

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 MSc¹, Patrick Wai-Hang Kwong PhD^{1*}, Ananda Sidarta PhD², Jack Jiaqi Zhang 4
PhD¹, Jingwen ZHUANG MSc¹, Yining LI MSc³, Kenneth NK Fong PhD¹ 5

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

²Rehabilitation Research Institute of Singapore, Nanyang Technological University, 8
Singapore, Singapore. 9

³Department 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. 21
22
23
24
25
26

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. 28
29
30
31
32

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- 34
35
36
37
38

/intra-limb coordination. Regarding bilateral elbow-elbow coordination, stroke group exhibited 39
decreased in-phase patterns ($P < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .368$) and increased anti-phase and non- 40
hemiplegic elbow dominance patterns ($P = .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .298$ and $P = .004$, partial $\eta^2 = .244$, 41
respectively). Regarding bilateral shoulder-shoulder coordination, stroke group showed 42
decreased hemiplegic shoulder leading patterns ($P = .010$, partial $\eta^2 = .196$) and increased anti- 43
phase and non-hemiplegic shoulder dominance patterns ($P = .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .315$ and $P < .001$, 44
partial $\eta^2 = .463$, respectively). For hemiplegic shoulder-elbow coordination, stroke group 45
showed decreased anti-phase patterns ($P < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .382$) and increased elbow 46
dominance patterns ($P < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .324$). Fugl-Meyer Assessment scores positively 47
correlated with smoothness and hemiplegic shoulder-elbow coordination ($r = -.500$, $P = .039$ 48
and $r = .600$, $P = .010$, respectively), while Action Research Arm Test scores negatively 49
correlated with movement initiation delay ($r = -.600$, $P = .010$). 50

Conclusions 51

This study enhances understanding of the folding towel task and may provide metrics to 52
quantify bilateral coordination task performance in stroke survivors. 53

Keywords 54

stroke; interlimb coordination; intralimb coordination; kinematics; upper limbs 55

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.

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 80
quality variables, such as smoothness and inter/intra-limb coordination, due to the use of ordinal 81
scales (15). 82

Kinematic assessments using motion capture systems overcome these disadvantages by 83
providing objective parameters that capture movement quality and monitor compensatory 84
movements without floor or ceiling effects (16). Recent studies have shown that features 85
extracted from motion capture can clearly distinguish between healthy individuals and stroke 86
patients during various functional movements (reaching, drinking water) and correlate with the 87
severity of stroke-specific impairments (17-26). The Second Stroke Recovery and 88
Rehabilitation Roundtable highlighted the benefits of using kinematic variables to assess upper 89
extremity function in stroke patients during functional tasks (27). However, most studies focus 90
on the hemiplegic upper limb, with no research exploring the feasibility of using kinematic data 91
and motion capture to quantify bimanual coordination tasks in people with stroke. A 92
standardized and widely used, folding towel could be valuable for assessing bilateral 93
coordination. A comprehensive assessment of spatiotemporal variables and movement quality 94
is essential for identifying specific issues with bimanual coordination in stroke patients (10, 95
11). This approach allows for targeted, evidence-based plans to improve coordinated 96
performance. 97

Based on the above, this study aimed to (1) use kinematic data from optical motion capture 98
to quantify the movement quality of the towel folding, (2) explore the differences in kinematic 99
parameters between stroke patients and healthy individuals during this bimanual task, and (3) 100
determine the relationship between kinematic variables from towel folding and upper limb 101
impairment or activity limitations assessed by clinical scales in people with stroke. This 102
approach aims to provide precise rehabilitation interventions and quantitative assessments of 103

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

125

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.

126

127

128

129

130

131

Fig 1. Markers placement

132

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

133

134

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).

