

1 **Are Electromyography data a fingerprint for patients with cerebral palsy (CP)?**

2 **Mehrdad Davoudi¹, Firooz Salami¹, Robert Reisig¹, Dimitrios A. Patikas², Nicholas A.**
3 **Beckmann¹, Katharina Susanne Gather¹, Sebastian I. Wolf^{1*}**

4 ¹ Clinic for Orthopaedics, Heidelberg University Hospital, Schlierbacher Landstr. 200a, 69118
5 Heidelberg, Germany.

6 ² Laboratory of Neuromechanics, School of Physical Education and Sports Science at Serres,
7 Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece.

8 *** Correspondence:**

9 Sebastian I. Wolf

10 Sebastian.Wolf@med.uni-heidelberg.de

11 Clinic for Orthopedics, Schlierbacher Landstr. 200a, 69118 Heidelberg, Germany.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 **NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

23 **Abstract**

24 This study aimed to first investigate changes in electromyography (EMG) patterns after
25 multilevel surgical treatment in patients with cerebral palsy (CP) and then to assess the
26 connection between the measure of EMG and motor control indices and surgery outcomes. We
27 analyzed retrospective EMG and gait data from 167 patients with CP before and after surgery
28 and from 117 typically developed individuals as a reference group. The patients underwent at
29 least one soft tissue surgery on their shank and foot muscles. Using Repeated Measures
30 ANOVA, we examined the norm-distance (ND) of the kinematics, kinetics, and EMG patterns,
31 in addition to the Kerpape-Rennes EMG-based Gait Index (EDI), EMG Profile Score (EPS),
32 and Walking Dynamic Motor Control Index (DMC) before and after surgery. Participants were
33 divided into different response groups (Poor, Mild, and Good gait quality) according to their
34 pre- and post-treatment Gait Deviation Index (GDI), using the K-means-PSO clustering
35 algorithm. The gait and EMG indices were compared between the responders using the
36 nonparametric Mann-Whitney test. The ND for all kinematics and kinetics parameters
37 significantly improved (p -value < 0.05) after the surgery. Regarding EMG, a significant
38 reduction was only observed in the ND of the rectus femoris (p -value < 0.001) and soleus (p -
39 value = 0.006). Among the indices, DMC was not altered post-operatively (p -value = 0.88).
40 Although EDI and EPS were consistent across responders with a similar pre-treatment gait, a
41 higher DMC was significantly associated with a greater improvement, particularly in patients
42 with poor gait (p -value < 0.05). These findings indicate systematic changes in the EMG of
43 patients with CP following surgery, which can also be demonstrated through indices. DMC is
44 a measure that can potentially serve as a partial predictor of outcomes, particularly in patients
45 with poor pre-operative gait. Future research should investigate the effects of different surgical
46 strategies on the improvement of these patients.

47 **Key Words: Cerebral Palsy, Orthopedic Surgery, EMG, Motor Control, Clustering**

48 **1- Introduction**

49 Does the electromyogram (EMG) remain unchanged as a fingerprint in patients with cerebral
50 palsy (CP) after orthopedic surgery? Visually inspecting pre- and post-operative EMG signals
51 in patients with CP, Gueth et al. [1] answered this question as a ‘yes’, indicating that EMG is
52 robust to surgery. Therefore, they proposed the idea that we don’t need to measure the EMG
53 after the operation. However, the assessment of a small number of patients as well as
54 subjectivity are two main limitations of their study.

55 Patikas et al. delved deeper into this question by monitoring 34 patients, focusing on the
56 changes in envelopes of EMG data rather than raw signals [2]. They observed a systematic
57 improvement in the EMG of shank muscles (soleus, tibialis anterior, and lateral gastrocnemius)
58 after a single-event multilevel surgery (SEMLS). However, the reported changes compared to
59 kinematics and kinetics were relatively small. The majority of the patients in their study had
60 equinus foot deformity with a history of calf muscle lengthening surgery, indicating the
61 significant impact of shank soft tissue surgery on EMG in patients with CP. These findings
62 aligned with other studies that indicated muscle activation patterns, as well as their recruitment
63 in patients with CP, may change after an intervention [3-5]. Consequently, they concluded that
64 EMG can describe the clinical condition of the patient before and after orthopedic surgery, and
65 it can be considered for better clinical decision-making, such as the approach developed by
66 Reinbold et al. [6] to predict the results of rectus transfer surgery.

67 The suggestion from Patikas et al. [2], which served as the main motivation for the current
68 study, was to conduct a controlled study with a larger population and more homogeneous
69 surgical treatment. They argued that employing such standardized approaches could help clarify
70 the pre-operative compensatory mechanisms present in patients, ultimately improving the
71 prediction of surgical intervention outcomes. Nonetheless, there remains a need for the
72 development of new analytical methods to interpret EMG signals effectively in a clinical
73 context. Moreover, the subjective evaluation of the pre-operative motor control status' impact

74 on surgical outcomes, in conjunction with CP biomechanics, constitutes a notable gap in extant
75 literature warranting attention.

76 Using clustering analysis, Davoudi et al. [7, 8] established an association between the pre-
77 operation activity of muscles in patients with CP and their response to the surgery. Moreover,
78 they introduced a simple index as the ratio between the activity of the rectus femoris and
79 gastrocnemius lateralis muscles as a predictor of the chance of improvement in patients with a
80 crouch gait. Kinematic indices such as the Gait Deviation Index (GDI) [9] and the Gait Profile
81 Score (GPS) [10] are two measures of gait quality whose applicability in the assessment of gait
82 with CP has already been reported in the literature [11-14]. The Kerpape-Rennes EMG-based
83 Gait Index [15], referred to as the EMG Deviation Index (EDI) in this study, and the EMG
84 Profile Score (EPS) [16] are two EMG-based measures calculated using the same methodology
85 as the GDI and GPS, respectively. EDI quantifies global muscle activity based on the Euclidean
86 distance between a patient's EMG pattern and that of typically developing (TD) subjects using
87 principal component analysis. Scores equal to or above 100 indicate normal gait, with a
88 decrease of 10 points indicating a deviation of one standard deviation (SD) from TD.
89 Additionally, to assess deviations from the norm for individual muscle groups independently,
90 the EPS was calculated based on the mean of the root mean square error (RMSE) for each
91 muscle during the gait, providing a score without units. While these are validated measures
92 [17], there is no study on the use of EMG indices in the CP population.

