.607
<b>Max non-hemiplegic shoulder velocity</b>	UE-FMA	-0.060 [-0.525, 0.433]	0.818
	ARAT	0.230 [-0.282, 0.640]	0.384
<b>Compensatory trunk displacement</b>			
<b>Max displacement</b>	UE-FMA	0.240 [-0.272, 0.646]	0.355
	ARAT	-0.022 [-0.497, 0.464]	0.933
<b>Total displacement</b>	UE-FMA	0.074 [-0.422, 0.536]	0.778
	ARAT	0.079 [-0.417, 0.539]	0.763
<b>Smoothness - JSM value (i.e., JSM increased, smoothness decreased)</b>			
<b>Hemiplegic elbow smoothness</b>	UE-FMA	-0.500 [-0.791, -0.025]	0.039*
	ARAT	-0.190 [-0.615, 0.320]	0.456
<b>Non-hemiplegic elbow smoothness</b>	UE-FMA	-0.670 [-0.870, -0.280]	0.004*
	ARAT	-0.650 [-0.861, -0.246]	0.005*
<b>Hemiplegic shoulder smoothness</b>	UE-FMA	-0.540 [-0.810, -0.080]	0.024*
	ARAT	-0.240 [-0.646, 0.272]	0.357
<b>Non-hemiplegic shoulder smoothness</b>	UE-FMA	-0.240 [-0.646, 0.272]	0.345
	ARAT	-0.026 [-0.500, 0.460]	0.921
<b>Hemiplegic wrist smoothness</b>	UE-FMA	-0.520 [-0.800, -0.052]	0.033*
	ARAT	-0.360 [-0.717, 0.146]	0.152

<b>Non-hemiplegic wrist</b>	UE-FMA	-0.370 [-0.722, 0.135]	0.147
<b>smoothness</b>	ARAT	-0.290 [-0.676, 0.222]	0.261
<b>Inter-limb and intra-limb coordination</b>			
<b>DOT: elbow-elbow</b>	UE-FMA	0.380 [-0.123, 0.728]	0.137
	ARAT	0.430 [-0.064, 0.755]	0.085
<b>DOT: shoulder-shoulder <sup>a</sup></b>	UE-FMA	-0.025 [-0.500, 0.461]	0.925
	ARAT	0.038 [-0.451, 0.509]	0.884
<b>DOT: hemiplegic/left shoulder-elbow <sup>a</sup></b>	UE-FMA	0.600 [0.168, 0.840]	0.010*
	ARAT	0.390 [-0.112, 0.733]	0.126

UE-FMA: The Upper Extremity scores of the Fugl-Meyer Assessment; ARAT: the Action Research Arm Test. DOT: the unit vector scalar product. 291  
292

## Hand velocity undergoing folding the towel 293

In both healthy individuals using their non-dominant hand and stroke survivors using their 294  
hemiplegic hand, a similar pattern of variation in hand speed was observed while folding a 295  
towel (Fig 5). The hand speed changed throughout the task, increasing and then decreasing at 296  
each phase. The highest hand speed for both healthy individuals and stroke survivors was during 297  
Phase e of the task. Furthermore, the hemiplegic hand had a more frequent and limited range of 298  
speed changes during task completion compared to the non-dominant hand where the maximum 299  
speed change was 31.6% of that of healthy individuals (Figs 5a and 5b). 300

**Fig 5. Curves of hand velocity variation throughout the total movement time in one stroke** 301  
**and healthy individual.** Phase a: Reaching the towel with bilateral hands; Phase b: The first 302  
fold, folding the towel with bilateral hands from the anterior to posterior; Phase c: The unilateral 303  
hand grasping the same side corner of the towel (i.e., the hemiplegic hand for stroke patients; 304  
the non-dominant hand for healthy controls); Phase d: The second fold, folding the towel to the 305  
opposite side with the selected unilateral hand; Phase e: Returning the hand to the initial 306  
position. **(a)** Curves of non-dominant hand velocity variation throughout the total movement 307



time in one representative healthy individual; **(b)** Curves of hemiplegic hand velocity variation 308  
throughout the total movement time in one representative stroke individual. 309

## Discussion 310

Our results showed that stroke individuals had longer time, slower initiation, lower max 311  
velocity, greater trunk displacement, fewer smoothness movements in the bilateral shoulder and 312  
hemiplegic wrist, and different coordination patterns compared to healthy controls. 313  
Additionally, we found that the UE-FMA was positively correlated with smoothness and intra- 314  
limb coordination, while the ARAT was negatively correlated with initiation delay in people 315  
with stroke. 316

