

1 **Implicit and explicit motor learning interventions have similar effects on walking**
2 **speed in people after stroke: a randomized controlled single blind trial**

3
4 Li-Juan Jie^{1,2,3*}, Melanie Kleynen¹, Kenneth Meijer³, Anna Beurskens^{2,4}, Susy Braun^{1,5}

- 5
6
7
8 1. Research Centre for Nutrition, Lifestyle and Exercise, Zuyd University of Applied
9 Sciences, Heerlen, Netherlands;
10 2. Department of Family Medicine, CAPHRI School for Public Health and Primary care,
11 Maastricht University, Maastricht, Netherlands
12 3. Department of Nutrition and Movement Sciences, NUTRIM School for Nutrition and
13 Translational Research in Metabolism, Maastricht University, Maastricht, Netherlands
14 4. Research Centre for Autonomy and Participation of Persons with a Chronic Illness, Zuyd
15 University of Applied Sciences, Heerlen, Netherlands
16 5. Department of Health Services Research, CAPHRI School for Public Health and Primary
17 care, Maastricht University, Maastricht, Netherlands
18

19
20
21
22 *Corresponding author:
23 Li-Juan Jie
24 Research Centre for Nutrition, Lifestyle and Exercise,
25 Zuyd University of Applied Sciences
26 PO Box 550, Heerlen, the Netherlands
27 li-juan.jie@zuyd.nl
28

29 **ABSTRACT**

30 **Background:** Therapists may use (more) implicit or (more) explicit motor learning
31 approaches to facilitate motor skill learning of stroke patients. The use of implicit motor
32 learning approaches has shown promising results in healthy populations.

33 **Objective:** To assess whether an implicit motor learning walking intervention is more
34 effective compared to an explicit motor learning walking intervention delivered at home with
35 regard to walking speed in people after stroke in the chronic phase of recovery.

36 **Design:** Randomized controlled single blind trial.

37 **Setting:** Home environment.

38 **Patients:** 79 people in the chronic phase after stroke (66.4 ± 11.0 years; 70.1 ± 64.3 months
39 after stroke; walking speed 0.7 ± 0.3 m/s; Berg Balance Scale score 44.5 ± 9.5) were
40 randomly assigned to an implicit (n=39) or explicit (n=41) group.

41 **Intervention:** Analogy learning was used as the implicit motor learning walking intervention,
42 whereas the explicit motor learning walking intervention consisted of detailed verbal
43 instructions. Both groups received nine training sessions, 30 minutes each, for a period of
44 three weeks.

45 **Measurements:** The primary outcome was walking speed measured by the 10-Meter Walk
46 Test. Outcome measures were assessed at baseline, immediate and 1-month post intervention.

47 **Results:** No statistically or clinically relevant differences between groups were obtained post
48 intervention (between-group difference estimated 0.02 m/s [95% CI -0.04 to 0.08] and at
49 follow-up (between-group difference estimated -0.02 m/s [95% CI -0.09 to 0.05], $p=0.563$).

50 **Limitations:** The treatment effects may have been diluted by “noise” accompanied with
51 research within real life settings, complex tasks and a representative sample.

52 **Conclusions:** Implicit motor learning was not superior to the explicit motor learning to
53 improve walking speed in people after stroke in the chronic phase of recovery.

54 INTRODUCTION

55 One of the most practiced motor skills in stroke rehabilitation is walking¹. In general,
56 therapists use (more) implicit or (more) explicit forms of learning to facilitate improvement of
57 gait. Explicit motor learning can be referred to as a more conscious form of learning, that is
58 characterized by the generation of verbal knowledge (i.e. facts and rules about movement
59 performance) and involvement of cognitive resources². In contrast, implicit motor learning is
60 assumed to take place without much knowledge of the underlying facts and rules of motor
61 skills and has been described as *‘learning that progresses with no or minimal increase in the*
62 *verbal knowledge of movement performance and without awareness’*^{2(p2)}. Within current
63 clinical practice therapists tend to structure therapy in a more explicit manner or switch
64 between implicit and explicit learning approaches³⁻⁵. However, this might not always be
65 efficient. For people after stroke, who often experience cognitive impairments⁶, it can be
66 difficult to process large amounts of verbal explicit information. Implicit motor learning, on
67 the other hand, strives to minimize the involvement of cognitive resources, especially
68 working memory⁷ and may therefore be more feasible for people after stroke who apart from
69 physical constraints also suffer from cognitive impairments. Studies show that people after
70 stroke are able to learn implicitly and that performance of an implicitly learned task might be
71 more stable under dual-task condition and more durable over time⁸. However, there is still a
72 lack of studies comparing the effects of implicit motor learning post-stroke to explicit motor
73 learning within clinically relevant tasks. In order to be clinically meaningful, implicit and
74 explicit motor learning approaches need to be tailored to the individual needs of the patients
75 and performed in the real-life situations.