93 Although EDI and EPS can describe biomechanics by considering patterns, they are relatively
94 weak in presenting the degree of motor involvement of the patient. To address this limitation,
95 Schwartz et al. introduced the Walking Dynamic Motor Control Index (Walk-DMC) to
96 clinically assess the effect of altered neuromuscular control on treatment outcomes in patients
97 with CP [18]. A higher DMC suggests better motor function, with 100 being the average DMC
98 for TD individuals, and 10 points representing one standard deviation from typical development
99 outcomes. The observed DMC was significantly associated with the response to treatment,

100 second only to the pre-treatment level of GDI. However, the treatment in their study included
101 various interventions such as surgery, physical therapy, and selective dorsal rhizotomy.
102 Additionally, the influence of DMC level on individuals with similar gait quality prior to
103 treatment was not investigated. Therefore, it remains unclear how DMC can be helpful for
104 predicting the results of surgery in patients with CP.

105 The primary aim of this study was to investigate the effect of SEMLS on the EMG and gait
106 kinematics of patients with CP. To achieve a more homogeneous surgical management across
107 the cohort, we focused on patients who underwent soft tissue surgery on their shank and foot
108 muscles, in addition to potentially other more proximal surgeries. Furthermore, we evaluated
109 the applicability of EMG indices as global measures for assessing the results of surgery in the
110 CP population. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time EDI and EPS have been
111 measured in patients with CP. Moreover, considering DMC, we assessed the connection
112 between motor control and surgery outcomes for subgroups with the same level of GDI. We
113 hypothesized that while EMG patterns, as a biomechanical aspect of EMG activity, will change
114 with surgery, motor control is rather independent of a specific gait pattern and remains stable.
115 Our second hypothesis is that DMC is robust against biomechanical correction following
116 surgery and potentially, this measure before treatment can serve as a predictor for the level of
117 improvement after SEMLS in patients with CP.

118 **2- Methods**

119 **2-1- Ethics statement**

120 The study was approved by the local Ethical Committee “Medical Faculty, Heidelberg
121 University (no: S-243/2022)”.

122 **2-2- Participants**

123 The data analyzed in this retrospective study were part of a larger database established at the
124 local University Clinics in the years 2000-2022 when retrieval was stopped. Only personnel

125 that had regular legal access to the medical records retrieved patient data, collected and
126 anonymized it. After this step, individual participants could not be identified anymore. They
127 collected data in the time November and December 2022, and anonymized it in the same year
128 December 28th.

129 The database was filtered for CP patients with at least two consecutive examinations in the local
130 gait laboratory with orthopedic surgery in between. Examinations that did not show high-
131 quality EMG data were excluded, and surgeries had to address gait disorders caused by CP. If
132 multiple examinations were available, the dates closest to the surgery were selected. The first
133 examination (E1) was conducted before the operation, and the second examination (E2) was
134 typically conducted one year after the operation. Therefore, E1 and E2 pertain to the same
135 individuals evaluated at different time points. For hemiplegia patients, only data from the
136 affected side were considered.

137 Further primary inclusion criteria encompassed gait and clinical data for each examination,
138 walking barefoot without assistive devices, and classification as Gross Motor Function
139 Classification System (GMFCS) level I or II. Usually, the surgeries involved multiple
140 procedures on different levels (hip, thigh, shank, and feet). If multiple surgeries were performed
141 on different dates between the two examinations, all procedures were included in this study as
142 they could be relevant for the second examination. Following the recommendation of Patikas
143 et al. [2], to ensure a more homogeneous approach to surgical treatment, we focused on patients
144 who, among other procedures, underwent soft tissue surgery on muscles located at the shank
145 and foot level. For 91% of patients, this involved at least one surgery on the triceps surae
146 muscle, such as the Baumann Procedure [19] (46%), Strayer Procedure [20] (46%), or Achilles
147 Tendon Lengthening [21] (17%). Additionally, there were some muscle transfer surgeries, such
148 as tibialis anterior transfer (13%) and tibialis posterior transfer (9%), and multiple muscle
149 lengthening procedures, such as flexor digitorum longus lengthening (3%). In most cases, the
150 surgery included further procedures on another level, i.e., legs and feet. The most prevalent

151 additional procedures were femoral derotation (78%), bony foot procedures (38%), rectus
152 transfer (30%), and hamstring lengthening (28%).

153 Furthermore, according to [2], we chose to assess only the more involved side in each patient
154 to maintain homogeneity regarding severity. This was defined as the side that underwent
155 surgery, and in cases of bilateral involvement, the side with the lower GDI was selected for
156 further analysis. Following the application of these criteria, 167 patients were recruited, along
157 with 117 TD individuals serving as the reference group. Table 1 presents the characteristics of
158 the study participants.

159 Table 1. Demographic and descriptive data of the participants at their first (E1) and second
160 (E2) examinations and also TD individuals.

