

1 **Title:** Matching Clinical Profiles with Interventions to Optimize Daily Stepping in People  
2 with Stroke

3

4 **Short Title:** Secondary Analysis of the PROWALKS RCT

5

6 **Authors:** Kiersten M. McCartney, DPT<sup>1,2</sup>, Ryan T. Pohlig, PhD<sup>3</sup>, Allison Miller, DPT,  
7 PhD<sup>4</sup>, Elizabeth D. Thompson, DPT, PhD<sup>1</sup>, Darcy Reisman, PT, PhD, FAPTA<sup>1,2</sup>

8

9 <sup>1</sup>University of Delaware, Department of Physical Therapy, Newark, DE, USA

10 <sup>2</sup>University of Delaware, Biomechanics and Movement Science Program, Newark, DE,  
11 USA

12 <sup>3</sup>University of Delaware, Biostatistics Core, Newark, DE, USA

13 <sup>4</sup>Washington University School of Medicine in St. Louis, Program of Physical Therapy,  
14 St. Louis, MO, USA

15

16 **Corresponding Author:**

17 Darcy S. Reisman, PT, PhD, FAPTA

18 Department of Physical Therapy, College Health Science, University of Delaware,  
19 Newark DE.

20 540 South College Avenue

21 Newark, DE 19713, USA

22 Phone: (302) 831-7422

23 Email: [dreisman@udel.edu](mailto:dreisman@udel.edu)

24

25 **Manuscript Word Count:** 5812 words

26 **ABSTRACT**

27 **Background:** Individualizing interventions is imperative to optimize physical activity in  
28 people with chronic stroke. This secondary analysis grouped individuals with chronic  
29 stroke into clinical profiles based on baseline characteristics and examined if these  
30 clinical profiles preferentially benefitted from a specific rehabilitation intervention to  
31 improve daily step-activity.

32 **Methods:** Participants had non-cerebellar strokes  $\geq 6$  months prior to enrollment, were  
33 21-85 years old, had walking speeds of 0.3-1.0 m/s, and took <8,000 steps-per-day.  
34 Participants were randomized to 1 of 3 interventions: high-intensity treadmill training  
35 (FAST), a step-activity behavioral intervention (SAM), or a combined intervention  
36 (FAST+SAM). The primary outcome was the interaction of latent class (clinical profile)  
37 and intervention group (FAST, SAM, FAST+SAM) on a change in steps-per-day. Key  
38 clinical characteristics to identify the latent classes included walking speed, walking  
39 endurance, balance self-efficacy, cognition, and area deprivation.

40 **Results:** Of the 190 participants with complete pre- and post-intervention data (mean  
41 [SD] age, 64 [12] years; 93 females [48.9%]), 3 distinct profiles of people with chronic  
42 stroke were identified. Within our sample, class 1 had the lowest walking capacity  
43 (speed and endurance), lowest balance self-efficacy, and highest area deprivation, and  
44 had the greatest change in step-activity when enrolled in the SAM (mean[95%CI], 1624  
45 [426 – 2821]) or FAST+SAM (1150 [723 – 1577]) intervention. Class 2 had walking  
46 capacity, baseline steps-per-day, and self-efficacy values between Class 1 and 3, and  
47 had the greatest change in step-activity when enrolled in the SAM (2002 [1193–2811])  
48 intervention. Class 3 had the highest walking capacity, highest self-efficacy, and lowest

49 area deprivation and the greatest change in step-activity when enrolled in the  
50 FAST+SAM (1532 [915–2150]) intervention.

51 **Conclusions:** People with chronic stroke require different interventions to optimize a  
52 change in step-activity. Clinicians can use clinically relevant measures to personalize  
53 intervention selection to augment step-activity in people with chronic stroke.

54

55 **Trial Registration:** NCT02835313; <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT02835313>

56 **Keywords:** stroke, walking, step-activity monitoring, physical activity, high-intensity gait

57

58

59

60 **NON-STANDARD ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS**

61 **6MWT** – Six-Minute Walk Test

62 **ABC** – Activities-specific Balance Confidence scale

63 **ADI** - Area Deprivation Index

64 **AIC** - Akaike's Information criterion

65 **BIC** - Bayesian Information Criterion

66 **CCI** - Charlson Co-morbidity Index

67 **FAST** – high-intensity treadmill training

68 **LMR-adjusted** - Lo-Mendell-Rubin adjusted likelihood ratio test

69 **LVMM** – Latent Variable Mixture Model

70 **MoCA** - Montreal Cognitive Assessment

71 **PHQ-9** - Patient Health Questionnaire-9

72 **POST**- after intervention

73 **PRE** – before randomization

74 **PROWALKS** – Promoting Recovery Optimization with Walking Exercise After Stoke

75 **SAM** – step-activity behavioral intervention

76 **SSWS** – self-selected walking speed

77 **VLMR** - Vuong-Lo-Mendell-Rubin likelihood ratio test

## 78 INTRODUCTION

79 People with chronic stroke average only 4,000 steps-per-day and rarely meet  
80 exercise and physical activity recommendations.<sup>1,2</sup> This profound inactivity increases  
81 the risks of secondary stroke and more severe stroke-related disability.<sup>3,4</sup> Recent  
82 research indicates if people with chronic stroke receive a behavioral intervention with  
83 step-activity monitoring, with or without a concurrent high-intensity walking training,  
84 there is a significant increase in their daily step-activity.<sup>5,6</sup>

85 The Promoting Recovery Optimization of Walking Activity in Stroke (PROWALKS;  
86 NCT02835313) randomized clinical trial aimed to improve daily step-activity in people  
87 with chronic stroke.<sup>5</sup> Participants across 4 sites were randomized to 1 of 3 intervention  
88 groups where training sessions focused on either (1) a behavioral intervention to  
89 improve daily step-activity, (2) a high-intensity treadmill walking intervention to improve  
90 walking capacity, or (3) a combined intervention which included both the behavioral and  
91 high-intensity treadmill walking interventions.<sup>5,7</sup> While there were significant differences  
92 in the change in daily step-activity observed between intervention groups, there was  
93 broad variability within each intervention group. These results indicate certain  
94 individuals may respond more favorably to one intervention over another.

