

1 Talking while Walking After Concussion: Acute effects of

2 concussion on speech pauses and gait speed

3 Shu Yang<sup>1</sup>, Paula K. Johnson<sup>2</sup>, Colby R. Hansen<sup>3</sup>, Elisabeth A. Wilde<sup>2</sup>,

4 Melissa M. Cortez<sup>2</sup>, Leland E. Dibble<sup>4</sup>, Peter C. Fino<sup>+ 4,5,6,7</sup>, Tiphonie E. Raffegeau<sup>+ 8</sup>

5 <sup>1</sup> University of Utah, Department of Psychology, Salt Lake City, UT

6 <sup>2</sup>University of Utah, Department of Neurology, Salt Lake City, UT

7 <sup>3</sup>University of Utah, Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Salt Lake City,  
8 UT

9 <sup>4</sup>University of Utah, Department of Physical Therapy and Athletic Training, Salt Lake  
10 City, UT

11 <sup>5</sup>University of Utah, Department of Health and Kinesiology, Salt Lake City, UT

12 <sup>6</sup>University of Utah, Department of Mechanical Engineering, Salt Lake City, UT

13 <sup>7</sup>University of Utah, Department of Biomedical Engineering, Salt Lake City, UT

14 <sup>8</sup>George Mason University, School of Kinesiology, Manassas, VA

15  
16 + Denotes Co-Senior authorship

17  
18  
19  
20 Corresponding Author:

21 Peter C. Fino, PhD

22 250 S 1850 E, Rm 257, Salt Lake City, UT, 84112, USA

23 peter.fino@utah.edu

24 801-213-1363

25  
26 Abstract word count: 248

27 Manuscript word count: 3751

28 Figures: 2

29 Tables: 4

30

31 **ABSTRACT**

32 **Background:** Deficits in dual-tasks (DT) are frequently observed post-concussion (i.e.,  
33 mild Traumatic Brain Injury). However, traditional DT may not be relevant to daily life.

34 Walking while talking elicits DT costs in healthy adults and is part of daily life.

35 **Objective:** We investigated the effect of concussion on walking with extemporaneous  
36 speech and explored relationships between DT and acute symptoms.

37 **Methods:** Participants with recent concussion (<14 days post-injury) and controls  
38 completed three tasks: single-task gait without speaking (ST<sub>G</sub>), single-task speaking  
39 without walking (ST<sub>S</sub>) and walking while speaking (DT). Silent pauses in speech audio  
40 reflected cognitive performance, and gait was quantified using inertial sensors. We used  
41 linear mixed models to compare groups and conditions and explored associations with  
42 self-reported symptoms.

43 **Results:** Both concussion (n=19) and control (n=18) groups exhibited longer speech  
44 pauses ( $p < 0.001$ ), slower walking speeds ( $p < 0.001$ ), and slower cadence ( $p < 0.001$ )  
45 during the DT compared to ST conditions. There were no group differences or  
46 interactions for speech pauses ( $p > 0.424$ ). The concussion group walked slower ( $p =$   
47  $0.010$ ) and slowed down more during DT than the control group (group\*task  $p = 0.032$ ).  
48 Vestibular symptoms strongly associated with ST speech pause duration ( $\rho = 0.72$ ), ST  
49 gait speed ( $\rho = -0.75$ ), and DT gait speed ( $\rho = -0.78$ ).

50 **Conclusions:** Extemporaneous speech is well-practiced, but challenging to complete  
51 while walking post-concussion. Strong associations between DT outcomes and  
52 vestibular-related symptoms suggest DT deficits vary with post-concussion  
53 symptomology. DT deficits may be deleterious to daily tasks post-concussion.