135

136

137

138

139

140

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

141

142

Fig 2. Steps of folding the towel

143

Outcome measures

144

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

145

146

The UE-FMA is a validated measure of movement impairment in stroke individuals (29, 147
30). The scale consists of 33 items to assess movements, reflexes, and coordination of the 148
shoulder, elbow, forearm, wrist, and hand. The UE-FMA ranges from 0-66 points, with a 149
maximum score of 66 points indicating the least motor deficit, with a score >31 indicating 150
moderate or mild upper limb impairment (19). 151

The ARAT is a validated measure of upper limb functional limitations and activity levels 152
in stroke individuals (31, 32). The scale comprises 19 items where 0 indicates no movement 153
and 3 indicates normal movement. Items are categorized into 4 subscales (grasp, grip, pinch, 154
and gross movement) to assess upper extremity performance of coordination, dexterity, and 155
functioning. The ARAT total score ranges from 0 to 57, with a higher score indicating better 156
performance (33). 157

Data reduction and analysis 158

Reflective markers were labeled, and missing data were gap-filled using Nexus software 159
(version 2.5). Visual 3D software (C-Motion, Rockville, MD, USA) was used to perform 160
biomechanical modeling. Joint angles and joint velocity were extracted for further analysis. 161
VectorCodeR package was used to calculate the coupling angle (CA) in the sagittal plane. 162
Definitions of different kinematics variables were represented in detail in Table 1. 163

Peak velocities were determined based on the whole process of the task as follows: 164

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

where x_i , y_i , and z_i are the coordinates of a marker, and i is the index of a frame. 165

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
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.
Spatiotemporal variables		
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	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. The initiation was defined as the start of phase I when the subjects moved faster than 5cm/s (34).	
Peak velocity	m/s	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).	
Trunk displacement	m	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).	
Movement quality-related variables	Smoothness	deg/s	Using jerk square mean value (JSM) described the upper limb joint movement smoothness index during the folding towel (25).
	Inter-limb Coordination	deg	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

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 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 (γ_i) were obtained 187
 based on the consecutive proximal segment angles (shoulder) or hemiplegic side angle (non- 188
 dominant for healthy individuals) ($\theta_{P(i)}$, $\theta_{P(i+1)}$) and consecutive distal segment angles (elbow) 189
 or non-hemiplegic side (dominant for healthy individuals) ($\theta_{D(i)}$, $\theta_{D(i+1)}$) as follows: 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 (γ_i) was corrected to present a value between 0 and 360 as follows (37, 192
 40). 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 194
 (bilateral elbow-elbow, bilateral shoulder-shoulder, and hemiplegic shoulder-elbow) between 195
 stroke and healthy individuals was calculated using the unit vector scalar product (DOT). DOT 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
Clinical parameters			
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 (n = 17)		Healthy Group (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 ⁻¹	174.2 (110.8)	128.0 (87.1)	181.8 (40.9)	164.4 (49.6)
Max shoulder velocity/ms ⁻¹	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 ⁻³	1131.5 (940.1)	810.5 (2502.9)	1930.6 (913.3)	884.7 (391.8)
JSM value of shoulder /deg*s ⁻³	322.3	237.0	116.5	67.1

		(324.9)	(690.8)	(93.7)	(48.6)
	JSM value of wrist /deg*s⁻³	2.5	1.9	0.3	4.2
		(4.2)	(2.3)	(0.1)	(11.0)
Inter-limb and intra-limb coordination patterns /units					
Elbow-elbow coordination (frequency)	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)	
Shoulder-shoulder coordination (frequency)	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)	
Hemiplegic/Non-dominant shoulder-elbow coordination (frequency)	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	P value	Effect size (d)
Time and Velocity/units			
Movement time / s	27.9	0.000*	1.396
Movement initiation delay / s	0.3	0.000*	0.797

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

			(Partial η^2)
Elbow-elbow coordination * / frequency (p < 0.01, η^2 = 0.428)			
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
Shoulder-shoulder coordination* / frequency (p < 0.01, η^2 = 0.552)			
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
Hemiplegic/Non-Dominant Shoulder-Elbow Coordination* / Frequency (p < 0.01, η^2 = 0.516)			
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