76

77 One practical approach to induce implicit motor learning is through the use of analogies. In
78 analogy learning, the learner is provided with one single metaphor (or analogy) that strives to

79 encompass all underlying (explicit) knowledge that is necessary to complete the motor skill.
80 For example, to facilitate step length a therapist could provide the analogy ‘*Walk as if you*
81 *follow the footprints in the sand*’⁹. Although no technical (explicit) instructions are given, the
82 analogy may facilitate for example a more symmetrical gait, the foot strike from heel to toe
83 and foot-clearance. Studies in athletes have shown that analogy learning led to better and
84 more stable performance under dual-task conditions^{10,11}. Within the neurological population
85 first pilot studies reveal the feasibility of analogy learning and demonstrate its potential as
86 both clinically relevant and statistically significant changes in walking performance could be
87 obtained^{9,12,13}. In the current study, the effects of analogy learning were compared to detailed
88 verbal instructions when training the clinically relevant task ‘walking’ in a real life setting
89 (home environment).

90
91 To our knowledge, this is the first randomized controlled trial that examines the effects of
92 implicit motor learning facilitated by analogies compared to explicit motor learning on a
93 functional walking task in people after stroke. Contrary to earlier studies examining implicit
94 motor learning using the same analogy for the entire group¹¹ the current study also tailored the
95 interventions towards the individual needs, preferences and abilities of the patients. The
96 research question was: Is a 3-week implicit motor learning walking intervention (analogies)
97 more effective compared to a 3-week explicit motor learning walking intervention (verbal
98 detailed instructions) delivered at home with regard to walking speed in people after stroke
99 who are in the chronic phase of recovery? Walking speed was chosen due its integrated results
100 on other gait parameters e.g. step length¹⁴ and functional outcomes¹⁵. It was hypothesized that
101 implicit motor learning would result in greater improvements of walking speed post
102 intervention (especially at 1-month post intervention).

103

104 **METHOD**

105 **Study design and participants**

106 The study adopts a randomized, controlled, single-blinded study design and was approved by
107 the local ethics committee METC-Z in Heerlen, the Netherlands (approval number 17-T-06,
108 Netherlands Trial Register: NL6133). Full details of the study protocol have been published
109 elsewhere¹⁶. Recruitment of participants took place via community practices, rehabilitation
110 institutes in the region and through a local health-related newspaper. Participants were
111 included if they were > 6 month after stroke, had a self-selected walking speed lower than 1.0
112 m/s, were able to communicate in Dutch and to complete a three-stage command. Participants
113 were excluded if they were unable to walk a minimum distance of 10 meter, could not
114 ambulate on level surfaces without manual contact of another person (Functional Ambulation
115 Scale (FAC) < 3), had additional impairments not related to stroke that significantly
116 influenced their gait pattern (e.g. Parkinson's disease). All participants signed a written
117 informed consent.

118

119 **Randomization and masking**

120 A randomization list was generated using a web-based randomization program and was only
121 available to an independent researcher, not involved in the delivery of the interventions or
122 measurements. Patients were randomly assigned (1:1) to either the implicit or explicit motor
123 learning condition (block size of four). The assessors were blind to the treatment allocation.
124 The therapists were aware of the treatment condition they provided. Patients were not told
125 which condition they received and were asked to not reveal details about the treatment to the
126 blinded assessors.

127

128 **Interventions**

129 In total nine training sessions were provided over a three-week long intervention period. Each
130 session lasted 30 minutes. Within a case-study this duration and frequency of sessions were
131 sufficient to result in clinically meaningful changes¹³. An intervention guideline outlining
132 how the implicit and explicit motor learning intervention should be delivered was developed
133 for therapists in the trial. The guideline was developed with physiotherapists and client
134 representatives and was based on the previous pilot studies and experiences^{9,13,16}. Prior to the
135 trial, five standardization training sessions with the therapists took place to discuss and
136 explicate the intervention guideline with example cases. In both interventions, therapist
137 examined the participants walking pattern and defined the underlying gait parameters which
138 could potentially influence walking speed. More details about the interventions and main
139 characteristics with regard to instructions and feedback are described in figure 1¹⁶.

140

141 *The implicit intervention*


142 The main focus for the implicit intervention was creating a learning situation in which the
143 learner was not (or minimally) aware of the underlying rules of the practiced motor skill. The
144 concept of analogy learning formed the basis to guide the implicit intervention because 1) it
145 has shown to adopt characteristics of implicit learning¹⁰ and 2) it offers therapists a practical
146 and feasible tool to apply therapy^{12,13}. The participants were provided with an analogy which
147 aimed to improve the walking performance and was meaningful to them.

148

149 *The explicit intervention*

150 The main focus for the explicit intervention was creating a learning situation in which the
151 learner is very aware of the learning process, e.g. in which he/she can precisely explicate the
152 underlying facts and rules that are necessary to perform the motor skill. Therefore, the
153 participant was provided with detailed explicit instructions on their gait performance.