	E1 (n=167)	E2 (n=167)	TD (n=117)
	pre-operative examination	post-operative examination	
Age (years)	15.86± 8.6 (5.3-49.5)	18.1 ± 8.9 (6.9-54.2)	21.7 ± 12.3 (6.0-46.0)
Height (cm)	149.1 ± 18.5 (105.0-194.0)	152.6 ± 18.2 (121.0-187)	161.9 ± 19.8 (108.0-195.0)
Body mass (kg)	43.68 ± 16 (14.6-87.3)	46.8 ± 17.3 (14.8-101.8)	66.4 ± 16.8 (19.0-91.0)
Sex (male/female)	84/83		58/59
CP type (diplegia/ hemiplegia)	148/19		
Interval between examinations (years)	2.3 ± 1.8 (0.8-13.5)		

161

162 **2-3- Data processing**

163 The data recording and processing approach used in this study was the same as the one
164 described in our recently published paper on rectus femoris EMG clustering [7]. Envelopes [22]
165 for the EMG of seven major lower-extremity muscles—rectus femoris, vastus lateralis, tibialis
166 anterior, semimembranosus, biceps femoris, lateral gastrocnemius, and soleus—were extracted

167 for subsequent analysis. Additionally, we calculated the kinematics, kinetics, and
168 spatiotemporal parameters of participants' gait.

169 To quantify the extent of deviation in a patient's EMG envelopes and gait parameters relative
170 to a reference group, we calculated the norm-distance (ND) according to [2]. ND was defined
171 as the absolute difference between a muscle's EMG envelope at the i _th data point belongs to
172 the patient p (F_{pi}) and the mean value of the corresponding data point within that muscle for
173 the reference group (\bar{F}_{ni}), divided by the respective standard deviation within the reference
174 group (SD_{ni}), as expressed in Equation (1). The ND values for all 101 data points were averaged
175 over a gait cycle for further analysis. Changes in the average ND (\overline{ND}) from the initial
176 examination (E1) to the subsequent examination (E2) were regarded as indicative of the
177 surgery's impact on the patient's EMG. A reduction in \overline{ND} following the intervention suggested
178 an improvement towards a pattern more similar to the reference group.

Eq. 1.
$$NDi = \frac{|F_{pi} - \bar{F}_{ni}|}{SD_{ni}}$$

179 The same procedure was also employed to assess gait patterns in sagittal plane, including
180 angles, moments, and power at the hip, knee, and ankle joints.

181 **2-4- Gait and EMG Indices**

182 EMG indices, including EDI [15], EPS [16], and Walk-DMC [18], were derived from the
183 envelopes in accordance with existing literature. An increase in EDI, along with a reduction in
184 EPS, may signify improvement post-surgery. Moreover, a higher DMC indicates enhanced
185 motor control function in the patient. Additionally, GDI [9] and GPS [10], as measures of gait
186 quality, were evaluated in both E1 and E2 for the patients. A higher GDI and a lower GPS are
187 associated with reduced deviation from a typical gait pattern. All analyses for the extraction of
188 parameters and indices were conducted using Matlab software (The MathWorks, Inc., USA).

189 **2-5- Clustering**

190 We utilized the same k-means-PSO clustering algorithm as in our previous study [7] to
191 categorize patients into three different gait levels based on their GDI in each examination, pre-
192 (E1) and post-operative (E2). By averaging the GDI of patients within each cluster, we
193 classified the patients as having good, mild, and poor gait quality, corresponding to high,
194 medium, and low mean GDI, respectively (Table 4 in the results section). Figure 1 shows the
195 clustering procedure applied to our database. The clustering algorithm was developed using
196 Matlab, based on the details described in [7]. The algorithm was identical for both E1 and E2
197 populations. The number of clusters was determined by us in a supervised manner, set at 'n=3'.
198 This allowed us to track the changes in gait quality of the patients (Figure 1). Although the
199 patients in both E1 and E2 are the same (matched), their GDI values may differ due to the
200 effects of the surgery (Figure 1.A and B).

201 **Please insert Fig 1**

202 **Fig 1. The clustering of the patients, (A) according to their pre-operation (E1) GDI, and**
203 **(B) according to their post-operation (E2) GDI. (C) The possible responses of the**
204 **patients to the surgery, identified within each cluster both pre- and post-operation.**

205 Using this approach, we removed the effect of the pre-treatment level of GDI, which, according
206 to [18], significantly influences the outcomes of surgery. Subsequently, we identified three
207 groups of patients with the same pre-operative GDI level (E1). Each patient could have one of
208 three possible responses to the intervention: good, mild, or poor, corresponding to being
209 identified as Cluster 1, Cluster 2, or Cluster 3 post-operatively (E2) (Figure 1.C). Furthermore,
210 the specifics of the type and number of surgeries performed between E1 and E2 for different
211 responders are examined to investigate any potential bias arising from the treatment approach
212 on the responses and clustering outcomes. According to the surgical details described in section
213 2.2, the most frequent proximal surgeries (femoral derotation, rectus transfer, and hamstring
214 lengthening) and the main distal surgeries (Baumann and Strayer procedures, Achilles tendon
215 lengthening, and bony foot procedures) were considered for examination between the clusters.

216 2-6- Statistics

217 To compare the effect of the intervention on the ND of kinematics, kinetics, and EMG
218 parameters (sections 2-3) and on the indices outlined in section 2-4, Repeated Measures
219 ANOVA was used. Further, for the muscles that showed a significant improvement (p-value =
220 0.05) in their ND, we applied statistical parametric mapping (SPM, www.spm1d.org)
221 implemented in Matlab [23] to compare the changes over the entire gait cycle. We applied the
222 nonparametric Mann-Whitney test (p-value = 0.05) to compare the primary levels of the gait
223 and EMG indices between the groups with the same condition in E1, and also to assess their
224 changes from E1 to E2.

225 3- Results

226 The ND of all measured kinematics and kinetics parameters exhibited significant improvement
227 (p-value < 0.05) post-surgery, as shown in Table 2. Regarding EMG, a significant reduction
228 was only observed in the ND of the EMG for the rectus femoris (p-value < 0.001) and soleus
229 (p-value = 0.006), as detailed in Table 3. While the gait indices (GDI and GPS) and EMG
230 indices (EDI and EPS) demonstrated significant changes towards normal values from E1 to E2
231 (p-value < 0.001), the measure for motor control (DMC) showed no significant difference after
232 the intervention (p-value = 0.88).