54 **KEY TERMS:**

55 mild traumatic brain injury, mobility, ecological dual-tasks, speech production,

56 locomotion,

57

## 58 INTRODUCTION

59 Cognitive and motor problems, such as balance and gait deficits, are common  
60 following concussions<sup>1-3</sup>. Performing cognitive-motor dual-tasks (DT) – completing  
61 simultaneous cognitive and motor tasks at the same time – elicits slower gait speeds,  
62 shorter strides, and longer stride times in people after a concussion<sup>2,4-7</sup>. DT deficits  
63 arise from an inability to handle competing cognitive and motor demands and are  
64 thought to result from deficits in attentional control and a loss of automaticity – defined  
65 as an increased reliance on cognitive resources for relatively automatic tasks (e.g.,  
66 walking)<sup>8,9</sup>. After a concussion, DT deficits can remain for months and persist long after  
67 the resolution of other signs and symptoms<sup>5,10,11</sup>. Further, DT deficits are reported in  
68 people with chronic, persisting post-concussion symptoms; people with persisting  
69 concussion-related symptoms prioritize the cognitive task, exhibiting higher costs to gait  
70 performance than cognitive task performance while carrying out both simultaneously,  
71 referred to as a “posture second” strategy<sup>12,13</sup>. The ‘posture second’ is a compensation  
72 that reflects an inability to appropriately allocate resources to motor performance when  
73 faced with a cognitive challenge<sup>14,15</sup>. Yet, the consequences of DT deficits during daily  
74 life remain unclear because prior work has typically studied cognitive tasks that are  
75 irrelevant to daily life<sup>16</sup>.

76 Ideally, studies of cognitive-motor DT effects should quantify both the cognitive  
77 and the motor task with equivalent resolution to examine the potential for bidirectional  
78 interference<sup>17</sup>. Unfortunately, prior DT paradigms have used contrived arithmetic,  
79 alphabet recitation, memorization, visuospatial, and auditory/visual Stroop tasks when  
80 testing concussion populations that are not measured continuously<sup>16</sup>. Although these

81 tasks are easy to administer and score, they may not represent the cognitive demands  
82 of everyday life, like walking and talking. Further, laboratory-based cognitive tests may  
83 be affected by individual differences in education/socio-economic background,  
84 mathematics-related anxiety or skill-level, comfort with public speaking, and task-  
85 engagement<sup>18</sup>. Typical contrived tasks are vulnerable to compensatory strategies that  
86 may not reflect the function of targeted cognitive behaviors<sup>19</sup>, and boast learning and  
87 practice effects that are difficult to control for in an experimental setting<sup>20</sup>.

88 In contrast to traditional arithmetic or recitation tasks, extemporaneous speech is  
89 a cognitive task that is highly practiced, relevant to daily living, commonly performed  
90 during other motor tasks such as walking, and elicits DT costs in healthy young adults  
91<sup>18,21–23</sup>. Extemporaneous speech involves complex cognitive processes (e.g. language  
92 formulation, executive function, processing speed) and demands ongoing cognitive  
93 processing and continuous language retrieval. Similar to gait, the cognitive load of  
94 extemporaneous speech can be obtained from measures of speed and fluency; speech  
95 rate per syllable decreases under high cognitive-linguistic demands, with longer and  
96 more prevalent silent pauses<sup>24</sup>. A natural pause during extemporaneous speech is  
97 around 150 ms to 250 ms<sup>25</sup>, and longer silent speech pauses serve as an indicator of  
98 language fluency<sup>26,27</sup>. Silent pauses are associated with cognitive planning and  
99 memory retrieval and reflect syntactic complexity in language formulation, and more  
100 frequent pauses at prosodic boundaries (i.e. clauses, sentence breaks) are associated  
101 with reduced syntactic complexity<sup>27</sup>. Therefore, the frequency and duration of silent  
102 pauses during extemporaneous speech reflect cognitive-linguistic demands<sup>27,28</sup>.

103           Speech deficits such as slower articulation rate have been documented in  
104 moderate-to-severe traumatic brain injuries (TBI)<sup>29</sup> and speech pauses may be an  
105 indicator of mild TBI (i.e., concussion). One study observed individuals exhibited more  
106 pauses and filler words during a picture description task acutely after concussion  
107 compared to their pre-concussion performance<sup>30</sup>. Separately, a machine learning-  
108 based analysis of speech patterns revealed high diagnostic accuracy in a small  
109 preliminary sample of athletes after concussion<sup>31</sup>. Further, clinical care patterns  
110 highlight the role of speech and language deficits post-concussion; a chart review  
111 indicated 43% of pediatric patients were referred from a specialty concussion clinic to  
112 speech language pathologists to treat issues with communication, attention, and  
113 memory<sup>32</sup>. Yet, it remains unclear how these concussion-related deficits in speech  
114 fluency, defined here as the frequency and duration of silent pauses in extemporaneous  
115 speech, interact with competing motor tasks, such as walking.