95 To reduce the well-documented negative consequences of low levels of physical  
96 activity after stroke, improvements in the efficacy of interventions aimed at increasing  
97 daily step-activity are needed. As in other areas of medical care today,<sup>8-10</sup> matching  
98 individual characteristics with specific interventions - in essence providing precision  
99 rehabilitation - is likely needed for optimal efficacy. Cross-sectional work has previously  
100 identified key characteristics which subgroup people with chronic stroke into distinct

101 classes and are related to their baseline daily step-activity.<sup>11</sup> However, it remains  
102 unknown if these characteristics are also important when examining the response of  
103 people with stroke after undergoing interventions targeting a *change* in daily step-  
104 activity.

105 Therefore, the purpose of this secondary analysis from a large rehabilitation  
106 randomized clinical trial was to determine if latent classes of people with chronic stroke  
107 differ on which intervention leads to the most robust change in daily step-activity. We  
108 hypothesized (1) latent classes of people with chronic stroke would differ on measures  
109 of baseline walking capacity, psychosocial factors, cognition, and environmental factors  
110 and (2) classes (e.g., clinical profiles) would differ on which intervention demonstrates  
111 the greatest change in daily stepping activity.

## 112 **METHODS**

### 113 **Participants**

114 This is a secondary analysis of the multisite PROWALKS randomized controlled  
115 trial. Full details of the study protocol and primary analyses have previously been  
116 reported.<sup>5,7</sup> Briefly, 250 participants aged 21-85 and in the chronic stroke (> 6 months)  
117 phase were randomized. Participants had to be able to walk without assistance of  
118 another person at speeds of 0.3-1.0m/s and have less than 8,000 steps-per-day at  
119 baseline.<sup>7</sup> This analysis includes all participants ( $n = 190$ ) with complete clinical  
120 evaluation and step-activity data at the pre- and post-intervention timepoints. Table 1  
121 displays demographic information. The parent RCT was approved by the University of  
122 Delaware, University of Pennsylvania, Indiana University and Christiana Care Hospitals

123 Institutional Review Boards and all participants gave written informed consent. This  
124 study is reported according to CONSORT guidelines.

## 125 **Interventions**

126 Participants were randomized to one of three intervention groups: high-intensity  
127 treadmill walking (FAST), step-activity monitoring (SAM), or a high-intensity treadmill  
128 walking and step-activity monitoring combined intervention (FAST+SAM).<sup>5,7</sup> For this  
129 analysis, 65 participants were in the FAST intervention, 65 participants were in the SAM  
130 intervention, and 60 participants were in the FAST+SAM intervention. The attendance  
131 goal for all groups was up to 36 sessions (~3x/week for 12 weeks).<sup>5,7</sup> The FAST  
132 intervention targeted changes in walking capacity, which is defined as what someone  
133 *can do* as measured in a structured environment such as a clinic or laboratory, and is  
134 often quantified as walking speed and walking endurance.<sup>12</sup> Briefly, the FAST  
135 intervention had a goal of accumulating as many minutes as possible (maximum 30  
136 minutes/session) of treadmill walking at or above 70% of their heart rate reserve. The  
137 SAM intervention used motivational interviewing techniques and individualized goal  
138 setting to target progressive increases in daily step-activity. The FAST+SAM group  
139 received both interventions simultaneously across the intervention period, thereby  
140 receiving a combined intervention targeting both improvements in walking capacity and  
141 daily step-activity. As previously reported, intervention groups did not differ on any  
142 training fidelity metrics.<sup>5</sup>

## 143 **Step-activity Monitoring**

144 At the pre- and post-intervention clinical evaluations, all participants were  
145 provided with a Fitbit One or Zip device (Google; San Francisco, CA) to wear on their

146 non-paretic ankle for 7 full days. These devices are valid and reliable to quantify step-  
147 activity in people with chronic stroke.<sup>13-16</sup> Participants were instructed to wear the device  
148 during all waking hours and to go about their normal daily activities.<sup>7</sup> Prior to enrollment,  
149 participants were required to have a minimum of 3 valid days of step-activity. For each  
150 participant, all days of step-activity were assessed to ensure consistent individual  
151 patterns of wear time. Prior to analysis data was downloaded from the Fitabase  
152 platform.

### 153 **Measures**

154 Eight variables, encompassing multiple domains, were identified for inclusion as  
155 they might impact which intervention an individual may preferentially benefit from to  
156 improve their step-activity. These selected variables have previously been found to  
157 distinguish latent classes within the chronic stroke population and were important  
158 predictors of cross-sectional step-activity.<sup>11</sup> These clinically relevant variables were used  
159 in a latent variable mixture model to identify latent classes of people with stroke. All  
160 variables were collected during the pre-intervention clinical evaluation.