233 Table 2- Pre- (E1) and post-operative (E2) norm-distance of the kinematics and kinetics
234 parameters and for GDI and GPS

Measure	Examination	Mean (SD)	95% Confidence interval (lower bound - upper bound)	Sig.
ND ankle dorsiflexion (degree)	E1	3.36 (0.22)	2.93 - 3.78	<0.001
	E2	1.81 (0.07)	1.67 - 1.95	
ND ankle dorsiflexion moment (Nm/kg)	E1	2.07 (0.04)	1.99 - 2.15	<0.001

	E2	1.63 (0.04)	1.54 - 1.71	
ND ankle dorsiflexion power (W/kg)	E1	1.80 (0.06)	1.68 - 1.91	<0.001
	E2	1.29 (0.04)	1.21 - 1.38	
ND knee flexion (degree)	E1	3.24 (0.14)	2.96 - 3.52	<0.001
	E2	2.53 (0.12)	2.28 - 2.77	
ND knee flexion moment (Nm/kg)	E1	1.76 (0.06)	1.65 - 1.87	<0.001
	E2	1.55 (0.05)	1.44 - 1.66	
ND knee flexion power (W/kg)	E1	1.24 (0.03)	1.18 - 1.30	<0.001
	E2	1.11 (0.02)	1.07 - 1.16	
ND hip flexion angle (degree)	E1	1.81 (0.08)	1.66 - 1.97	<0.001
	E2	1.52 (0.07)	1.39 - 1.65	
ND hip flexion moment (Nm/kg)	E1	1.85 (0.05)	1.76 - 1.95	<0.001
	E2	1.54 (0.05)	1.45 - 1.64	
ND hip flexion power (W/kg)	E1	1.74 (0.04)	1.67 - 1.81	<0.001
	E2	1.55 (0.04)	1.47 - 1.63	
GDI	E1	58.51 (0.96)	56.61 - 60.42	<0.001
	E2	73.74 (0.92)	71.93 - 75.55	
GPS	E1	14.35 (0.35)	13.66 - 15.03	<0.001
	E2	9.73 (0.24)	9.27 - 10.20	

235

236 Table 3- Pre- (E1) and post-operative (E2) norm-distance of the EMG activity of muscles and

237

for EDI, EPS and DMC

Measure	Examination	mean (SD)	95% confidence interval (lower bound - upper bound)	Sig.
ND rectus femoris	E1	1.51 (0.031)	1.45 - 1.57	<0.001
	E2	1.39 (0.028)	1.34 - 1.45	
ND vastus lateralis	E1	1.45 (0.03)	1.39 - 1.51	0.63
	E2	1.43 (0.034)	1.37 - 1.50	
ND tibialis anterior	E1	1.34 (0.027)	1.29 - 1.39	0.19
	E2	1.30 (0.025)	1.25 - 1.35	
ND gastrocnemius lateralis	E1	1.19 (0.022)	1.14 - 1.23	0.29
	E2	1.15 (0.025)	1.10 - 1.20	
ND soleus	E1	1.36 (0.028)	1.30 - 1.41	0.006
	E2	1.26 (0.025)	1.21 - 1.31	
ND biceps femoris	E1	0.95 (0.024)	0.91 - 1.00	0.76
	E2	0.95 (0.022)	0.90 - 0.99	
ND semimembranosus	E1	0.98 (0.027)	0.92 - 1.03	0.15
	E2	0.94 (0.023)	0.89 - 0.98	
EDI	E1	82.2 (0.36)	81.50 - 82.94	<0.001
	E2	83.84 (0.38)	83.10 - 84.59	
EPS	E1	73.60 (0.78)	72.06 - 75.15	<0.001
	E2	70.23 (0.75)	68.75 - 71.72	
DMC	E1	79.72 (0.66)	78.43 - 81.01	0.88
	E2	79.63 (0.64)	78.37 - 80.88	

239 SPM analysis revealed significant differences at specific phases of the gait cycle for the rectus
240 femoris, approximately 20% (early stance) and 75% (mid-swing) (Figure 2.A). For the soleus,
241 significant differences were observed at the beginning (initial contact), around 50% (end of
242 stance), and at the end (terminal swing) of the gait cycle between E1 and E2 (Figure 2.B).

Please insert Fig 2

Fig. 2 - Results of SPM analysis highlighting differences in EMG patterns of rectus femoris (A) and soleus (B) muscles pre-operation (E1) and post-operation (E2) throughout the gait cycle. Dark areas indicate significant differences in activity.

243
244 Initial clustering results provided in Table 4 indicate the mean and SD of the GDI for patients
245 identified in each cluster at two assessment points (pre- and post-operation). Patients with the
246 best and the poorest gait performance at E1 had an average GDI of 71.02 and 43.43,
247 respectively. The same assigned gait conditions had an average GDI of 86.47 and 58.51 at E2.
248 This illustrates the general effect of the surgery on improving gait, as evidenced by the increase
249 in the mean GDI from 58.51 at E1 to 73.74 at E2. However, since individual responses varied,
250 patients were categorized according to the change in their cluster post-operation. Tables 5, 6,
251 and 7 compare those with similar pre-operative gait, minimizing the influence of initial gait
252 quality.

253 Table 4 - Average GDI of the patients within each identified cluster pre- and post-operation,
254 along with the assigned gait conditions.