## Difference in time and peak velocity between the two groups 317

Previous evidence has shown that movements in stroke individuals were slower compared to 318  
healthy individuals when performing unilateral tasks (17, 43). Our study extends these findings 319  
to bilateral tasks in stroke individuals, suggesting that movement time is effective for 320  
distinguishing between post-acute stroke and healthy individuals. 321

We found that stroke individuals exhibited similar elbow velocity on the hemiplegic side during 322  
bilateral tasks compared to healthy individuals. This finding was partly in line with previous 323  
evidence. Specifically, Hussain et al. (2018) documented that compared to control, stroke 324  
individuals with moderate impairment, not mild, displayed a significantly decreased peak 325  
velocity (43). It implies that the measure's sensitivity varies with the severity of impairment. 326

## Compensatory trunk displacement 327

One notable distinction in movement patterns between the two groups was that stroke survivors 328

tended to bend their trunks to fold a towel that was well within their arm's reach (44). This 329  
compensatory strategy has been reported in earlier studies in unilateral reaching tasks (17, 19, 330  
22). One possible explanation for this strategy is that the trunk may be controlled by the bilateral 331  
CST and therefore less impaired than the arm, which is predominantly controlled by the 332  
unilateral CST (45, 46). Another possible explanation is that the subject may fix the shoulder 333  
girdle to the trunk in an attempt to stabilize the unstable upper limb, reducing the number of 334  
degrees of freedom related to the upper limb. This could be supported by other findings of 335  
reduced variability in elbow and shoulder movements in stroke individuals with severe 336  
impairment (19). The additional trunk recruitment may supplant the reduced shoulder and 337  
elbow movement and provide the system additional stability. Another possibility was that the 338  
trunk muscles were recruited first to contribute to the task because of a lower threshold (47). 339

## **Difference in smoothness between the two groups** 340

Our findings suggest that differences in movement smoothness between stroke and healthy 341  
individuals vary by joints. Previous studies have shown worse smoothness in the hemiplegic 342  
upper limb during drinking tasks in stroke individuals compared to healthy individuals (17, 43, 343  
48). Consistent with these findings, we observed decreased movement smoothness in the 344  
hemiplegic wrist and bilateral shoulders compared to healthy controls (49, 50), likely due to 345  
impaired motor control from muscle weakness and spasticity (51). 346

Interestingly, we found increased smoothness in the non-hemiplegic wrist and bilateral elbows 347  
compared to healthy controls. This might be because the longer movement time in stroke 348  
participants resulted in smaller JSM values for non-hemiplegic joints. Additionally, the 349  
simplicity of elbow movements in the task may have contributed to relatively intact smoothness 350  
in the hemiplegic elbow. However, the variability in task performance among participants 351  
means these findings should be interpreted cautiously. 352

## Differences in the frequency distribution in inter-limb and intra-limb coordination between the two groups

Previous studies used vector coding techniques to explore coordination patterns of bilateral lower limbs during walking in healthy individuals (37, 38). Our study is the first to apply this technique to bilateral upper limbs in stroke individuals. Our findings revealed that stroke individuals exhibited notable increases in anti-phase and non-hemiplegic dominance in bilateral coordination patterns compared to healthy individuals. Previous studies and our study have observed movement initiation delay between the hemiplegic and non-hemiplegic side of stroke individuals during functional tasks (52, 53). Additionally, stroke individuals often compensate for their hemiplegic upper limb by using their non-hemiplegic limb (7). It implies that increased frequency for anti-phase and non-hemiplegic leading may aid in performing bilateral occupational activities in people with stroke.

Additionally, our results suggest that individuals with stroke tended to exhibit increases in hemiplegic elbow leading and decreases in anti-phase in intra-limb coordination patterns compared to healthy individuals. This aligns well with the previous study that found significantly decreased anti-phase in stroke individuals than healthy individuals (17). It is plausible that damage in CST made the ability to voluntarily move one segment independently of other segments dramatically decrease in stroke individuals (54-56). For instance, stroke individuals used the abnormal synergistic shoulder and elbow coupling to compensate for insufficient isolated shoulder flexion for adaptively completing reaching tasks, compared with healthy individuals (22). Further, Cirstea and Levin (2000) found that the elbow movement was initiated first during activities compared to the hemiplegic upper limb. This implies that enhancement in elbow leading and limitation in the anti-phase pattern in intra-limb coordination pattern was an integral part of the bilateral functional activities to promote the activities for

stroke individuals (19). Furthermore, they partly explained the difference in intralimb 377  
coordination between stroke and healthy individuals through limited active ranges of motion 378  
and changes in motor thresholds for a group of muscles (19). 379