### 161 **Walking Capacity**

162 Self-selected walking speed (SSWS) and the Six-Minute Walk Test (6MWT) are  
163 recommended measures with strong psychometric properties to quantify walking speed  
164 and endurance in people with stroke.<sup>17-19</sup> The 10-meter walk test quantifies walking  
165 speed over a short distance.<sup>19</sup> The 6MWT quantifies a person's capacity to walk for  
166 longer periods of time and is the strongest measure to distinguish home versus  
167 community ambulators in people with stroke.<sup>20</sup>

### 168 **Psychosocial Factors**



169           The Activities-specific Balance Confidence (ABC) scale and Patient Health  
170 Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9) are valid measures in people with stroke and represent  
171 balance self-efficacy and depressive symptoms, respectively.<sup>21,22</sup>

## 172 **Physical Health and Cognition**

173           The Charlson Co-morbidity Index (CCI) is a 16-item self-report questionnaire  
174 used to quantify comorbidity burden by weighting factors based on disease severity.<sup>23,24</sup>

175           The Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA) provides a global assessment of overall  
176 cognition.<sup>25</sup>

## 177 **Environmental Factors**

178           The Area Deprivation Index (ADI) uses an individual's zip code to provide a  
179 national percentile ranking (1-100; higher = more disadvantage) of neighborhood  
180 socioeconomic disadvantage. The Walk Score represents the walkability of  
181 neighborhoods (0-100; higher = greater walkability) and is based on the number of  
182 amenities within walking distance from a given location.<sup>26,27</sup>

## 183 **Statistical Analyses**

184           Latent Variable Mixture Modeling (LVMM) is a special case of Structural Equation  
185 Modeling which uses observed variables, called indicators, to identify homogeneous  
186 classes within a heterogeneous population.<sup>28</sup> The data-driven approach of LVMM allows  
187 the sample to be grouped into latent classes based on similar patterns among indicator  
188 variables in the model. A combination of multiple objective criteria was used to  
189 determine the optimal number of classes including Akaike's Information criterion (AIC),  
190 Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC), sample-size adjusted BIC, and Entropy. The  
191 Vuong-Lo-Mendell-Rubin likelihood ratio test (VLMR) and Lo-Mendell-Rubin adjusted

192 likelihood ratio test (LMR-adjusted) were used to determine if a model with  $k$  number of  
193 classes better fit the data than a model with  $k - 1$  classes.<sup>29</sup>

194 Once the optimal number of classes was determined, participants were assigned to  
195 the class of their highest posterior probability.<sup>28</sup> A higher posterior probability (values  
196 range 0-1) indicates more similarity to other individuals within that class. General Linear  
197 Models were used to compare classes on the eight indicator variables used in the  
198 LVMM. Classes were also compared on demographic characteristics (age, sex, stroke  
199 chronicity), intervention group, and baseline steps-per-day. A GLM with robust errors  
200 was used to compare the pre- to post-intervention change in daily step-activity. Fixed  
201 effects included the main effects of class and intervention group (FAST, SAM, or  
202 FAST+SAM) and their interaction. The LVMM analysis was conducted in Mplus (Muthén  
203 and Muthén, version 8.10),<sup>30</sup> and subsequent class comparisons were conducted in  
204 SPSS (version 29.0). For all analyses,  $p < 0.05$  was considered statistically significant.  
205 The senior author (D.R.) has full access to all the data in the study and takes  
206 responsibility for its integrity and the data analysis.

## 207 **RESULTS**

208 The 190 participants with full pre- and post-intervention step-activity data were  
209 included in the LVMM. Models with 2-5 latent classes were examined and fit criteria  
210 indicated an optimal fit of 3 classes (Table 2). In this final 3-class model, class 1 had 47  
211 individuals, class 2 had 62 individuals, and class 3 had 81 individuals. Classes 1-3 had  
212 an average latent class probability of 0.946, 0.957, and 0.920, respectively.

213 Of the eight variables entered in the model (Table 3), there were significant  
214 differences among all classes in the 6MWT (mean [95% CI]; class 1, 148m [135-160];

215 class 2, 275m [264-410]; class 3, 397m [384-410];  $p < .001$ ) and SSWS (.42m/s [.40-  
216 .45]; class 2, .67m/s [.65-.70]; class 3, .91m/s [.89-.93];  $p < .001$ ) with class 1  
217 demonstrating the least distance covered on the 6MWT (lowest walking endurance) and  
218 the slowest gait speed and class 3 demonstrating the highest walking endurance and  
219 fastest gait speed. There were significant differences between classes 1 vs. 3 and 2 vs.  
220 3 in measures of cognition (MoCA; class 1, 23 [22-24]; class 2, 22 [21-24]; class 3, 25  
221 [24-26];  $p < .001$ ) and balance self-efficacy (ABC (%); class 1, 66 [61–72]; class 2, 72  
222 [68-76]; class 3, 81 [78–85];  $p < .001$ ) with classes 1 and 2 having lower cognition and  
223 balance self-efficacy than class 3. Lastly, there was a significant difference between  
224 class 1 vs. 3 in area deprivation (ADI (%); class 1, 47 [39-54]; class 2, 39 [33-44]; class  
225 3, 34 [29-38];  $p = .014$ ), with class 1 having higher deprivation than class 3. There were  
226 no significant differences among classes in depressive symptoms (PHQ-9; class 1, 3.5  
227 [2.3–4.6]; class 2, 4.1 [3.2–5.0]; class 3, 4.1 [3.3-5.0])  $p = .600$ , comorbidity burden  
228 (CCI; class 1, 3.7 [3.2–4.2]; class 2, 3.4 [2.9–3.9]; class 3, 3.1 [2.6–3.6];  $p = .188$ ), or  
229 Walk Score (class 1, 33.6 [26.1-41.1]; class 2, 31.8 [25.4–38.2]; class 3, 25.9 [20.5–  
230 31.3];  $p = .185$ ).

231 There were no significant differences among all classes on age (years; class 1,  
232 63.6 [59.9–67.2]; class 2, 64.3 [61.2–67.5]; class 3, 63.5 [61.0-65.9],  $p = .905$ ), sex ( $n$   
233 female (%); class 1, 22 (46.8); class 2, 36 (58.1); class 3, 35 (43.2);  $p > .200$ ), stroke  
234 chronicity (months; class 1, 36.1 [26.1–46.2]; class 2, 62.8 [41.2–84.4]; class 3, 41.7  
235 [29.0–54.4];  $p = .066$ ), or intervention group ( $n$  (%); class 1, FAST, 16 (34.0), SAM, 12  
236 (25.5), FAST+SAM, 19 (40.4); class 2, FAST, 18 (29.0), SAM, 24 (38.7), FAST+SAM, 20  
237 (23.3); class 3, FAST, 31 (38.3), SAM, 29 (35.8), FAST+SAM, 21 (25.9);  $p = .363$ ). All

238 classes significantly differed on baseline step-activity (steps-per-day; class 1, 2095  
239 [1636-2554]; class 2, 3792 [3373-4211]; class 3, 4850 [4522-5178];  $p < .001$ ). Class 1  
240 demonstrated the lowest baseline steps-per-day with class 3 demonstrating the highest  
241 baseline steps-per-day.