154



Elements	Implicit condition	Explicit condition
General rules	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minimal use of verbal instructions. - For the participant, learning should progress without being aware of the underlying gait parameters that the therapist aims to improve. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Many verbal instructions should be used, however, only to an extent that is feasible for the participant. - For the participant, learning should progress in a conscious manner. The participant should be very aware of the underlying gait parameters that the therapist aims to improve.
Instructions	<p>The instructions should only contain information about the analogy. The analogy can be based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Past experiences and/or meaningful situations. It should contain an image. 	<p>Instructions should contain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Detailed instructions with reference to joints, angles, and precise placing of extremities/limbs. - Biomechanical information. - Keep internally focussed (directed on body movements). - Create a conscious walking environment. - Frequently repeat verbal instructions.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No information about joints, angles, position of limbs, etc. - No details about spatiotemporal gait parameters or biomechanics of gait. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No information about how the movement feels, no use of images, no reference to familiar situations, no imagery.
Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Knowledge of results (state goal of movement). - Link the feedback to the analogy e.g. situations, images, or emotions. - Use positive feedback. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Knowledge of performance (kinematic feedback; information about execution of movement). - Link the instructions to e.g. feedback directed at the joints, angles, or placing of placing of extremities/limbs. - Use positive feedback.
Examples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Walk as if you are walking through a deep layer of snow. - Walk as if you follow the footprints in the sand. - Try to cross a small bridge. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Place your heel right. - Lift your feet. - Transfer your weight on your right/left leg. - Push off with your foot. - Bend your knees. - Walk up-right. - Lift your walking frame.

155

156 **Figure 1.** Adapted from Jie et al¹⁶ under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution 4.0
 157 license

158

159 **Outcomes**

160 *Demographic information*

161 The following demographic information and clinical characteristics were collected: age,
162 gender, time post stroke, affected side, use of walking aids, educational level, cognitive level
163 (Montreal Cognitive Assessment, MoCA)¹⁷, static balance and fall risk (Berg Balance
164 Scale)¹⁸, mobility disability (Rivermead Mobility Index)¹⁹, and ability to make movements
165 outside the synergetic patterns (Fugl-Meyer assessment of the lower limb)²⁰. To assess the
166 propensity for conscious motor processing, the Dutch version of Movement Specific
167 Reinvestment Scale (MSRS)^{21,22} was used.

168

169 *Outcome assessment*

170 The primary outcome measure was walking speed which was calculated by measuring the
171 walking time on a 10-Meter Walk Test (10MWT; 10m / time (s))²³. Secondary outcomes
172 measures were the modified Dynamic Gait Index (DGI)²⁴, motor and cognitive Dual Task
173 (DT) performance²⁵, Movement Specific Reinvestment Scale (MSRS) adapted for gait^{16,26},
174 verbal protocol, Stroke and Aphasia Quality of Life Scale (SAQOL-39)²⁷, Global Perceived
175 Effect (GPE) scale²⁸ and verbal protocol.

176

177 *Assessment of the dual task*

178 Motor task performance was measured through calculating the Dual Task Effects (DTE)
179 according to the formula of Kelly et al²⁹. The cognitive task performance was measured via
180 calculating the error scores as done before by Wilson et al²⁵. The error scores were not yet
181 relative to single task. Therefore, the dual task error scores were subtracted from the single
182 task error scores. Both the motor and cognitive task performances were expressed in
183 percentages. Negative percentages indicate that performance deteriorated relative to single
184 task, whereas positive scores indicate relative improvements of the dual task performance.

185

186 *Verbal Protocol*

187 To assess the amount of explicit knowledge, a verbal protocol questionnaire was be
188 administered after the three-week intervention⁸. Explicit knowledge is assessed by examining
189 the number of explicit rules that the participant used during walking. More information of the
190 definition of ‘explicit rule’ is described elsewhere¹⁶. The answers of the verbal protocol were
191 screened by two independent researchers who were blind to the experimental intervention.

192

193 **Sample size calculation and statistical analyses**

194 The sample size calculation resulted in a minimum group size of 33 participants per group.
195 The power was set at beta 0.80, the significance level at alpha 0.05, and a standard error of
196 0.23m/s³⁰. The minimal clinically important difference (MCID) of 0.16 m/s for walking speed
197 was set as the minimal change³¹. Considering 10% of participants may be lost during (drop-
198 out) and another 10% after the intervention (loss-to-follow-up), this study aimed to recruit 40
199 participants per group. The statistical analyses were performed using IBM SPSS (version 24).
200 Baseline characteristics of the two groups were reported using frequency distributions and
201 descriptive statistics. For the *intention-to-treat analyses* data of all participants who received
202 the intervention were analysed according to their original treatment allocation. Treatment
203 effects on numerical data were assessed using a linear mixed model. The model represented
204 group, time and group × time as fixed factors. For the repeated measures (balanced design) an
205 unstructured covariance structure was used. The linear mixed model analyses uses all
206 available data, corrects for baseline differences and accounts for dependency of data.