## **Correlations between kinematic variables and clinical parameters 380**

### **in stroke group 381**

Our findings revealed that UE-FMA was positively associated with smoothness and ARAT was 382  
negatively associated with delayed initiation. These findings were consistent with previous 383  
studies (57, 58). For instance, a study reported that the UE-FMA score increased when the 384  
smoothness of the hemiplegic hand increased during unilateral tasks (57). Further, Alt Murphy 385  
et al. (58) found that ARAT was notably correlated with movement time in stroke individuals 386  
during drinking tasks. Our results confirmed and extended these findings to bilateral functional 387  
tasks. These findings further support the notion that temporal kinematic variables were 388  
associated with clinical parameters involving the time component for task completion and 389  
movement quality-related kinematic variables were linked to clinical parameters involving the 390  
ability to perform joint movement (59). 391

Of note, our results suggest that UE-FMA was strongly related to intra-limb coordination 392  
patterns rather than bilateral coordination patterns in stroke individuals, likely due to UE-FMA 393  
mainly assesses hemiplegic upper limb motor function involving both multiple joints synergic 394  
and isolated movements (29). It implies that intra-limb may be a valuable tool for evaluating 395  
stroke movement quality. 396

No notable relationship between ARAT and inter/intra-limb coordination was observed, 397  
possibly because ARAT mainly focuses on task completion within a limited time and 398  
performance quality (33, 58). These findings suggest that inter/intra-limb coordination was 399

indicative of changes in movement patterns and movement quality (i.e., impairment) rather than 400  
time and performance quality (i.e., activity). 401

## Limitations 402

There are several limitations to consider. Firstly, the small sample size of stroke and healthy 403  
individuals limits the generalizability of the results. Future studies should include a larger 404  
number of participants to enhance the applicability of the findings to the broader stroke 405  
population. Secondly, the accuracy of shoulder movement analysis is a concern. The shoulder 406  
is a complex joint, and there is debate over the best methods to calculate the centers of the 407  
glenohumeral, acromioclavicular, and sternoclavicular joints, as well as the definition of the 0- 408  
degree position and the computation of the range of motion (60). Thirdly, the study did not 409  
extract kinematic variables related to shoulder abduction-adduction during the towel-folding 410  
task. People with stroke often compensate with shoulder abduction in upper limb tasks, which 411  
limits the accuracy of the coordination pattern analysis between bilateral upper limbs and within 412  
the hemiplegic upper extremity. 413

## Conclusions 414

This study deepens the understanding of the folding towel task, a component of the Wolf Motor 415  
Function assessment, by identifying kinematic features linked to motor impairments in people 416  
with stroke. Kinematic assessments of interlimb and intralimb coordination prove sensitive in 417  
detecting differences in coordination patterns between people with stroke and healthy 418  
individuals during bilateral functional tasks. These metrics offer a precise quantification of the 419  
quality of bilateral coordination performance in people with stroke. 420

## Declaration of Conflict of interests 421

The author declared that there is no potential conflict of interest with the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article. 422  
423

## **Ethics approval and consent to participate** 424

The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and approved by the Institutional Review Board of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University (HSEARS20220125002). 425  
426  
Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study. 427

## **Consent for publication** 428

Written informed consent has been obtained from the patient(s) to publish this paper. 429

## **Availability of data and materials** 430

The data are held in a public repository (<https://figshare.com/s/c6f94b5f957382f6d9a1>) 431

## **Competing interests** 432

The authors declare that they have no competing interests. 433

## **Funding** 434

This research was funded by the Hong Kong Polytechnic University, grant number P0036617 435

## **Authors' contributions** 436

Conceptualization: KWH, AS, and JYW.	437
Methodology: KWH and JYW.	438
Software: KWH and JYW.	439
Formal analysis: KWH and JYW.	440
Investigation: JYW, JWZ, and YNL.	441
Writing—original draft preparation: JYW, JJQZ, and JWZ.	442
Writing—review and editing: KWH, AS, FNK, and JJQZ.	443
Visualization: KWH and JYW.	444
Supervision: KWH.	445
Project administration: KWH.	446
Funding acquisition: KWH.	447
<b>Acknowledgments</b>	448
The authors thank all participants for their valuable contributions. The authors also thank Ms.	449
XU and Mr. GU for assistance in the kinematic data processing.	450