242 There was a significant class by intervention group interaction ( $p = .016$ ) in the  
243 change in steps-per-day from pre- to post-intervention (Table 4). For clarity, results are  
244 outlined by class in the paragraphs below.

245 For class 1, participants had the greatest change in step-activity if enrolled in the  
246 SAM or FAST+SAM intervention, increasing their daily steps on average by 1,624 (SE,  
247 611) and 1,150 (218) steps, respectively (Table 4). There was no significant difference  
248 between SAM or FAST+SAM (mean difference, [95% CI]; 473 [-798-1745];  $p = .466$ ;  
249 Table 4). When compared to participants in class 1 enrolled in FAST (314 (192)),  
250 participants in SAM took 1,309 more steps-per-day (95% CI [54-2565];  $p = .041$ ) and  
251 participants in FAST+SAM took 836 more steps-per-day (95% CI [266-1406];  $p = .004$ ;  
252 Table 4).

253 For class 2, participants had the greatest change in step-activity when enrolled in  
254 the SAM intervention, increasing their average daily step-activity by 2,002 (413) steps  
255 (Table 4). This was an increase of 2,221 more steps than class 2 participants enrolled in  
256 FAST (95% CI [1283-3159];  $p < .001$ ) and 1,135 more steps than class 2 participants  
257 enrolled in the FAST+SAM (95% CI [196-2074];  $p = .018$ ; Table 4) intervention. Within  
258 class 2, participants enrolled in the FAST+SAM intervention increased their step-activity  
259 by 1,086 more steps-per-day than those in the FAST intervention (95% CI [414-1758];  $p$   
260 = .002; Table 4).

261 For class 3, participants had the greatest change in step-activity when enrolled in  
262 the FAST+SAM intervention, increasing their average steps by 1,532 (315) steps-per-  
263 day (Table 4). This was an increase of 1,142 more steps-per-day than class 3  
264 participants enrolled in the FAST intervention (95% CI [246-2039];  $p = .013$ ) and 872  
265 more steps-per-day than those in SAM intervention (95% CI [14-1729];  $p = .046$ ; Table  
266 4). For class 3, there was no significant difference in change in daily steps between  
267 those enrolled in the FAST intervention versus the SAM intervention (95% CI [-1152-  
268 611];  $p = .547$ ; Table 4).

## 269 **DISCUSSION**

270 The results of this study demonstrate that the individual characteristics of a  
271 person with chronic stroke can be utilized to determine which rehabilitation intervention  
272 will optimally improve their daily step-activity. Using a data-driven statistical method, we  
273 identified three distinct classes, or clinical profiles, of people with chronic stroke who  
274 differed on measures of walking capacity (speed and endurance), balance self-efficacy,  
275 area deprivation, cognition, and baseline step-activity. In line with our hypothesis, we  
276 found that these clinical profiles of people with chronic stroke - with different baseline  
277 characteristics - show greater changes in daily step-activity following certain  
278 interventions. Based on these results, clinicians can use simple, clinically available  
279 measures in their own clinical evaluations to guide intervention selection to optimally  
280 improve daily step-activity in people with chronic stroke.

281 The clinical profile of Class 1 was characterized by the individuals in our sample  
282 with the lowest walking capacity (speed and endurance), balance self-efficacy,  
283 cognition, and baseline step-activity, and the highest area deprivation. This clinical

284 profile had the greatest change in step-activity when enrolled in the SAM or FAST+SAM  
285 intervention, indicating a targeted behavioral intervention - with or without a  
286 simultaneous walking capacity intervention - will result in the greatest change in their  
287 daily step-activity. This finding aligns with preliminary work in a small sample of people  
288 with chronic stroke that found those with below average walking endurance and step-  
289 activity responded most favorably to an intervention targeting both step-activity and  
290 walking capacity (e.g., FAST+SAM).<sup>31</sup> The primary PROWALKS results found the  
291 FAST+SAM and SAM interventions demonstrated similar changes in steps-per-day.<sup>5</sup>  
292 However, when comparing these two interventions, only the FAST+SAM intervention  
293 had clinically meaningful improvements in walking capacity.<sup>5</sup> Combined, these results  
294 suggest when people with chronic stroke have low walking capacity – such as those in  
295 class 1 – combining a behavioral intervention with a high-intensity walking training  
296 intervention may be optimal to maximize changes in both steps-per-day and walking  
297 capacity.

298         The class 2 clinical profile encompassed individuals with values of walking  
299 capacity, baseline step-activity, cognition, balance self-efficacy, and area deprivation  
300 that fell between classes 1 and 3. This clinical profile had the most robust response in  
301 daily step-activity when enrolled in the SAM intervention, exceeding a change of 2000  
302 steps-per-day. Notably for this class, the changes in steps-per-day for those in the  
303 FAST+SAM intervention was less than one-half of the change observed in the SAM  
304 intervention. Furthermore, the change in steps-per-day when enrolled in FAST+SAM  
305 was less than 1000 steps-per-day, which may be an important threshold in step-activity  
306 changes (see below). This suggests that when people with chronic stroke have levels of

307 walking capacity and baseline step-activity similar to class 2, a behavioral intervention  
308 *alone* may be *most effective* for improving daily step-activity.