Examination time	Cluster	Average (SD) of GDI for the patients in the cluster	Assigned gait condition
E1 (pre-operation)	Cluster1	71.02 (6.9)	Good
	Cluster2	55.18 (3.0)	Mild
	Cluster3	43.43 (5.0)	Poor
E2 (post-operation)	Cluster1	86.47 (6.8)	Good
	Cluster2	72.28 (3.3)	Mild
	Cluster3	58.51 (6.7)	Poor

255

256 For patients with severe pre-operative gait conditions (Table 5), all three responder groups
 257 experienced significant GDI improvements: 44, 30, and 14 units for good, mild, and poor
 258 responses, respectively. While gait and EMG indices (EDI and EPS) at E1 were consistent
 259 across these responders, DMC was significantly lower for patients with a poor response
 260 (Poor_to_Poor) compared to those with a good response (Poor_to_Good, 72.75 vs. 85.37, p-
 261 value < 0.001) and a mild response (Poor_to_Mild, 72.75 vs. 79.02, p-value = 0.004). EDI and
 262 EPS also improved from E1 to E2 across all responders, particularly for the mild ones
 263 (Poor_to_Mild, p-value < 0.001).

264 Table 5 - Comparative analysis of gait and EMG indices among participants with poor gait
 265 quality at baseline (E1) across responders according to their post-operation gait quality.

Variable	Gait quality condition before surgery (E1)	Gait quality condition after surgery (E2)	No.	Mean (SD) in E1	Mean (SD) in E2	P-Value between E1-E2	P-Value between Poor_to_Good and Poor_to_Mild in E1	P-Value between Poor_to_Good and Poor_to_Poor in E1	P-Value between Poor_to_Mild and Poor_to_Poor in E1
GDI	Poor	Good	10	42.27 (5.8)	86.21 (7.4)	<0.001	0.418	0.387	0.516
	Poor	Mild	22	43.98 (4.8)	72.55 (0.8)	<0.001			
	Poor	Poor	11	43.56 (5.2)	57.01 (8.0)	<0.001			
GPS	Poor	Good	10	20.92 (3.4)	6.93 (1.2)	<0.001	0.392	0.453	0.422
	Poor	Mild	22	19.96 (2.7)	9.54 (0.98)	<0.001			
	Poor	Poor	11	20.2 (2.9)	14.43 (3.4)	<0.001			
EDI	Poor	Good	10	83.49 (3.4)	84.49 (5.3)	0.137	0.184	0.057	0.312
	Poor	Mild	22	81.69 (2.5)	85.03 (0.9)	<0.001			
	Poor	Poor	11	80.96 (3.3)	82.62 (3.7)	0.147			
EPS	Poor	Good	10	70.8 (6.3)	69.08 (10.9)	0.126	0.162	0.103	0.437

	Poor	Mild	22	74.33 (5.6)	67.74 (1.6)	<0.001			
	Poor	Poor	11	75.51 (7.6)	71.86 (7.5)	0.18			
DMC	Poor	Good	10	84.22 (6.4)	85.37 (9.1)	0.339	0.256	<0.001	0.004
	Poor	Mild	22	78.64 (7.2)	79.02 (1.8)	0.387			
	Poor	Poor	11	71.66 (6.9)	72.75 (6.5)	0.447			

266

267 Additionally, the improvement in gait for patients with moderate pre-operative gait issues was
 268 significant (Table 6). The mean DMC for the best responders (Mild_to_Good) was higher than
 269 that of the other two groups at E1, and the levels of EDI and EPS approached a TD level,
 270 although statistical significance was not demonstrated.

271 Table 6 - Comparative analysis of gait and EMG indices among participants with mild gait
 272 quality at baseline (E1) across responders according to their post-operation gait quality.

Variable	Gait quality condition before surgery (E1)	Gait quality condition after surgery (E2)	No.	Mean (SD) in E1	Mean (SD) in E2	P-Value between E1-E2	P-Value between Mild_to_Good and Mild_to_Mild in E1	P-Value between Mild_to_Good and Mild_to_Poor in E1	P-Value between Mild_to_Mild and Mild_to_Poor in E1
GDI	Mild	Good	15	55.99 (3.7)	86.55 (4.9)	<0.001	0.09	0.374	0.128
	Mild	Mild	21	54.41 (3.1)	73.05 (3.4)	<0.001			
	Mild	Poor	21	55.39 (2.4)	58.9 (7.2)	<0.001			
GPS	Mild	Good	15	14.56 (1.3)	6.9 (0.8)	<0.001	0.065	0.379	0.149
	Mild	Mild	21	15.19 (1.2)	9.49 (0.8)	<0.001			
	Mild	Poor	21	14.77 (0.9)	13.72 (3.2)	<0.001			
EDI	Mild	Good	15	83.41 (4.4)	84.55 (4.9)	0.291	0.138	0.14	0.448
	Mild	Mild	21	81.61 (4.7)	83.21 (5.8)	0.202			

	Mild	Poor	21	81.99 (4.0)	83.42 (4.5)	0.194			
EPS	Mild	Good	15	71.35 (8.9)	69.64 (10.2)	0.294	0.183	0.207	0.479
	Mild	Mild	21	74.82 (10.3)	71.62 (12)	0.172			
	Mild	Poor	21	73.78 (8.8)	70.85 (8.9)	0.191			
DMC	Mild	Good	15	81.91 (7.3)	79.98 (7.5)	0.252	0.112	0.293	0.225
	Mild	Mild	21	78.14 (10.3)	78.32 (8.2)	0.465			
	Mild	Poor	21	80.07 (8.5)	80.5 (7.1)	0.445			

273

274 Lastly, for patients with the highest GDI levels at E1, while the changes in gait were significant,
 275 seven patients (Good_to_Poor) experienced a reduction in GDI (increase in GPS), indicating
 276 an unsuccessful surgical outcome. They exhibited a decrease in EDI from 83.73 at E1 to 82.11
 277 at E2, with their DMC being significantly lower than that of Good_to_Good at E1 (78.08 vs.
 278 82.68, p-value = 0.041). Good responders also had a higher initial level of DMC compared to
 279 mild responders (78.95 vs. 82.68, p-value = 0.038). Further, the changes in EMG for good
 280 responders from E1 to E2 were significant, as measured by EDI (p-value = 0.044) and EPS (p-
 281 value = 0.035).