207

208 Statistical analyses of the primary outcome was also described in relation to clinically relevant
209 differences between groups (MCID: 0.16 m/s)³¹. In the *per-protocol analyses* data of subjects

210 were excluded if they did not receive the intervention as intended i.e. when protocol
211 deviations occurred in two or more (of the nine) sessions. Possible protocol deviations were
212 self-reported (subjective) in therapists logs and randomly 10 gait training sessions were audio-
213 recorded (objective) and evaluated to detect protocol deviations. Furthermore, people who did
214 not meet the inclusion criteria or people who dropped out were excluded in the per-protocol
215 analysis. Descriptive sub-group analysis was performed on cognition to explore whether
216 cognitive abilities ($\text{MoCA} \leq 21$) might influence the effect of the interventions. The verbal
217 protocol was only assessed once and an independent t-test was used to compare results
218 between the groups.
219
220

221 **RESULTS**

222 **Flow of participants through the trial**


223 The flowchart of the trial is presented in figure 2. Between 19 May 2017 and 19 September
 224 2018, a total 81 people were assessed for eligibility and randomized. Two participants (3%)
 225 did not start with the study. One participant withdrew due to diagnoses with additional
 226 impairments that severely influenced his gait. The other participant decided to stop due to
 227 personal reasons. All participants (n=79) that started the intervention were included in the
 228 primary intention-to-treat analysis. Demographics and baseline characteristics are presented in
 229 table 1. There were no apparent differences between the groups at baseline.

230
 231 **Table 1.** Baseline characteristics of participants.

	Implicit (n = 38)	Explicit (n = 41)
General Characteristics		
Age (yr), mean (SD)	64.6 (9.4)	67.8 (11.6)
Gender, n males (%)	24 (63%)	25 (61%)
Length (cm), mean (SD)	171.7 (8.0)	172.0 (8.8)
Educational level, n (%)		
Elementary education	0 (0%)	1 (2%)
Secondary education	20 (53%)	18 (44%)
Vocational training	10 (26%)	11 (27%)
University	8 (21%)	11 (27%)
Stroke Characteristics		
Time post stroke (months), mean (SD)	72.8 (59.3)	67.5 (69.1)
Side of stroke, n right (%)	19 (50%)	16 (19%)
Independent walking, n (%)		
Walk unaided	9 (24%)	9 (22%)
Walk with stick	29 (67%)	32 (78%)
Motor Characteristics		
Berg Balance Scale (0-56), mean (SD)	45.5 (11.6)	43.5 (8.9)
Rivermead Mobility Index (0-15), mean (SD)	11.6 (2.5)	11.3 (2.7)
Fugl-Mayer Assessment (0-34), mean (SD)	23.5 (8.0)	22.2 (8.1)*
Cognitive Characteristics		
Montreal Cognitive Assessment (points/30, mean (SD)	24.7 (4.2)	23.2 (6.2)
Conscious motor control preference		
Movement Specific Reinvestment Scale (0-10), mean (SD)	4.9 (2.5)	5.1 (2.6)

232 * Due to fatigue one participant from the explicit group was unable to complete the Fugl-Mayer Assessment

233



234

235 **Figure 2.** Flowchart of the trial

236 ^a One participant was unavailable for the post intervention assessment (n=1) ^b One participant

237 was unavailable for the follow-up assessment (n=1)

238

239 Compliance with the trial

240 Two participants (3%) deviated from the protocol with regard to the provided instructions (>2

241 explicit instructions within the implicit intervention). Analysis revealed that in retrospect ten

242 participants (13%) did not meet the inclusion criteria of walking slower than 1 m/s at baseline.

243 In addition, three participants (4%) wanted to improve overall fitness but had no specific

244 goals related to gait and therefore discontinued with the intervention. Two participants (3%)
245 stopped due to other complaints not related to gait. Furthermore, the medical diagnoses of one
246 participant (initially stroke; 1%) was changed during the intervention. Due to pregnancy
247 another participant dropped out of the intervention. All available data of these 19 participants
248 (24%) were included in the primary intention-to-treat analysis but were excluded in the per-
249 protocol analysis.

250

251 **Results of the intention-to-treat analysis**

252 Table 2 presents the observed means (SD) per group and time point, the within-group
253 differences, and the estimated between-group differences of the implicit versus the explicit
254 group. Mixed linear models revealed no statistically significant differences between the
255 groups immediately after (difference estimate 0.02 m/s [95% CI -0.04 to 0.08], $p=0.498$) and
256 one-month post intervention (difference estimate -0.02 m/s [95% CI -0.09 to 0.05], $p=0.563$;
257 see table 2 and figure 3). Also, no clinically relevant (MCID: 0.16 m/s³¹) difference between
258 groups were observed. No statistically significant differences in favour of any group was
259 obtained on any of the other secondary outcome parameters (table 2). Over time, within
260 groups, positive changes were observed in outcome measures related to gait function (DGI,
261 DTmotor), and quality of life (SAQOL-39). Participants' perceived effects with regard to the
262 intervention was similar for both groups (see figure 4). With regard to the verbal protocol, on
263 average, people in the implicit group accumulated significantly fewer explicit rules ($M=0.38$,
264 $R= 0$ to 2 rules, $SE=0.10$) compared to the explicit group ($M=2.42$, $R= 0$ to 6 rules, $SE=0.27$),
265 $t(68)=-7.07$, $p<.05$ after the intervention.