309       Class 3 was defined by the people with stroke in our sample with the highest  
310 walking capacity (speed and endurance), balance self-efficacy, cognition, and baseline  
311 step-activity, and lowest area deprivation. This clinical profile had the greatest change in  
312 step-activity when enrolled in the FAST+SAM intervention. This indicates that for this  
313 group, a behavioral intervention *alone is not* as effective to improve step-activity as  
314 when it is paired with an intervention targeting improvements in walking capacity. In fact,  
315 for individuals in class 3, the SAM intervention alone resulted in only 40% of the change  
316 in steps-per-day as seen in the FAST+SAM intervention (mean difference [95% CI], 872  
317 [14 -1729]). The change in steps-per-day when enrolled in the FAST+SAM intervention  
318 well exceeded a 1,000-step change (see below) while the SAM intervention fell below  
319 this threshold. This suggests that for class 3, optimal changes to step-activity will likely  
320 occur when participating in a combined behavioral change and walking capacity building  
321 intervention.

322       For all classes, the FAST intervention – which used high-intensity walking training  
323 to target changes in walking capacity – demonstrated the smallest changes in daily  
324 step-activity. This mirrors the primary PROWALKS results in which participants  
325 randomized to the FAST intervention were the only intervention group which did not  
326 have a significant increase in steps-per-day.<sup>5</sup> Thus, the results for the individual classes,  
327 in which the FAST intervention had the smallest change in step-activity, may appear  
328 self-evident, but that may not have necessarily been the case. It may have been that  
329 while the FAST intervention did not result in a significant change in steps-per-day for the

330 entire sample, it could have been better for individuals with a certain clinical profile. As  
331 this result did not occur, it further reinforces the primary PROWALKS results, and other  
332 studies, which demonstrate that interventions primarily targeting changes in walking  
333 capacity will have minimal impact on daily step-activity.<sup>5,32,33</sup>

334 Notably, the step-activity behavioral intervention delivered either independently  
335 (SAM) or in combination with a high-intensity walking intervention (FAST+SAM) was  
336 required have the most robust change in daily step-activity. While there is no known  
337 change in step-activity defined as “clinically meaningful”, a 1,000 steps-per-day  
338 threshold has previously been found to decrease all-cause mortality risk by 15%.<sup>34</sup>  
339 When considering the *optimal class and intervention group pairings* identified above  
340 (Class 1 = SAM or FAST+SAM; Class 2 = SAM; Class 3 = FAST+SAM), all pairings  
341 surpassed a change of at least 1,000 steps-per-day. In contrast, no other class and  
342 intervention group pairing (e.g., class 2 participants enrolled in FAST+SAM) reached  
343 this 1,000-step change. This evidence emphasizes that using baseline personal  
344 characteristics to guide intervention selection can better optimize meaningful changes in  
345 step-activity outcomes.

346 The present results confirm previous cross-sectional work in people with stroke  
347 that identified similar key variables which distinguished classes of people with  
348 stroke.<sup>6,11,35,36</sup> Collectively, these results emphasize the importance of walking speed  
349 and endurance, balance self-efficacy, cognition, and area deprivation on influencing  
350 both baseline step-activity *and* a change in steps-per-day following targeted  
351 interventions in people with chronic stroke.<sup>11,35</sup> Of note, all key variables identified in this



352 analysis could be collected within a clinical setting, increasing the ease of implementing  
353 these findings.

### 354 **Limitations**

355 This secondary analysis was limited to the measures collected by the parent  
356 randomized clinical trial. Despite these measures often being used, and/or  
357 recommended to be used, in rehabilitation settings, alternative measures could impact  
358 or alter the results. While this analysis was able to identify three distinct clinical profiles  
359 of people with chronic stroke, the results are still restricted to the participants included in  
360 the parent randomized clinical trial. It could be tempting to think of the three clinical  
361 profiles in this analysis as those with “high”, “average”, or “low” walking capacity, self-  
362 efficacy, and baseline steps-per-day. However, it is important to note that these  
363 descriptors are only applicable within the sample of people tested which included  
364 individuals with chronic stroke with a self-selected walking speed between 0.3-1.0 m/s  
365 and with less than 8,000 steps-per-day. It is unclear how these results would generalize  
366 to people with chronic stroke with gait speeds below 0.3 m/s or above 1.0 m/s, and/or to  
367 individuals who require physical assistance from another individual to walk or walk more  
368 than 8,000 steps/day. Therefore, results of this study are unable to determine of what is  
369 considered “low” or “high”, rather can only recommend the most robust intervention to  
370 improve steps-per-day for individuals who most similarly match the clinical profiles  
371 uncovered.

### 372 **Conclusions**

373 The results of this analysis provide rehabilitation clinicians with key clinical  
374 characteristics which can guide intervention selection to have the most robust change in

375 steps-per-day in people with chronic stroke. Optimizing intervention selection by  
376 personalizing it to each patient has the potential to significantly reduce the levels of  
377 physical inactivity, and the secondary health consequences of it, in people with chronic  
378 stroke. There is a known reduction in physical activity in people with stroke, and ample  
379 evidence on the risks of such inactivity, making it critical to understand which  
380 interventions can most optimally improve post-stroke walking activity. The results of this  
381 analysis provide clear guidance on what intervention should be selected to improve  
382 step-activity based on the clinical profile of the person. Providing such individualized  
383 interventions will likely improve the efficacy of rehabilitation care.

384 **Acknowledgements:** The authors would like to acknowledge Henry Wright and Tamara  
385 Wright for their significant contributions in subject recruitment, data collections, and data  
386 cleaning.

387

388 **Funding:** This work was primarily funded by NIH/NICHHD - Promoting Recovery  
389 Optimization with WALKing Exercise after Stroke (PROWALKS), 1R01HD086362;  
390 NIH/NICHHD – Predoctoral Training in Physical Therapy and Rehabilitation Research,  
391 T32HD007490; This research has been supported in full or part from the Foundation for  
392 Physical Therapy Research; NIH NICHHD/NCMRR R25HD105583 – Reproducible  
393 Rehabilitation Research Educational Program. The funding sources played no role in  
394 study design, execution, administration, or dissemination.