282 Table 8 also shows the details of the main distal and proximal surgeries for the responders in
 283 this study. Dividing the total number of surgeries by the total number of patients for each
 284 condition, the average number of surgeries each patient underwent was calculated. To have
 285 clinical meaning, we have rounded this number. The better responders with a poor gait
 286 (Poor_to_Good) underwent more surgeries (on average 4) than the others (on average 3 and 2).
 287 In general, the amount of proximal surgeries was relatively higher than distal surgeries for the
 288 patients with a better post-operative gait (21 vs. 15 for Poor_to_Good and 25 vs. 23 for
 289 Mild_to_Good).

290 Table 7 - Comparative analysis of gait and EMG indices among participants with good gait

291 quality at baseline (E1) across responders according to their post-operation gait quality.

Variable	Gait quality condition before surgery (E1)	Gait quality condition after surgery (E2)	Number	Mean (SD) in E1	Mean (SD) in E2	P-Value between E1-E2	P-Value between Good_to_Good and Good_to_Mild in E1	P-Value between Good_to_Good and Good_to_Poor in E1	P-Value between Good_to_Mild and Good_to_Poor in E1
GDI	Good	Good	30	72.06 (7.1)	86.53 (7.8)	<0.001	0.132	0.345	0.412
	Good	Mild	30	70.08 (7)	71.55 (3.1)	0.023			
	Good	Poor	7	70.62 (6.7)	59.72 (3.4)	0.002			
GPS	Good	Good	30	9.85 (1.7)	6.94 (1.1)	<0.001	0.15	0.304	0.488
	Good	Mild	30	10.31 (1.7)	9.83 (0.8)	0.021			
	Good	Poor	7	10.29 (1.6)	13.35 (1)	0.002			
EDI	Good	Good	30	82.45 (6.6)	85.01 (5)	0.044	0.381	0.231	0.394
	Good	Mild	30	82 (5.4)	82.78 (5.2)	0.343			
	Good	Poor	7	83.73 (3.5)	82.11 (3.7)	0.311			
EPS	Good	Good	30	73.71 (13.5)	68.13 (9.5)	0.035	0.36	0.245	0.319
	Good	Mild	30	74.25 (12.7)	72.19 (11.1)	0.278			
	Good	Poor	7	70.25 (7.1)	73.36 (7.3)	0.356			
DMC	Good	Good	30	82.68 (6.9)	80.91 (7.7)	0.141	0.038	0.041	0.495
	Good	Mild	30	78.95 (9.7)	79.8 (8.6)	0.37			
	Good	Poor	7	78.08 (4)	76.28 (8.1)	0.268			

292

293

294

Table 8 – Comparison between the type and number of surgeries for each responding condition

Responders	Total number of patients	Distal surgeries				Proximal surgeries			Average number of surgeries on one patient	total number of distal surgeries	total number of proximal surgeries
		Achilles tendon lengthening	Baumann procedure	Strayer procedure	bony foot procedures	femoral derotation	rectus transfer	hamstring lengthening			
Poor_to_Good	10	1	6	5	3	10	7	4	4	15	21
Poor_to_Mild	22	6	10	9	3	21	11	14	3	28	46
Poor_to_Poor	11	0	3	7	4	9	4	1	3	14	14
Mild_to_Good	15	3	8	8	4	13	6	6	3	23	25
Mild_to_Mild	21	2	12	9	9	20	7	9	3	32	36
Mild_to_Poor	21	6	7	12	11	17	3	6	3	36	26
Good_to_Good	30	5	16	11	11	20	5	3	2	43	28
Good_to_Mild	30	5	10	14	16	16	5	3	2	45	24
Good_to_Poor	7	1	4	2	3	4	2	1	2	10	7

295 4- Discussion

296 This study confirms the systematic changes in EMG observed in patients with cerebral palsy
297 following orthopedic surgery. In a relatively larger and more homogeneous cohort, we observed
298 the same findings as Patikas et al. [2] regarding the improvement in post-operative norm-
299 distance for kinetics, kinematics, and EMG (Tables 2 and 3).

300 The post-operative reduction in soleus activity during initial contact and terminal swing (Figure
301 2.A) may be attributed to the decreased equinus following the (gastrocnemius) lengthening
302 procedures. This adjustment, common in our population, allowed for a more dorsiflexed
303 position during initial contact. Additionally, the increased activation of the soleus during
304 terminal stance can enhance power generation in the plantar flexors, which is crucial for the
305 body's forward progression [24].

306 Moreover, while increased mid-swing EMG activity of the rectus femoris is typically observed
307 in individuals with cerebral palsy [25], the reduction in this activity post-surgery indicates a
308 positive effect on their gait (Figure 2.B). The increase in rectus femoris activity during early
309 stance can also provide sufficient moment to extend the knee in mid-stance. During gait, as the
310 knee extends and the ankle dorsiflexes, the knee moment transitions from an extensor to a flexor
311 moment, allowing the quadriceps to cease contracting and the ankle to absorb power through
312 the eccentric contraction of the gastrocnemius–soleus complex [26]. These synergistic changes
313 observed in our study in the EMG of the soleus and rectus muscles may result in an improved
314 plantar flexion–knee extension coupling mechanism [26], leading to better gait quality as
315 indicated by the GDI and GPS (Table 2).

316 The examined EMG indices, EDI and EPS, basically describe EMG patterns, and tend to
317 become more typical (Table 3) as gait becomes more typical after the surgery (gait parameters,
318 Table 2). This might be interpreted as a biomechanical aspect of EMG activity. In contrast,
319 DMC seems to be a quantity that is relatively independent of the changes in gait pattern or

320 indexes derived from them (Table 3). Therefore, and this is the second hypothesis we examined
321 in this study, DMC can be a partial predictor of outcomes: 'Good DMC = good response; Poor
322 DMC = poor response' (i.e., of orthopedic/biomechanical intervention). According to [18], we
323 applied a clustering algorithm to divide the subjects into groups of patients with similar gait
324 quality in E1 and the same response to the treatment in E2.