116           The purpose of our study was to investigate the effect of concussion on  
117 extemporaneous speech production during single-task (ST) and DT walking paradigms.  
118 Our primary hypotheses were that people recovering from concussion would exhibit  
119 impaired speech production, defined by more frequent and longer silent pauses during  
120 speech; that both groups would exhibit a decline in speech production when walking  
121 compared to sitting; and that those with a concussion would exhibit greater DT costs  
122 (DTC) to gait and speech compared to the control group, defined as slower DT gait  
123 speed or longer and more frequent DT speech pauses. As a secondary aim, we  
124 explored the association between self-reported post-concussion symptoms and the DT  
125 effects of walking and talking. As extemporaneous speech production is understudied in

126 people with concussion, we also explored the associations between traditional  
127 neurocognitive tests with ST and DT speech and gait performance outcomes using the  
128 National Institutes of Health (NIH) Cognition Toolbox.

129

## 130 **MATERIALS and METHODS**

### 131 Participants

132 As part of a larger study, 22 participants with recent concussions (<14 days post-  
133 injury) and 19 healthy control participants were recruited and provided informed written  
134 consent for the study. All protocols were approved by the Institutional Review Board,  
135 and participants provided informed written consent in advance. Concussion participants  
136 were identified and recruited using electronic medical records indicating a recent  
137 concussion-related injury. Control participants were recruited from the local community  
138 using flyers, online postings, and public dissemination, and were age- and gender-  
139 matched to the concussion participants. Candidates were included if they had no history  
140 of neurological illness (e.g. stroke), history of a major neurological condition (e.g.  
141 epilepsy), major psychiatric disorders that required in-patient hospitalization, orthopedic  
142 conditions that would explain balance or gait issues, history of vestibular or orthostatic  
143 blood pressure problems, and no more than three concussions in their lifetime.  
144 Additionally, healthy control participants had no history of concussion or concussion  
145 symptoms in the five years prior to participation. Due to other components of the larger  
146 study, participants also had no contraindications for an MRI.

147            Procedures

148            Participants completed a series of cognitive, balance, mobility, autonomic, and  
149 neuroimaging assessments as part of the larger study; however, the current analysis is  
150 focused on a subset of balance and cognitive tasks. First, participants completed the  
151 Neurobehavioral Symptom Inventory (NSI) to identify self-reported symptoms <sup>33</sup>.

152            Participants also completed the NIH-Toolbox Cognition battery as a computerized  
153 assessment of several aspects of cognition <sup>34</sup> including: Picture Vocabulary, Flanker  
154 Inhibitory Control and Attention, List Sorting, Dimensional Change Card Sort, Pattern  
155 Comparison, Picture Sequence Memory, Oral Reading Recognition. All NIH Toolbox  
156 tests were administered via an iPad with the test administrator in an isolated room.

157            Three summary scores included the Total Composite, the Fluid Composite, which  
158 included the Dimensional Change Card Sort, Flanker Inhibitory Control and Attention,  
159 Picture Sequence Memory, List Sorting, and Pattern Comparison, and the Crystallized  
160 Composite, which included the Picture Vocabulary and Oral Reading Recognition tests.

161            The cognitive-motor assessment included three tasks: single-task speaking while  
162 seated (ST<sub>S</sub>), single-task gait without speaking (ST<sub>G</sub>), and walking while speaking (DT).  
163 By design, continuous measures of both cognitive and motor tasks with equivalent  
164 resolution were selected to gain insight into dual-task effects on both cognitive and  
165 motor function. Participants were given a list of pre-designed topics and asked to select  
166 five topics from a list of 20 that they felt most comfortable discussing (e.g., favorite  
167 childhood memory). Participants were instructed that they should select topics that they  
168 could talk about for one minute continuously and that it did not matter what they said,  
169 just that they kept talking the entire time. Next, participants were seated and given one



170 prompt from the five selected topics (e.g., “Tell me about your favorite childhood  
171 memory”). A timer was used to ensure all participants spoke for one minute. Following  
172 the seated speech task (ST<sub>S</sub>), participants were instructed to walk back and forth  
173 between two lines spaced 20 meters apart at their comfortable pace for one minute  
174 (ST<sub>G</sub>). Following both ST conditions, participants completed a DT condition where they  
175 were assigned a new topic and instructed to repeat the walking task while talking about  
176 their given topic. Participants were not provided explicit instructions to prioritize either  
177 task.