395

396 **Disclosures:** None.

397

- 398 1. Fini NA, Holland AE, Keating J, Simek J, Bernhardt J. How Physically Active Are People  
399 Following Stroke? Systematic Review and Quantitative Synthesis. *Phys Ther*.  
400 2017;97:707-717. doi: 10.1093/ptj/pzx038
- 401 2. Moore SA, Boyne P, Fulk G, Verheyden G, Fini NA. Walk the Talk: Current Evidence for  
402 Walking Recovery After Stroke, Future Pathways and a Mission for Research and Clinical  
403 Practice. *Stroke*. 2022;53:3494-3505. doi: 10.1161/strokeaha.122.038956
- 404 3. Girotra T, Lekoubou A, Bishu KG, Ovbiagele B. A contemporary and comprehensive  
405 analysis of the costs of stroke in the United States. *J Neurol Sci*. 2020;410:116643. doi:  
406 10.1016/j.jns.2019.116643
- 407 4. Tsao CW, Aday AW, Almarzooq ZI, Alonso A, Beaton AZ, Bittencourt MS, Boehme AK,  
408 Buxton AE, Carson AP, Commodore-Mensah Y, et al. Heart Disease and Stroke Statistics-  
409 2022 Update: A Report From the American Heart Association. *Circulation*.  
410 2022;145:e153-e639. doi: 10.1161/cir.0000000000001052
- 411 5. Thompson ED, Pohlig RT, McCartney KM, Hornby TG, Kasner SE, Raser-Schramm J, Miller  
412 AE, Henderson CE, Wright H, Wright T, et al. Increasing Activity After Stroke: A  
413 Randomized Controlled Trial of High-Intensity Walking and Step Activity Intervention.  
414 *Stroke*. 2024;55:5-13. doi: 10.1161/strokeaha.123.044596
- 415 6. Danks KA, Pohlig RT, Roos M, Wright TR, Reisman DS. Relationship Between Walking  
416 Capacity, Biopsychosocial Factors, Self-efficacy, and Walking Activity in Persons  
417 Poststroke. *J Neurol Phys Ther*. 2016;40:232-238. doi: 10.1097/npt.000000000000143
- 418 7. Wright H, Wright T, Pohlig RT, Kasner SE, Raser-Schramm J, Reisman D. Protocol for  
419 promoting recovery optimization of walking activity in stroke (PROWALKS): a randomized  
420 controlled trial. *BMC Neurol*. 2018;18:39. doi: 10.1186/s12883-018-1044-1
- 421 8. Sicklick JK, Kato S, Okamura R, Schwaederle M, Hahn ME, Williams CB, De P, Krie A,  
422 Piccioni DE, Miller VA, et al. Molecular profiling of cancer patients enables personalized  
423 combination therapy: the I-PREDICT study. *Nat Med*. 2019;25:744-750. doi:  
424 10.1038/s41591-019-0407-5
- 425 9. Schoenthaler A, Leon M, Butler M, Steinhäuser K, Wardzinski W. Development and  
426 Evaluation of a Tailored Mobile Health Intervention to Improve Medication Adherence in  
427 Black Patients With Uncontrolled Hypertension and Type 2 Diabetes: Pilot Randomized  
428 Feasibility Trial. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth*. 2020;8:e17135. doi: 10.2196/17135
- 429 10. Krzyszczyk P, Acevedo A, Davidoff EJ, Timmins LM, Marrero-Berrios I, Patel M, White C,  
430 Lowe C, Sherba JJ, Hartmanshenn C, et al. The growing role of precision and personalized  
431 medicine for cancer treatment. *TECHNOLOGY*. 2018;06:79-100. doi:  
432 10.1142/s2339547818300020
- 433 11. Miller A, Pohlig RT, Wright T, Kim HE, Reisman DS. Beyond Physical Capacity: Factors  
434 Associated With Real-world Walking Activity After Stroke. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*.  
435 2021;102:1880-1887.e1881. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2021.03.023
- 436 12. Lang CE, Holleran CL, Strube MJ, Ellis TD, Newman CA, Fahey M, DeAngelis TR, Nordahl  
437 TJ, Reisman DS, Earhart GM, et al. Improvement in the Capacity for Activity Versus  
438 Improvement in Performance of Activity in Daily Life During Outpatient Rehabilitation.  
439 *Journal of Neurologic Physical Therapy*. 2023;47:16-25. doi:  
440 10.1097/npt.0000000000000413