## References

1. Gittler M, Davis AM. Guidelines for adult stroke rehabilitation and recovery. *Jama*. 2018;319(8):820-1.
2. Yang CL, Lim SB, Peters S, Eng JJ. Cortical Activation During Shoulder and Finger Movements in Healthy Adults: A Functional Near-Infrared Spectroscopy (fNIRS) Study. *Front Hum Neurosci*. 2020;14:260.
3. Liu F, Chen C, Bai Z, Hong W, Wang S, Tang C. Specific subsystems of the inferior parietal lobule are associated with hand dysfunction following stroke: A cross-sectional resting-state fMRI study. *CNS Neurosci Ther*. 2022.
4. Nguyen VT, Lu YH, Wu CW, Sung PS, Lin CC, Lin PY, et al. Evaluating interhemispheric synchronization and cortical activity in acute stroke patients using optical hemodynamic oscillations. *J Neural Eng*. 2022;19(3):36034.
5. Scano A, Guanziroli E, Mira RM, Brambilla C, Tosatti LM, Molteni F. Biomechanical assessment of the ipsilesional upper limb in post-stroke patients during multi-joint reaching tasks: A quantitative study. *Frontiers in Rehabilitation Sciences*. 2022;3:943397.
6. Culham JC, Cavina-Pratesi C, Singhal A. The role of parietal cortex in visuomotor control: what have we learned from neuroimaging? *Neuropsychologia*. 2006;44(13):2668-84.
7. Jones TA. Motor compensation and its effects on neural reorganization after stroke. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*. 2017;18(5):267-80.
8. Kantak SS, Zahedi N, McGrath RL. Task-Dependent Bimanual Coordination After Stroke: Relationship With Sensorimotor Impairments. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2016;97(5):798-806.
9. Schaffer JE, Maenza C, Good DC, Przybyla A, Sainburg RL. Left hemisphere damage produces deficits in predictive control of bilateral coordination. *Exp Brain Res*. 2020;238(12):2733-44.
10. Rohrer B, Fasoli S, Krebs HI, Hughes R, Volpe B, Frontera WR, et al. Movement smoothness changes during stroke recovery. *Journal of neuroscience*. 2002;22(18):8297-304.
11. Caimmi M, Carda S, Giovanzana C, Maini ES, Sabatini AM, Smania N, et al. Using kinematic analysis to evaluate constraint-induced movement therapy in chronic stroke patients. *Neurorehabilitation and neural repair*. 2008;22(1):31-9.




12. Wolf SL, Lecraw DE, Barton LA, Jann BB. Forced use of hemiplegic upper extremities to reverse the effect of learned nonuse among chronic stroke and head-injured patients. *Exp Neurol*. 1989;104(2):125-32.
13. Wolf SL, Catlin PA, Ellis M, Archer AL, Morgan B, Piacentino A. Assessing Wolf motor function test as outcome measure for research in patients after stroke. *Stroke*. 2001;32(7):1635-9.
14. Lin J-H, Hsu M-J, Sheu C-F, Wu T-S, Lin R-T, Chen C-H, et al. Psychometric comparisons of 4 measures for assessing upper-extremity function in people with stroke. *Physical therapy*. 2009;89(8):840-50.
15. Schwarz A, Kanzler CM, Lambercy O, Luft AR, Veerbeek JM. Systematic review on kinematic assessments of upper limb movements after stroke. *Stroke*. 2019;50(3):718-27.
16. Gladstone DJ, Danells CJ, Black SE. The fugl-meyer assessment of motor recovery after stroke: a critical review of its measurement properties. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2002;16(3):232-40.
17. Alt Murphy M, Willén C, Sunnerhagen KS. Kinematic variables quantifying upper-extremity performance after stroke during reaching and drinking from a glass. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2011;25(1):71-80.
18. Alt Murphy M, Murphy S, Persson HC, Bergström UB, Sunnerhagen KS. Kinematic Analysis Using 3D Motion Capture of Drinking Task in People With and Without Upper-extremity Impairments. *J Vis Exp*. 2018(133).
19. Cirstea MC, Levin MF. Compensatory strategies for reaching in stroke. *Brain*. 2000;123(5):940-53.
20. Carpinella I, Jonsdottir J, Ferrarin M. Multi-finger coordination in healthy subjects and stroke patients: a mathematical modelling approach. *Journal of neuroengineering and rehabilitation*. 2011;8(1):1-20.
21. Clark RA, Pua YH, Bryant AL, Hunt MA. Validity of the Microsoft Kinect for providing lateral trunk lean feedback during gait retraining. *Gait Posture*. 2013;38(4):1064-6.
22. Levin MF, Liebermann DG, Parmet Y, Berman S. Compensatory Versus Noncompensatory Shoulder Movements Used for Reaching in Stroke. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2016;30(7):635-46.