178         Audio from each task was recorded using a lapel microphone and wireless  
179 transmitter (WMX-1, Movo Photo, Los Angeles CA, USA) connected to an iPad (8<sup>th</sup>  
180 generation, Apple Inc.) such that audio and video were recorded simultaneously.  
181 Standard spatiotemporal measures of gait speed and cadence were obtained for each  
182 walking trial using inertial sensors (APDM Inc., Portland OR, USA) placed bilaterally on  
183 the feet, lumbar spine, forehead, and sternum. Inertial sensors recorded tri-axial  
184 acceleration and angular velocity, which was processed using validated, automated  
185 algorithms (Mobility Lab v2, APDM Inc. Portland OR, USA) to obtain gait speed and  
186 cadence<sup>35</sup>. To account for differences in stature, gait speed was normalized by dividing  
187 the speed by participant height.

### 188         Data Analysis

189         All audio recordings were trimmed to exactly one minute long, removing all noise  
190 before and after the cues to start and stop talking. Audio files were then imported into  
191 MATLAB and processed using a custom script to identify speech and measure silent  
192 pause frequency and duration for each participant. The audio signal for each recording

193 was filtered using a 4<sup>th</sup> order bandpass filter with a passband of 100 Hz to 5000 Hz to  
194 isolate frequencies and their harmonics associated with speech. A moving variance  
195 window of 50 ms was then applied to the signal, and a ‘speech threshold’ equal to the  
196 40<sup>th</sup> percentile of the windowed variance was used to identify the presence or absence  
197 of speech, based on agreement with manual identification of silent pauses. Durations  
198 longer than 250 ms without speech (windowed variance > 40<sup>th</sup> percentile) were  
199 designated as silent speech pauses. The 250 ms threshold was selected based on prior  
200 work that indicated an increase in speech pauses were related to increased cognitive  
201 demand during walking<sup>29,30,36–38</sup>. The total duration of silent pauses was selected as the  
202 primary outcome. Secondary outcomes included the total number of pauses.

### 203 Statistical Analysis

204 To investigate the effect of concussion on extemporaneous speech production  
205 during ST and DT walking, we implemented linear mixed effect regression models for  
206 each speech and gait outcome. Models included fixed effects for group, task (single vs.  
207 dual), and the group\*task interaction. Models were adjusted for covariates of age and  
208 sex. Random intercepts by subject were included to account for within-subject  
209 correlations across tasks. Between-group effect sizes were calculated for both single-  
210 and DT conditions using Hedges’s  $g$ <sup>39</sup>. A significance level of 0.05 was used for each  
211 analysis.

212 To explore the associations between self-reported symptoms and neurocognition  
213 on the DT effects of walking and talking, Pearson correlation coefficients were  
214 computed between the primary outcomes (total pause duration and gait speed) and the  
215 symptom categories (affective, cognitive, somatosensory, vestibular, and total) of the

216 Neurobehavioral Symptom Inventory (NSI) within the concussion group and fully  
217 adjusted t-scores from the NIH Toolbox Cognition battery from groups separately. In  
218 addition to primary outcomes during ST and DT conditions, DT costs (DTC) were  
219 calculated for both speech (DTC<sub>S</sub>) and gait (DTC<sub>G</sub>) outcomes using  $DTC =$   
220  $\frac{DT-ST}{ST} \times 100\%$ , where ST and DT represent the ST and DT outcome. To ensure all  
221 outcomes remained in the same direction (i.e., more negative value indicates worse  
222 performance), all speech outcomes were multiplied by a negative sign for DTC<sub>S</sub>  
223 calculations. Correlations were computed between self-reported symptoms and all ST,  
224 DT, and DTC outcomes. As this was an exploratory analysis, correlation coefficients  
225 were interpreted using guidelines proposed by Rowntree (Rowntree, 1981): values less  
226 than 0.2 indicate a very weak relationship, 0.20 to .39 indicate a weak relationship, 0.40  
227 to 0.69 indicates a moderate relationship, 0.70 to 0.89 indicates a strong relationship,  
228 and 0.90 or greater indicates a very strong relationship. All analyses were conducted in  
229 MATLAB using the Statistics and Machine Learning Toolbox (r2020a, The MathWorks,  
230 Inc.).  
231