- 441 13. Schaffer SD, Holzapfel SD, Fulk G, Bosch PR. Step count accuracy and reliability of two  
442 activity tracking devices in people after stroke. *Physiother Theory Pract.* 2017;33:788-  
443 796. doi: 10.1080/09593985.2017.1354412
- 444 14. Duclos NC, Aguiar LT, Aissaoui R, Faria C, Nadeau S, Duclos C. Activity Monitor Placed at  
445 the Nonparetic Ankle Is Accurate in Measuring Step Counts During Community Walking  
446 in Poststroke Individuals: A Validation Study. *Pm r.* 2019;11:963-971. doi:  
447 10.1002/pmrj.12080
- 448 15. Klassen TD, Simpson LA, Lim SB, Louie DR, Parappilly B, Sakakibara BM, Zbogar D, Eng JJ.  
449 "Stepping Up" Activity Poststroke: Ankle-Positioned Accelerometer Can Accurately  
450 Record Steps During Slow Walking. *Phys Ther.* 2016;96:355-360. doi:  
451 10.2522/ptj.20140611
- 452 16. Hui J, Heyden R, Bao T, Accettone N, McBay C, Richardson J, Tang A. Validity of the Fitbit  
453 One for Measuring Activity in Community-Dwelling Stroke Survivors. *Physiother Can.*  
454 2018;70:81-89. doi: 10.3138/ptc.2016-40.ep
- 455 17. Sullivan JE, Crouner BE, Kluding PM, Nichols D, Rose DK, Yoshida R, Pinto Zipp G.  
456 Outcome measures for individuals with stroke: process and recommendations from the  
457 American Physical Therapy Association neurology section task force. *Phys Ther.*  
458 2013;93:1383-1396. doi: 10.2522/ptj.20120492
- 459 18. Flansbjer UB, Holmbäck AM, Downham D, Patten C, Lexell J. Reliability of gait  
460 performance tests in men and women with hemiparesis after stroke. *J Rehabil Med.*  
461 2005;37:75-82. doi: 10.1080/16501970410017215
- 462 19. Moore JL, Potter K, Blankshain K, Kaplan SL, O'Dwyer LC, Sullivan JE. A Core Set of  
463 Outcome Measures for Adults With Neurologic Conditions Undergoing Rehabilitation: A  
464 CLINICAL PRACTICE GUIDELINE. *Journal of Neurologic Physical Therapy.* 2018;42:174-  
465 220. doi: 10.1097/npt.0000000000000229
- 466 20. Fulk GD, He Y, Boyne P, Dunning K. Predicting Home and Community Walking Activity  
467 Poststroke. *Stroke.* 2017;48:406-411. doi: 10.1161/strokeaha.116.015309
- 468 21. Salbach NM, Mayo NE, Hanley JA, Richards CL, Wood-Dauphinee S. Psychometric  
469 evaluation of the original and Canadian French version of the activities-specific balance  
470 confidence scale among people with stroke. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2006;87:1597-1604.  
471 doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2006.08.336
- 472 22. de Man-van Ginkel JM, Gooskens F, Schepers VP, Schuurmans MJ, Lindeman E,  
473 Hafsteinsdóttir TB. Screening for poststroke depression using the patient health  
474 questionnaire. *Nurs Res.* 2012;61:333-341. doi: 10.1097/NNR.0b013e31825d9e9e
- 475 23. D'Hoore W, Sicotte C, Tilquin C. Risk adjustment in outcome assessment: the Charlson  
476 comorbidity index. *Methods Inf Med.* 1993;32:382-387.
- 477 24. Charlson ME, Pompei P, Ales KL, MacKenzie CR. A new method of classifying prognostic  
478 comorbidity in longitudinal studies: Development and validation. *Journal of Chronic*  
479 *Diseases.* 1987;40:373-383. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9681\(87\)90171-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9681(87)90171-8)
- 480 25. Pendlebury ST, Mariz J, Bull L, Mehta Z, Rothwell PM. MoCA, ACE-R, and MMSE versus  
481 the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke-Canadian Stroke Network  
482 Vascular Cognitive Impairment Harmonization Standards Neuropsychological Battery  
483 after TIA and stroke. *Stroke.* 2012;43:464-469. doi: 10.1161/strokeaha.111.633586

- 484 26. Carr LJ, Dunsiger SI, Marcus BH. Validation of Walk Score for estimating access to  
485 walkable amenities. *Br J Sports Med*. 2011;45:1144-1148. doi:  
486 10.1136/bjsm.2009.069609
- 487 27. Duncan DT, Aldstadt J, Whalen J, Melly SJ, Gortmaker SL. Validation of walk score for  
488 estimating neighborhood walkability: an analysis of four US metropolitan areas. *Int J*  
489 *Environ Res Public Health*. 2011;8:4160-4179. doi: 10.3390/ijerph8114160
- 490 28. Lubke GH, Luningham J. Fitting latent variable mixture models. *Behaviour research and*  
491 *therapy*. 2017;98:91-102. doi: 10.1016/j.brat.2017.04.003
- 492 29. Weller BE, Bowen NK, Faubert SJ. Latent Class Analysis: A Guide to Best Practice. *Journal*  
493 *of Black Psychology*. 2020;46:287-311. doi: 10.1177/0095798420930932
- 494 30. Muthen LK, Muthen B, Muthén, . M. *Mplus Version 8 User's Guide*. Muthen & Muthen;  
495 2017.
- 496 31. Danks KA, Pohlig R, Reisman DS. Combining Fast-Walking Training and a Step Activity  
497 Monitoring Program to Improve Daily Walking Activity After Stroke: A Preliminary Study.  
498 *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2016;97:S185-193. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2016.01.039
- 499 32. Hornby TG, Plawecki A, Lotter JK, Scofield ME, Lucas E, Henderson CE. Gains in Daily  
500 Stepping Activity in People With Chronic Stroke After High-Intensity Gait Training in  
501 Variable Contexts. *Physical Therapy*. 2022;102. doi: 10.1093/ptj/pzac073
- 502 33. Michael K, Goldberg AP, Treuth MS, Beans J, Normandt P, Macko RF. Progressive  
503 Adaptive Physical Activity in Stroke Improves Balance, Gait, and Fitness: Preliminary  
504 Results. *Topics in Stroke Rehabilitation*. 2009;16:133-139. doi: 10.1310/tsr1602-133
- 505 34. Banach M, Lewek J, Surma S, Penson PE, Sahebkar A, Martin SS, Bajraktari G, Henein MY,  
506 Reiner Ž, Bielecka-Dąbrowa A, et al. The association between daily step count and all-  
507 cause and cardiovascular mortality: a meta-analysis. *Eur J Prev Cardiol*. 2023;30:1975-  
508 1985. doi: 10.1093/eurjpc/zwad229
- 509 35. Miller A, Pohlig RT, Reisman DS. Social and physical environmental factors in daily  
510 stepping activity in those with chronic stroke. *Topics in stroke rehabilitation*.  
511 2021;28:161-169. doi: 10.1080/10749357.2020.1803571
- 512 36. Thilarajah S, Mentiplay BF, Bower KJ, Tan D, Pua YH, Williams G, Koh G, Clark RA. Factors  
513 Associated With Post-Stroke Physical Activity: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis.  
514 *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2018;99:1876-1889. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2017.09.117  
515