266

267 **Table 2.** Mean (SD) of groups, mean (SD) difference within groups, and estimated mean (95% CI) difference between groups as established
 268 with linear mixed model.
 269

Outcome	Groups						Within group difference				Estimated between group difference	
	Week 0 (baseline)		Week 4 (post intervention)		Week 8 (1-month follow-up)		Week 4 minus Week 0		Week 8 minus Week 0		Week 4 minus Week 0	Week 8 minus Week 0
	Implicit (n = 38)	Explicit (n = 41)	Implicit (n = 34)	Explicit (n = 38)	Implicit (n = 35)	Explicit (n = 36)	Implicit	Explicit	Implicit	Explicit	Implicit-Explicit	Implicit-Explicit
10 MWT (<i>m/s</i>)	0.71 (0.37)	0.70 (0.29)	0.76 (0.37)	0.76 (0.33)	0.79 (0.40)	0.76 (0.34)	0.05 (0.13)	0.07 (0.13)	0.08 (0.15)	0.06 (0.14)	0.02 (-0.04 to 0.08)	-0.02 (-0.09 to 0.05)
DTC motor task (%)	-7.2 (23.3)	-7.7 (38.4)	6.4 (33.9)	3.4 (38.4)	3.4 (34.5)	-6.3 (22.9)	11.2 (29.6)	5.1 (24.6)	9.8 (30.1)	0.6 (24.8)	-2.21 (-17.38 to 12.66)	-10.45 (-22.91 to 2.02)
DTC cognitive task (%)	-6.3 (20.2)	-12.8 (23.6)	-6.3 (21.9)	0.1 (54.8)	-13.6 (52.9)	8.4 (57.4)	1.8 (31.5)	8.5 (51.7)	-5.8 (57.5)	15.9 (51.0)	7.35 (-12.48 to 27.19)	23.57 (-2.04 to 49.17)
mDGI (0 to 64)	35.9 (15.3)	33.7 (13.2)	39.6 (15.0)	36.5 (14.1)	39.3 (16.4)	36.4 (14.5)	3.5 (5.3)	2.5 (4.6)	3.7 (6.1)	2.5 (5.0)	-0.75 (-2.98 to 1.49)	-1.28 (-3.93 to 1.38)
MSRS (0 to 10)	4.9 (2.5)	5.1 (2.6)	5.1 (2.6)	4.4 (2.1)	4.9 (2.4)	4.8 (2.6)	0.4 (2.2)	-0.7 (2.5)	0.2 (2.3)	-0.3 (2.4)	-0.84 (-1.74 to 0.07)	0.34 (-1.29 to 0.62)
SAQOL-39 (1 to 195)	152 (23)	148 (25)	-	-	161 (22)	152 (30)	-	-	10 (15)	5 (17)	-	-5.9 (-13.34 to 1.50)

270 Within group differences were calculated pairwise, missing cases were excluded. Small anomalies in subtraction are due to the effects of rounding.
 271 10MWT = 10-Meter Walk Test, DT = Dual Task, mDGI = modified Dynamic Gait Index, SAQOL-39 = Stroke and Aphasia Quality of Life Scale-39




Figure 3. Performance of the 10 Meter Walking Test




Figure 4. Boxplot of the Global Perceived Effect

Sub-group analysis on cognition

In total 15 people (implicit group n=5; explicit group n=10) had a MoCA score < 22. No trend in favour of the implicit intervention was observed in the descriptive sub-group analysis on cognition (see supplementary data 1).

Results of the Per-Protocol

The per-protocol analyses led to slightly larger changes between groups but again did not lead to statistically significant after (difference estimate -0.06 m/s [95% CI -0.13 to 0.02],

p=0.140) or clinically relevant effects (MCID: 0.16 m/s) between group on the primary outcome (see lower graph figure 3 and supplementary data 2).

DISCUSSION

People after stroke in the chronic phase of recovery who received an implicit motor learning walking intervention (analogies) under the guidance of physiotherapists in their home environments, had similar effects on walking speed compared to those who received an explicit motor learning walking intervention (verbal detailed instructions). No statistically nor clinically relevant differences between groups were found as between group differences (intention-to-treat Δ 0.02 m/s; per-protocol Δ 0.05 m/s) did not exceed the chosen clinically relevant threshold of 0.16 m/s³¹. Similarly, based on the descriptive sub-group analysis on cognition (MoCA <22) no trend in favour of the implicit intervention was observed (table 3). No statistical sub-group analysis on cognition was performed based on small group sizes.

To our knowledge this was the first and largest trial in the field of stroke rehabilitation to examine the effectiveness of implicit motor learning to improve the functional ‘walking’ task within a clinically relevant context (home environment of the patient)³². The results of this study did not replicate the more promising findings on implicit motor learning in stroke from earlier studies, generally performed in more standardized, laboratory settings and/or with non-functional tasks e.g.^{33–35}. A variety of factors related to the selection of participants (selection bias), use of the 10MWT as primary outcome measure (information bias) and operationalization of the intervention (contrasts) may have influenced the results and led to these neutral findings.