Compensatory Trunk Displacement 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
 $\text{deg}^*\text{s}^{-3}$; $P = .031$; Cohen's $d = .883$ and mean difference = 169.9 $\text{deg}^*\text{s}^{-3}$; $P = .958$; Cohen's d
= .128, respectively), and hemiplegic wrist joints (mean difference = 2.2 $\text{deg}^*\text{s}^{-3}$; $P < .001$;
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 $\text{deg}^*\text{s}^{-3}$; P
= .014; Cohen's $d = -.909$ and mean difference = -74.3 $\text{deg}^*\text{s}^{-3}$; $P < .001$; Cohen's $d = -2.177$,
respectively) and non-hemiplegic wrist (mean difference = -2.3 $\text{deg}^*\text{s}^{-3}$; $P = .003$; 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
Time and Velocity			
Movement time	UE-FMA	-0.320 [-0.694, 0.190]	0.217
	ARAT	-0.350 [-0.711, 0.157]	0.174
Movement initiation delay	UE-FMA	-0.340 [-0.705, 0.168]	0.179
	ARAT	-0.600 [-0.839, -0.168]	0.010*
Max hemiplegic elbow velocity	UE-FMA	-0.130 [-0.575, 0.374]	0.607
	ARAT	0.210 [-0.301, 0.627]	0.425
Max non-hemiplegic elbow velocity	UE-FMA	-0.038 [-0.509, 0.451]	0.884
	ARAT	0.230 [-0.282, 0.640]	0.370
Max hemiplegic shoulder velocity	UE-FMA	-0.260 [-0.659, 0.252]	0.311
	ARAT	-0.130 [-0.575, 0.374]	0.607
Max non-hemiplegic shoulder velocity	UE-FMA	-0.060 [-0.525, 0.433]	0.818
	ARAT	0.230 [-0.282, 0.640]	0.384
Compensatory trunk displacement			
Max displacement	UE-FMA	0.240 [-0.272, 0.646]	0.355
	ARAT	-0.022 [-0.497, 0.464]	0.933
Total displacement	UE-FMA	0.074 [-0.422, 0.536]	0.778
	ARAT	0.079 [-0.417, 0.539]	0.763
Smoothness - JSM value (i.e., JSM increased, smoothness decreased)			
Hemiplegic elbow smoothness	UE-FMA	-0.500 [-0.791, -0.025]	0.039*
	ARAT	-0.190 [-0.615, 0.320]	0.456
Non-hemiplegic elbow smoothness	UE-FMA	-0.670 [-0.870, -0.280]	0.004*
	ARAT	-0.650 [-0.861, -0.246]	0.005*
Hemiplegic shoulder smoothness	UE-FMA	-0.540 [-0.810, -0.080]	0.024*
	ARAT	-0.240 [-0.646, 0.272]	0.357
Non-hemiplegic shoulder smoothness	UE-FMA	-0.240 [-0.646, 0.272]	0.345
	ARAT	-0.026 [-0.500, 0.460]	0.921
Hemiplegic wrist smoothness	UE-FMA	-0.520 [-0.800, -0.052]	0.033*
	ARAT	-0.360 [-0.717, 0.146]	0.152

Non-hemiplegic wrist smoothness	UE-FMA	-0.370 [-0.722, 0.135]	0.147
	ARAT	-0.290 [-0.676, 0.222]	0.261
Inter-limb and intra-limb coordination			
DOT: elbow-elbow	UE-FMA	0.380 [-0.123, 0.728]	0.137
	ARAT	0.430 [-0.064, 0.755]	0.085
DOT: shoulder-shoulder^a	UE-FMA	-0.025 [-0.500, 0.461]	0.925
	ARAT	0.038 [-0.451, 0.509]	0.884
DOT: hemiplegic/left shoulder-elbow^a	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, 422
and/or publication of this article. 423

Ethics approval and consent to participate 424

The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and approved by the 425
Institutional Review Board of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University (HSEARS20220125002). 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

Acknowledgments 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, Lamercy 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





(a). Elbow-elbow Coordination



(b). Shoulder-shoulder Coordination



(c). Hemiplegic/Non-Dominant Shoulder-Elbow Coordination



Figure