516 **Table 1: Participant Characteristics**  
517

<b>Measure</b>	<b>Participants (<i>n</i> = 190)</b>
Age (y)	63.8 (12.2)
Sex, No. (% F)	93 (48.9)
Time Since Stroke (mo)	47.2 (66.0)
Assistive Device Use, No. (% yes)	94 (49.5)
Orthotic Device Use, No. (% yes)	51 (26.8)
Self-selected Walking Speed (m/s)	0.71 (0.2)
Baseline steps-per-day	3823 (1933)

518  
519 *Data presented as mean (standard deviation) or n (%).*

520 **Table 2: Model Fit Criteria for models with 2 through 5 latent classes**

521

# of Classes	AIC	BIC	Sample-Adjusted-BIC	Entropy	VLMR	VLMR $p$ value	LMR-Adjusted	LMR-Adjusted $p$ value
2	8905.916	8987.092	8907.902	0.855	-4542.537	< 0.001	224.405	< 0.001
3	8836.118	8946.516	8838.819	0.872	-4427.958	0.0075	85.978	0.0084
4	8802.562	8942.184	8805.978	0.888	-4384.059	0.1111	50.487	0.1153
5	<i>Model did not fully converge.</i>							

522  
523 *AIC = Akaike's Information Criterion, BIC = Bayesian Information Criterion, VLMR =*

524 *Vuong-Lo-Mendell-Rubin likelihood ratio test, LMR-adjusted = Lo-Mendell-Rubin*

525 *adjusted likelihood ratio test*

526



527 **Table 3: Differences between key variables among latent classes**

Measure	Class 1 (n = 47)	Class 2 (n = 62)	Class 3 (n = 81)	p-value
<b>Variables Used in the Latent Variable Mixture Model to define the Classes</b>				
<b>6MWT (m)<sup>a</sup></b>	148 (135-160)	275 (264-410)	397 (384-410)	<.001
<b>SSWS (m/s)<sup>a</sup></b>	.42 (.40-.45)	.67 (.65-.70)	0.91 (.89-.93)	<.001
<b>MoCA<sup>b</sup></b>	23 (22-24)	22 (21-24)	25 (24-26)	<.001
<b>ABC (%)<sup>b</sup></b>	66 (61-72)	72 (68-76)	81 (78-85)	<.001
<b>PHQ9</b>	3.5 (2.3-4.6)	4.1 (3.2-5.0)	4.1 (3.3-5.0)	.600
<b>CCI</b>	3.7 (3.2-4.2)	3.4 (2.9-3.9)	3.1 (2.6-3.6)	.188
<b>ADI (%)<sup>c</sup></b>	46.8 (3.9)	38.6 (2.8)	33.6 (2.4)	.014
<b>Walk Score</b>	34 (26-41)	32 (25-38)	26 (21-31)	.185
<b>Variables the Classes were Compared on following the Mixture Model Analysis</b>				
<b>Sex (No., %F)</b>	22, 46.8	36, 58.1	35, 43.2	> .200
<b>Age (years)</b>	63.6 (59.9-67.2)	64.3 (61.2-67.5)	63.5 (61.0-65.9)	.905
<b>Time Since Stroke (mo.)</b>	36.1 (26.1-46.2)	62.8 (41.2-84.4)	41.7 (29.0-54.4)	.066
<b>Baseline SPD<sup>a</sup></b>	2095 (1636-2554)	3792 (3373-4211)	4850 (4522-5178)	< .001

528 *Data represented as mean (95% Confidence Interval).*

529 <sup>a</sup> All comparisons significant at  $p < .05$ .

530 <sup>b</sup> Statistically significant differences between class 1 vs. 3, class 2 vs. 3 at  $p < .05$ .

531 <sup>c</sup> Statistically significant differences between class 1 vs. class 3 at  $p < .05$ .

532 *6MWT = Six Minute Walk Test; SSWS = Self-Selected Walking Speed; MoCA =*

533 *Montreal Cognitive Assessment; ABC = Activities Balance Confidence Scale; PHQ-9 =*

534 *Patient Health Questionnaire-9; CCI = Charlson Comorbidity Index; ADI = Area*

535 *Deprivation Index; SPD = steps-per-day.*

536

537 **Table 4. Class by Intervention Group Change in Steps-per-Day**

538

539 Comparison of latent class by intervention group change in pre- to post-intervention

540 steps-per-day. There was a significant interaction effect ( $p = .016$ ).

541

	<b>FAST</b>	<b>SAM</b>	<b>FAST+SAM</b>
<b>Class 1<sup>a</sup></b>	314 ± 192 [-63 – 691]	1624 ± 611 [426 – 2821]	1150 ± 218 [723 – 1577]
<b>Class 2<sup>a,c</sup></b>	-219 ± 242 [-693 – 256]	2002 ± 413 [1193 – 2811]	867 ± 243 [391 - 1344]
<b>Class 3<sup>b,c</sup></b>	390 ± 332 [-260 – 1040]	661 ± 304 [66 – 1256]	1532 ± 315 [915 – 2150]

542 *All data reported as estimated marginal means ± SE, [95% Confidence Interval]*

543 <sup>a</sup> Statistically significant differences between FAST vs. SAM at  $p < .05$ .

544 <sup>b</sup> Statistically significant differences between FAST vs. FAST+SAM at  $p < .05$ .

545 <sup>c</sup> Statistically significant differences between SAM vs. FAST+SAM at  $p < .05$ .

546

547 **FIGURE LEGENDS/CAPTIONS AND TABLES**

548

549 **Figure 1.** CONSORT diagram. CPET = cardiopulmonary exercise test; FAST = high-

550 intensity treadmill intervention; POST = end of the intervention; PT = physical therapy;

551 SAM = step-activity behavioral intervention

## TOTAL CONSORT Flow Diagram