First, a selection bias may have occurred. To increase generalizability of the results and to

gain a better insight into the potential effects in clinical practice, we chose to include a sample of stroke patients, which reflects the heterogeneity of the stroke population as seen in rehabilitation. The researched target population group therefore showed a large variability in terms of demographics as well as physical and cognitive abilities. This heterogeneity may reflect reality in practice but might also have diminished the results. Further, the erroneous inclusion of ten participants whose baseline walking speed exceeded the inclusion criterion may have led to a ceiling effect. This ceiling effect might explain the larger, but not significant, trend towards implicit motor learning (see figure 3 lower graph) in the per-protocol analysis. In addition, the study was probably underpowered due to this deviation.

Second, the use of the 10MWT as primary outcome measure may have implications for both the findings themselves and the interpretation in terms of clinical meaningfulness. The 10MWT was chosen as the primary outcome measure due to its validity, reliability and feasibility within clinical practice³⁶ but also to allow comparison with other studies³⁷. The advantage of using walking speed as a primary outcome is the integrated result on multiple gait parameters such as step length and frequency^{14, 15} and the direct relation to changes in functional scales³⁸. However, it could be argued that the 10MWT might not have been sensitive enough to detect changes due to implicit learning if those underlying changes are small or not obviously related to walking speed (e.g. improvement of confidence during walking).

Another explanation for the neutral results could originate from the way the interventions were operationalised. Contrary to earlier studies in more controlled settings and with non-functional tasks such as serial reaction time tasks³², it seems difficult to keep the contrast between interventions equally large when including a functional task within a clinically

relevant environment. In contrast to other studies^{10,11} the exact number of rules were not pre-defined but tailored to the participants. For example, Lam et al used a fixed number of ‘eight’ verbal rules compared to ‘one’ analogy¹¹. The provided number of explicit rules (explicit intervention) may have been limited because of ethical reasons, potentially resulting in a diminished contrast between groups.

Within this study we assessed the implicit nature of the intervention by asking participants to report the number of explicit rules they learned (verbal protocol), assessing durability of performance over a longer time period and dual task interference^{10,11}. None of these measures revealed a clear picture on the nature of the learning process. For instance, fewer rules were accumulated in the implicit compared to the explicit group, but it remains unclear whether these rules have been acquired through treatments before enrolment of this study. In addition, for some participants the tone-counting task may have been too easy not leading to dual task interference, whereas for other people the task was too difficult. Due to this large variation in performance on the cognitive (tone counting) dual task it was not possible to further legitimately interpret these results.

Finally, on average both groups slightly improved their walking speed after the intervention (+0.08 m/s in the implicit group and +0.06 m/s in the explicit group) exceeding the threshold for clinical relevant change of > 0.06 m/s for within group differences as established by Perera et al³⁹. It might be that using implicit or explicit motor learning does not make a (clinically relevant) difference for the results of walking rehabilitation within the included target group and setting of this trial. It is remarkable that the detected improvement (in both groups) remained relatively stable at the follow-up test. This finding might be seen as a form of retention and indicates that motor learning occurred rather than just a temporal improvement in motor performance.

Future research

The design of this RCT was carefully prepared by research into underlying theories⁴⁰, feasibility and piloting testing^{12,13} of implicit motor learning⁴¹. Applying the RCT in its cleanest form in clinical settings⁴² and with complex interventions was challenging as we needed to balance between external validity (generalizability of the results for daily practice) and internal validity (standardization and reliability of the results). Other designs may be considered to evaluate effectiveness of long-term, highly individualized, and complex interventions⁴¹, as needed in the field of motor learning. Two recent studies suggest that tailoring motor learning interventions towards patient characteristics and preferences might be important, promoting more pragmatic trials^{9,43}. The interventions may also be applicable for people with more severe cognitive impairments (MoCA <21) as equal trends in performance were found within this sub-group. A logical next step would be to assess which patient characteristics influence motor learning interventions and how these factors influence the learning process. Therefore, cohort studies in which all potential influencing factors (e.g. activity dependent plasticity, cognition, or individual preferences) are measured over time and therapist document the used motor learning approach in detail might be an interesting alternative to consider.

To gain more insight in the gait mechanisms and functional effects when applying implicit motor learning, future studies may consider combining upcoming instruments for quantitative gait analysis which can be performed outside laboratory settings (e.g. use of wearable sensors^{44,45}) with patient specific outcome measures which can detect functional relevant changes within individualized goals (e.g., Patient Specific Functional Scale)^{46,47}.

Conclusion and clinical message

In this study, no overall benefits of implicit motor learning over explicit motor learning for improving walking performance in people after stroke in the chronic phase of recovery were found. The treatment effects in this study may have been diluted by “noise” accompanied with research within real life settings, complex tasks and a representative sample of the target population. For tailored motor learning approaches more insight is needed on the patient characteristics and preferences that influence the process of motor learning. While awaiting further results, therapists may consider both motor learning approaches to facilitate walking speed within the stroke population.

Acknowledgements: The authors would like to thank the therapists, and researchers who contributed in conducting the trial: Jos Halfens, Jos Kurvers, Wiel Regtop, Kyra Theunissen, Monique Rothbauer, Inge de Lang, Ritch te Kampen, Renée van den Heuvel, Joep Westbroek. Furthermore, we thank the client participants Nathalie Sieben, Else de Bont, and Anja Minheere for their perspectives and thoughts on the trial during the set-up of the study. We thank Peter Konsten for his support on the assessment forms and Bjorn Winkens for his advice in the data analyses. Finally, we thank all participants that took part in the study.