325 Considering the possible recovery conditions, DMC was the only measure that showed a
326 difference between the responding groups with the same baseline GDI (Tables 5, 6, and 7),
327 while it remained the same from E1 to E2. The patients with a relatively low DMC (≈ 70 out of
328 100 for TD) along with poor gait quality (GDI ≈ 40 out of 100 for TD) are more likely to have
329 worse outcomes after treatment (Table 5). This finding interestingly implies that orthopedic
330 surgeons should be cautious not to overtreat patients with severely limited motor control.
331 Conversely, a relatively high DMC (≈ 80 out of 100 for TD) for patients with a better pre-
332 treatment GDI (≈ 70 out of 100 for TD) can lead to further improvement in their gait following
333 the intervention (Table 7). Moreover, for mild cases (Table 6), it can also be seen that the
334 average DMC for the good responders was higher than for the other groups. However, for these
335 cases, it might be difficult to distinguish between the biomechanics and the motor effect on
336 their gait deficit. It is crucial to acknowledge that the descriptive terms used in this study, such
337 as poor, good, mild, better, and worse, are context-specific and pertain to the population
338 included in our research. In other clinical settings, where the severity levels of patients may
339 differ, these thresholds might not apply uniformly. Nevertheless, the inclusion of 167 patients
340 in our study provides a sufficiently large sample size to generalize the systematic changes in
341 EMG post-surgery, validate the application of EMG indices in clinical practice, and underscore
342 the significance of DMC as a measure of motor control function in clinical decision-making.
343 While prior studies addressed pre-treatment femoral anteversion [27], knee flexion [28],
344 dynamic hip flexion [29], and gait profile score [30] as predictors of post-operative outcomes,

345 this is the first study to examine the connection between DMC and gait following surgery in a
346 relatively homogeneous group of patients with CP.

347 Comparing the type and number of surgeries among the responders, it appears that those with
348 poor pre-treatment gait quality who demonstrated better responses underwent the most
349 extensive surgical interventions. Furthermore, proximal surgeries, such as rectus transfer,
350 hamstring lengthening, and femoral derotation, seem to have resulted in higher responder rates
351 compared to distal surgeries, such as Baumann-Strayer and bony foot procedures, for patients
352 with initially poor and mild gait quality. This may introduce a potential bias in the grouping
353 methodology employed in this study. Our research primarily focused on the applicability of
354 EMG as a clinical measure to enhance decision-making for patients with CP. However, we
355 recommend that future researchers conduct more focused studies on the impact of different
356 surgical approaches on EMG changes and their relationship with gait improvement.
357 Additionally, the influence of growth, changes in muscle mass, and spasticity over time,
358 particularly following surgery, on the EMG and gait of patients with cerebral palsy, should also
359 be explored in future studies.

360 **5- Conflict of Interest**

361 ‘The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or
362 financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.’

363 There is no conflict of interest.

364 **6- Author Contributions**

365 MD: Writing original draft, Data analysis; FS: Review & editing, Methodology; RR: Data
366 analysis; DAP, NAB and KG: Review & editing; SIW: Review & editing, Conceptualization,
367 Methodology, Project administration.

368 **7- Data Availability**

369 The data supporting the conclusions of this article will be made available by the authors upon
370 request.

371 **8- Funding**

372 This research was funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG) (no: WO 1624/ 8-1).
373 This funder had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or
374 preparation of the manuscript.

375 **References**

- 376 1. Gueth V, Abbink F, Reuken R. Comparison of pre-and postoperative electromyograms
377 in children with cerebral palsy. *Electromyography and clinical neurophysiology*.
378 1985;25(4):233-43.
- 379 2. Patikas D, Wolf SI, Schuster W, Armbrust P, Dreher T, Döderlein L. Electromyographic
380 patterns in children with cerebral palsy: Do they change after surgery? *Gait & posture*.
381 2007;26(3):362-71.
- 382 3. Woollacott M, Shumway-Cook A, Hutchinson S, Ciol M, Price R, Kartin D. Effect of
383 balance training on muscle activity used in recovery of stability in children with cerebral palsy:
384 a pilot study. *Developmental medicine and child neurology*. 2005;47(7):455-61.
- 385 4. Buurke JH, Hermens HJ, Roetenberg D, Harlaar J, Rosenbaum D, Kleissen RFM.
386 Influence of hamstring lengthening on muscle activation timing. *Gait & posture*. 2004;20(1):48-
387 53.
- 388 5. Romkes J, Hell AK, Brunner R. Changes in muscle activity in children with hemiplegic
389 cerebral palsy while walking with and without ankle-foot orthoses. *Gait & posture*.
390 2006;24(4):467-74.
- 391 6. Reinbolt JA, Fox MD, Schwartz MH, Delp SL. Predicting outcomes of rectus femoris
392 transfer surgery. *Gait & posture*. 2009;30(1):100-5.
- 393 7. Davoudi M, Salami F, Reisig R, Patikas D, Wolf S. Rectus Femoris Electromyography
394 Signal Clustering: Data-Driven Management of Crouch Gait in Patients with Cerebral Palsy.
395 *PloS one*. 2024:Forthcoming.
- 396 8. Davoudi M, Salami F, Reisig R, Wolf SI. Rectus femoris EMG clustering, A data-driven
397 management of crouch gait in patients with cerebral palsy (CP). *Gait & Posture*. 2023;106:S45-
398 S6.
- 399 9. Schwartz MH, Rozumalski A. The Gait Deviation Index: a new comprehensive index
400 of gait pathology. *Gait & posture*. 2008;28(3):351-7.