23. Liddy JJ, Zelaznik HN, Huber JE, Rietdyk S, Claxton LJ, Samuel A, et al. The efficacy of the Microsoft Kinect TM to assess human bimanual coordination. *Behavior research methods*. 2017;49(3):1030-47.
24. Pfister A, West AM, Bronner S, Noah JA. Comparative abilities of Microsoft Kinect and Vicon 3D motion capture for gait analysis. *J Med Eng Technol*. 2014;38(5):274-80.
25. Sakata K, Kogure A, Hosoda M, Isozaki K, Masuda T, Morita S. Evaluation of the age-related changes in movement smoothness in the lower extremity joints during lifting. *Gait & posture*. 2010;31(1):27-31.
26. Xu X, McGorry RW, Chou LS, Lin JH, Chang CC. Accuracy of the Microsoft Kinect for measuring gait parameters during treadmill walking. *Gait Posture*. 2015;42(2):145-51.
27. Kwakkel G, van Wegen EEH, Burridge JH, Winstein CJ, van Dokkum LEH, Alt Murphy M, et al. Standardized Measurement of Quality of Upper Limb Movement After Stroke: Consensus-Based Core Recommendations From the Second Stroke Recovery and Rehabilitation Roundtable. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2019;33(11):951-8.
28. Bernhardt J, Hayward KS, Kwakkel G, Ward NS, Wolf SL, Borschmann K, et al. Agreed definitions and a shared vision for new standards in stroke recovery research: the stroke recovery and rehabilitation roundtable taskforce. *International Journal of Stroke*. 2017;12(5):444-50.
29. Fugl Meyer AR, Jaasko L, Leyman I. The post stroke hemiplegic patient. I. A method for evaluation of physical performance. *Scandinavian journal of rehabilitation medicine*. 1975;7(1):13-31.
30. Kim H, Her J, Ko J, Park D-s, Woo J-H, You Y, et al. Reliability, concurrent validity, and responsiveness of the Fugl-Meyer Assessment (FMA) for hemiplegic patients. *Journal of Physical Therapy Science*. 2012;24(9):893-9.
31. Chen H-f, Lin K-c, Wu C-y, Chen C-l. Rasch validation and predictive validity of the action research arm test in patients receiving stroke rehabilitation. *Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation*. 2012;93(6):1039-45.
32. Lang CE, Wagner JM, Dromerick AW, Edwards DF. Measurement of upper-extremity function early after stroke: properties of the action research arm test. *Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation*. 2006;87(12):1605-10.

33. Lyle RC. A performance test for assessment of upper limb function in physical rehabilitation treatment and research. *International journal of rehabilitation research*. 1981;4(4):483-92.
34. Coats RO, Fath AJ, Astill SL, Wann JP. Eye and hand movement strategies in older adults during a complex reaching task. *Exp Brain Res*. 2016;234(2):533-47.
35. Nan HC, Rambely AS. Peak velocity of elbow joint during touching contra lateral shoulder activity for normal subject. *AIP Conference Proceedings*; April: AIP Publishing LLC; 2017. p. 020034.
36. Jafri M, Brown S, Arnold G, Abboud R, Wang W. Kinematical analysis of the trunk, upper limbs and fingers during minimal access surgery when using an armrest. *Ergonomics*. 2015;58(11):1868-77.
37. Needham R, Naemi R, Chockalingam N. Quantifying lumbar–pelvis coordination during gait using a modified vector coding technique. *Journal of biomechanics*. 2014;47(5):1020-6.
38. Needham RA, Naemi R, Chockalingam N. A new coordination pattern classification to assess gait kinematics when utilising a modified vector coding technique. *Journal of biomechanics*. 2015;48(12):3506-11.
39. Chang R, Van Emmerik R, Hamill J. Quantifying rearfoot–forefoot coordination in human walking. *Journal of biomechanics*. 2008;41(14):3101-5.
40. Sparrow W, Donovan E, Van Emmerik R, Barry E. Using relative motion plots to measure changes in intra-limb and inter-limb coordination. *Journal of motor behavior*. 1987;19(1):115-29.
41. Yap B, Sim C. Comparison of various types of normality tests. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*. 2011;81(12):2141-55.
42. Cohen J. *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. 2nd ed. Hillsdale, N.J: L. Erlbaum Associates; 1988.
43. Hussain N, Murphy MA, Sunnerhagen KS. Upper limb kinematics in stroke and healthy controls using target-to-target task in virtual reality. *Frontiers in neurology*. 2018;9(MAY):300-.
44. Alt Murphy M, Häger CK. Kinematic analysis of the upper extremity after stroke—how far have we reached and what have we grasped? *Physical Therapy Reviews*. 2015;20(3):137-55.