Funding: This work was supported by Nationaal Regieorgaan Praktijkgericht Onderzoek SIA (RAAKPRO; grant number 2014-01-49PRO).

Conflicts of interest: non declared.

REFERENCES

1. Latham NK, Jette DU, Slavin M, et al. Physical Therapy During Stroke Rehabilitation for People With Different Walking Abilities. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2005;86(12):41-50.
2. Kleynen M, Braun SM, Bleijlevens MH, et al. Using a Delphi technique to seek consensus regarding definitions, descriptions and classification of terms related to implicit and explicit forms of motor learning. *PLoS One*. 2014;9(6):e100227.
3. Johnson L, Burridge JH, Demain SH. Internal and external focus of attention during gait re-education: an observational study of physical therapist practice in stroke rehabilitation. *Phys Ther*. 2013;93(7):957-966.
4. Kal E, van den Brink H, Houdijk H, et al. How physical therapists instruct patients with stroke: an observational study on attentional focus during gait rehabilitation after stroke. *Disabil Rehabil*. 2017:1-12.
5. Kleynen M, Moser A, Haarsma FA, Beurskens AJ, Braun SM. Physiotherapists use a great variety of motor learning options in neurological rehabilitation, from which they choose through an iterative process: a retrospective think-aloud study. *Disabil Rehabil*. 2016:1-9.
6. Tatemichi TK, Desmond DW, Stern Y, Paik M, Sano M, Bagiella E. Cognitive impairment after stroke: frequency, patterns, and relationship to functional abilities. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 1994;57(2):202-207.
7. Masters RSW, Maxwell JP. *Implicit Motor Learning, Reinvestment Andmovement Disruption: What You Don't Know Won't Hurt You?* In. A.M. Williams & N.J. Hodges (Eds.); 2004.
8. Orrell AJ, Eves FF, Masters RS. Motor learning of a dynamic balancing task after stroke: implicit implications for stroke rehabilitation. *Phys Ther*. 2006;86(3):369-380.
9. Kleynen M, Jie LJ, Theunissen K, et al. The immediate influence of implicit motor learning strategies on spatiotemporal gait parameters in stroke patients: a randomized within-subjects design. *Clin Rehabil*. December 2018:0269215518816359.
10. Liao CM, Masters RS. Analogy learning: a means to implicit motor learning. *J Sport Sci*. 2001;19(5):307-319.
11. Lam WK, Maxwell JP, Masters RS. Analogy versus explicit learning of a modified basketball shooting task: performance and kinematic outcomes. *J Sport Sci*. 2009;27(2):179-191.
12. Jie LJ, Goodwin V, Kleynen M, Braun S, Nunns M, Wilson M. Analogy learning in Parkinson's disease: A proof-of-concept study. *Int J Ther Rehabil*. 2016;23(3):123-130.
13. Kleynen M, Wilson MR, Jie LJ, te Lintel Hekkert F, Goodwin VA, Braun SM. Exploring the utility of analogies in motor learning after stroke: a feasibility study. *Int J Rehabil Res*. 2014;37(3):277-280.
14. Kirtley C, Whittle MW, Jefferson RJ. Influence of walking speed on gait parameters. *J Biomed Eng*. 1985;7(4):282-288.
15. Fritz S, Lusardi M. White Paper: "Walking Speed: the Sixth Vital Sign." *J Geriatr Phys Ther*. 2009;32(2):2-5.
16. Jie LJ, Kleynen M, Meijer K, Beurskens A, Braun S. The Effects of Implicit and Explicit Motor Learning in Gait Rehabilitation of People After Stroke: Protocol for a Randomized Controlled Trial. *JMIR Res Protoc*. 2018;7(5):e142.
17. Nasreddine ZS, Phillips NA, Bédirian V, et al. The Montreal Cognitive Assessment, MoCA: a brief screening tool for mild cognitive impairment. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2005;53(4):695-699.
18. Berg K, Wood-Dauphine S, Williams JI, Gayton D. Measuring balance in the elderly:

- preliminary development of an instrument. *Physiother Can.* 1989;41(6):304-311.
19. Collen FM, Wade DT, Robb GF, Bradshaw CM. The Rivermead Mobility Index: a further development of the Rivermead Motor Assessment. *Int Disabil Stud.* 1991;13(2):50-54.
 20. Fugl-Meyer AR, Jaasko L, Leyman I, Olsson S, Steglind S. The post-stroke hemiplegic patient. 1. a method for evaluation of physical performance. *Scand J Rehabil Med.* 1975;7(1):13-31.
 21. Masters RSW, Polman RCJ, Hammond N V. 'Reinvestment': A dimension of personality implicated in skill breakdown under pressure. *Pers Individ Differ.* 1993;14(5):655-666.
 22. Kleynen M, Braun SM, Beurskens AJHM, Verbunt JA, de Bie RA, Masters RSW. Investigating the Dutch Movement-Specific Reinvestment Scale in people with stroke. *Clin Rehabil.* 2013;27(2):160-165.
 23. Collen FM, Wade DT, Bradshaw CM. Mobility after stroke: reliability of measures of impairment and disability. *Int Disabil Stud.* 1990;12(1):6-9.
 24. Shumway-Cook A, Taylor CS, Matsuda PN, Studer MT, Whetten BK. Expanding the scoring system for the Dynamic Gait Index. *Phys Ther.* 2013;93(11):1493-1506.
 25. Wilson MR, Vine SJ, Bright E, Masters RSW, Defriend D, McGrath JS. Gaze training enhances laparoscopic technical skill acquisition and multi-tasking performance: a randomized, controlled study. *Surg Endosc.* 2011;25(12):3731-3739.
 26. Orrell AJ, Masters RS, Eves FF. Reinvestment and movement disruption following stroke. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair.* 2009;23(2):177-183.
 27. Hilari K, Byng S, Lamping DL, Smith SC. Stroke and aphasia quality of life scale-39 (SAQOL-39). *Stroke.* 2003;34(8):1944-1950.
 28. Hudak PL, Wright JG. The characteristics of patient satisfaction measures. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976).* 2000;25(24):3167-3177.
 29. Kelly VE, Janke AA, Shumway-Cook A. Effects of instructed focus and task difficulty on concurrent walking and cognitive task performance in healthy young adults. *Exp Brain Res.* 2010;207(1-2).
 30. Combs-Miller SA, Kalpathi Parameswaran A, Colburn D, et al. Body weight-supported treadmill training vs. overground walking training for persons with chronic stroke: a pilot randomized controlled trial. *Clin Rehabil.* 2014;28(9):873-884.
 31. Tilson JK, Sullivan KJ, Cen SY, et al. Meaningful gait speed improvement during the first 60 days poststroke: minimal clinically important difference. *Phys Ther.* 2010;90(2):196-208.
 32. Kal E, Winters M, van der Kamp J, et al. Is Implicit Motor Learning Preserved after Stroke? A Systematic Review with Meta-Analysis. *PLoS One.* 2016;11(12):e0166376.
 33. Pohl PS, McDowd JM, Filion DL, Richards LG, Stiers W. Implicit learning of a perceptual-motor skill after stroke. *Phys Ther.* 2001;81(11):1780-1789.
 34. Boyd LA, Quaney BM, Pohl PS, Winstein CJ. Learning implicitly: Effects of task and severity after stroke. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair.* 2007;21(5):444-454.
 35. Boyd L, Winstein C. Explicit information interferes with implicit motor learning of both continuous and discrete movement tasks after stroke. *J Neurol Phys Ther.* 2006;30(2):46-49.
 36. Tyson S, Connell L. The psychometric properties and clinical utility of measures of walking and mobility in neurological conditions: A systematic review. *Clin Rehabil.* 2009;23(11):1018-1033.
 37. Dobkin BH. Strategies for stroke rehabilitation. *Lancet Neurol.* 2004;3(9):528-536.
 38. Schmid A, Duncan PW, Studenski S, et al. Improvements in Speed-Based Gait Classifications Are Meaningful. *Stroke.* 2007;38(7):2096-2100.

39. Perera S, Mody SH, Woodman RC, Studenski SA. Meaningful change and responsiveness in common physical performance measures in older adults. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2006;54(5):743-749.
40. Kleynen M, Braun SM, Rasquin SMC, et al. Multidisciplinary Views on Applying Explicit and Implicit Motor Learning in Practice: An International Survey. *PLoS One*. 2015;10(8):e0135522.
41. Craig P, Dieppe P, Macintyre S, Michie S, Nazareth I, Petticrew M. Developing and evaluating complex interventions: the new Medical Research Council guidance. *Int J Nurs Stud*. 2013;50(5):587-592.
42. Bothwell LE, Greene JA, Podolsky SH, Jones DS. Assessing the Gold Standard — Lessons from the History of RCTs. *N Engl J Med*. 2016.
43. Kal E, Houdijk H, van der Kamp J, et al. Are the effects of internal focus instructions different from external focus instructions given during balance training in stroke patients? A double-blind randomized controlled trial. *Clin Rehabil*. 2018;33(2):207-221.
44. Dobkin BH, Dorsch A. The promise of mHealth: Daily activity monitoring and outcome assessments by wearable sensors. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2011;25(9):788-798.
45. Senden R, Heyligers IC, Meijer K, Savelberg H, Grimm B. Acceleration-based motion analysis as a tool for rehabilitation: Exploration in simulated functional knee limited walking conditions. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil*. 2011;90(3):226-232.
46. Stevens A, Beurskens A, Köke A, Van Der Weijden T. The use of patient-specific measurement instruments in the process of goal-setting: A systematic review of available instruments and their feasibility. *Clin Rehabil*. 2013;27(11):1005-1019.
47. Stratford P, Gill C, Westaway M BJ, Stratford P, Stratford P, Gill C, Westaway M BJ. Assessing disability and change on individual patients: a report of a patient specific measure. *Physiother Can*. 1995;47(4):258-263.