- 401 10. Baker R, McGinley JL, Schwartz MH, Beynon S, Rozumalski A, Graham HK, et al.
402 The gait profile score and movement analysis profile. *Gait & posture*. 2009;30(3):265-9.
- 403 11. Rasmussen HM, Nielsen DB, Pedersen NW, Overgaard S, Holsgaard-Larsen A. Gait
404 Deviation Index, Gait Profile Score and Gait Variable Score in children with spastic cerebral
405 palsy: Intra-rater reliability and agreement across two repeated sessions. *Gait & posture*.
406 2015;42(2):133-7.
- 407 12. Speciali DS, Corrêa JCF, Luna NM, Brant R, Greve JMDA, de Godoy W, et al.
408 Validation of GDI, GPS and GVS for use in Parkinson's disease through evaluation of effects
409 of subthalamic deep brain stimulation and levodopa. *Gait & Posture*. 2014;39(4):1142-5.
- 410 13. Cimolin V, Galli M, Vimercati SL, Albertini G. Use of the Gait Deviation Index for the
411 assessment of gastrocnemius fascia lengthening in children with Cerebral Palsy. *Research in*
412 *developmental disabilities*. 2011;32(1):377-81.
- 413 14. Bickley C, Linton J, Scarborough N, Sullivan E, Mitchell K, Barnes D. Correlation of
414 technical surgical goals to the GDI and investigation of post-operative GDI change in children
415 with cerebral palsy. *Gait & Posture*. 2017;55:121-5.
- 416 15. Bervet K, Bessette M, Godet L, Crétual A. KeR-EGI, a new index of gait quantification
417 based on electromyography. *Journal of Electromyography and Kinesiology*. 2013;23(4):930-7.
- 418 16. Ropars J, Lempereur M, Vuillerot C, Tiffreau V, Peudenier S, Cuisset J-M, et al. Muscle
419 activation during gait in children with Duchenne muscular dystrophy. *PloS one*.
420 2016;11(9):e0161938.
- 421 17. Nüesch C, Mandelli F, Przybilla P, Schären S, Mündermann A, Netzer C. Kinematics
422 and paraspinal muscle activation patterns during walking differ between patients with lumbar
423 spinal stenosis and controls. *Gait & Posture*. 2023;99:44-50.
- 424 18. Schwartz MH, Rozumalski A, Steele KM. Dynamic motor control is associated with
425 treatment outcomes for children with cerebral palsy. *Developmental Medicine & Child*
426 *Neurology*. 2016;58(11):1139-45.
- 427 19. Baumann JU, Koch HG. Ventrale aponeurotische Verlängerung des Musculus
428 gastrocnemius. *Operative Orthopädie und Traumatologie*. 1989;1:254-8.
- 429 20. Strayer Jr LM. Gastrocnemius recession: five-year report of cases. *JBJS*.
430 1958;40(5):1019-30.
- 431 21. Kay RM, Rethlefsen SA, Ryan JA, Wren TAL. Outcome of gastrocnemius recession
432 and tendo-achilles lengthening in ambulatory children with cerebral palsy. *Journal of Pediatric*
433 *Orthopaedics B*. 2004;13(2):92-8.

- 434 22. Patikas D, Wolf S, Döderlein L. Electromyographic evaluation of the sound and
435 involved side during gait of spastic hemiplegic children with cerebral palsy. *European journal*
436 *of neurology*. 2005;12(9):691-9.
- 437 23. Pataky TC. Generalized n-dimensional biomechanical field analysis using statistical
438 parametric mapping. *Journal of biomechanics*. 2010;43(10):1976-82.
- 439 24. Winter DA. Energy generation and absorption at the ankle and knee during fast, natural,
440 and slow cadences. *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research (1976-2007)*. 1983;175:147-
441 54.
- 442 25. DeLuca PA, Bell KJ, Davis RB. Using surface electrodes for the evaluation of the rectus
443 femoris, vastus medialis and vastus lateralis muscles in children with cerebral palsy. *Gait &*
444 *Posture*. 1997;5(3):211-6.
- 445 26. Sangeux M, Rodda J, Graham HK. Sagittal gait patterns in cerebral palsy: The
446 plantarflexor–knee extension couple index. *Gait & posture*. 2015;41(2):586-91.
- 447 27. Dreher T, Wolf SI, Heitzmann D, Swartman B, Schuster W, Gantz S, et al. Long-term
448 outcome of femoral derotation osteotomy in children with spastic diplegia. *Gait & posture*.
449 2012;36(3):467-70.
- 450 28. Hicks JL, Delp SL, Schwartz MH. Can biomechanical variables predict improvement
451 in crouch gait? *Gait & posture*. 2011;34(2):197-201.
- 452 29. Schwartz MH, Rozumalski A, Truong W, Novacheck TF. Predicting the outcome of
453 intramuscular psoas lengthening in children with cerebral palsy using preoperative gait data and
454 the random forest algorithm. *Gait & posture*. 2013;37(4):473-9.
- 455 30. Rutz E, Donath S, Tirosh O, Graham HK, Baker R. Explaining the variability
456 improvements in gait quality as a result of single event multi-level surgery in cerebral palsy.
457 *Gait & posture*. 2013;38(3):455-60.


458

A

GDI of the patients before surgery (E1)



K-mean-PSO




3 clusters according to the gait quality:


- Cluster1-E1: Good gait quality
- Cluster2-E1: Mild gait quality
- Cluster3-E1: Poor gait quality

B

GDI of the patients after surgery (E2)



K-mean-PSO



3 clusters according to the gait quality:

- Cluster1-E2: Good gait quality
- Cluster2-E2: Mild gait quality
- Cluster3-E2: Poor gait quality




C

Figure 1

A**Rectus femoris activity in E1 vs. E2**

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.22.24314168>; this version posted September 24, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

**B****Soleus activity in E1 vs. E2****Figure 2**