45. Fujiwara T, Sonoda S, Okajima Y, Chino N. The relationships between trunk function and the findings of transcranial magnetic stimulation among patients with stroke. *J Rehabil Med*. 2001;33(6):249-55.
46. Karthikbabu S, Chakrapani M, Ganeshan S, Rakshith KC, Nafeez S, Prem V. A review on assessment and treatment of the trunk in stroke: A need or luxury. *Neural Regen Res*. 2012;7(25):1974-7.
47. Shaikh T, Goussev V, Feldman AG, Levin MF. Arm-trunk coordination for beyond-the-reach movements in adults with stroke. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2014;28(4):355-66.
48. Bustrén E-L, Sunnerhagen KS, Alt Murphy M. Movement kinematics of the ipsilesional upper extremity in persons with moderate or mild stroke. *Neurorehabilitation and neural repair*. 2017;31(4):376-86.
49. Lang CE, Wagner JM, Bastian AJ, Hu Q, Edwards DF, Sahrman SA, et al. Deficits in grasp versus reach during acute hemiparesis. *Exp Brain Res*. 2005;166(1):126-36.
50. Nowak DA. The impact of stroke on the performance of grasping: usefulness of kinetic and kinematic motion analysis. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*. 2008;32(8):1439-50.
51. Balkaya M, Cho S. Optimizing functional outcome endpoints for stroke recovery studies. *J Cereb Blood Flow Metab*. 2019;39(12):2323-42.
52. Jones RD, Donaldson IM, Parkin PJ. Impairment and recovery of ipsilateral sensory-motor function following unilateral cerebral infarction. *Brain*. 1989;112(1):113-32.
53. Chae J, Yang G, Park BK, Labatia I. Delay in initiation and termination of muscle contraction, motor impairment, and physical disability in upper limb hemiparesis. *Muscle Nerve*. 2002;25(4):568-75.
54. Dewald JP, Pope PS, Given JD, Buchanan TS, Rymer WZ. Abnormal muscle coactivation patterns during isometric torque generation at the elbow and shoulder in hemiparetic subjects. *Brain*. 1995;118(2):495-510.
55. Lang CE, Schieber MH. Reduced muscle selectivity during individuated finger movements in humans after damage to the motor cortex or corticospinal tract. *J Neurophysiol*. 2004;91(4):1722-33.

56. Lang CE, Bland MD, Bailey RR, Schaefer SY, Birkenmeier RL. Assessment of upper extremity impairment, function, and activity after stroke: foundations for clinical decision making. *J Hand Ther.* 2013;26(2):104-15.
57. van Dokkum L, Hauret I, Mottet D, Froger J, Métrot J, Laffont I. The contribution of kinematics in the assessment of upper limb motor recovery early after stroke. *Neurorehabilitation and neural repair.* 2014;28(1):4-12.
58. Alt Murphy M, Willén C, Sunnerhagen KS. Movement kinematics during a drinking task are associated with the activity capacity level after stroke. *Neurorehabilitation and neural repair.* 2012;26(9):1106-15.
59. Alt Murphy M, Resteghini C, Feys P, Lamers I. An overview of systematic reviews on upper extremity outcome measures after stroke. *BMC neurology.* 2015;15:1-15.
60. Blache Y, Martinez R, Dumas R, Begon M, Hagemeister N, Duprey S. Chapter 20 - Motion analysis and modeling of the shoulder: challenges and potential applications. In: Scataglini S, Paul G, editors. *DHM and Posturography*: Academic Press; 2019. p. 261-71.



Figure





(a)



(b)



(c)




(d)






(e)

Figure





Figure





Figure



Figure