256 moderately associated with all other symptom subscores ( $\rho = 0.55-0.66$ , Table 3). The  
257 strength of the associations between symptoms and total pause duration decreased  
258 during walking; weak-to-moderate associations were observed for DT total pause  
259 duration and DTCs (Table 3) for all symptom scores. Conversely, ST<sub>G</sub> and DT gait  
260 speed was strongly associated with vestibular symptoms ( $\rho = -0.75$  and  $-0.78$   
261 respectively, see Table 3 and Figure 2), and moderately associated with all other  
262 symptom subscores ( $\rho = -0.50$  and  $-0.63$ ).

263 Table 3 Here

264 Figure 2 Here

265 There were no strong associations between any computerized cognitive score  
266 and total pause duration or gait speed overall or in any group (Table 4). In the control  
267 group, the total duration of speech pauses in ST<sub>S</sub> and DT conditions had moderate  
268 inverse associations with Pattern Comparison Processing Speed in controls ( $\rho = -0.47$   
269 and  $-0.56$ , respectively), where better cognitive scores were associated with shorter  
270 total durations of speech pauses. However, ST and DT total pause duration and Pattern  
271 Comparison Processing Speed had only weak inverse associations with one another in  
272 people with concussion ( $\rho = -0.32$  and  $-0.28$ , respectively); instead, ST<sub>G</sub> speed was  
273 moderately associated with Pattern Comparison Processing Speed in those with  
274 concussion ( $\rho = 0.43$ ). There were numerous moderate associations between ST<sub>G</sub> and  
275 DT gait speed with all Fluid Cognition cognitive scores, where better cognitive scores  
276 were associated with faster ST<sub>G</sub> and DT gait speed ( $\rho = 0.42 - 0.48$ , Table 4). Some  
277 notable differences in the specific pairs of moderate associations were observed  
278 between groups: the concussion group exhibited moderate associations between ST<sub>G</sub>

279 and DT gait speed with the Dimensional Change Card Sort ( $\rho = 0.45$  and  $0.48$ ,  
280 respectively) while ST<sub>G</sub> and DT gait speed in controls exhibited very weak associations  
281 with Dimensional Change Card Sort ( $\rho = -0.01$  and  $-0.14$ , respectively).

282 Table 4 Here

283 **DISCUSSION**

284 Our study investigated the effects of concussion on extemporaneous speech  
285 production during ST (seated) and DT (walking) paradigms. In agreement with prior  
286 work, we observed extemporaneous speech elicited DT costs on walking, indicated by  
287 slower gait speeds and slower cadence. Our results did not fully support our hypothesis  
288 about group differences; individuals with a concussion did not uniformly exhibit longer  
289 pauses during extemporaneous speech and did not demonstrate significantly larger DT  
290 costs in speech compared to controls, although moderate effect sizes warrant further  
291 study. However, our results indicated that those with a concussion had larger DTC in  
292 gait speed than controls. Eliciting greater DTC to gait using an ecologically relevant  
293 cognitive DT complements well-established deleterious effects of concussion on DT gait  
294 using standardized cognitive tasks<sup>2,4-7,9,10,13,16</sup>. Further, variable association of DTC  
295 with differing symptom domains suggests that the effects will be worst in symptomatic  
296 individuals, and more importantly that DT deficits are heterogeneous across people with  
297 concussion and may be dependent on symptomology.

298 While we did not observe any significant group differences in the total duration of  
299 pauses or the number of pauses during speech, the effect sizes observed complement  
300 prior work suggesting concussion-related symptoms may increase pauses during  
301 speech. Prior work in acutely concussed athletes (0-6 days post-concussion) observed  
302 increased pause and time fill (i.e., filler word) errors after concussion compared to pre-  
303 injury baseline performance<sup>30</sup>. The difference between these two studies may be  
304 attributed to different task demands, symptomology, and time since injury. While prior  
305 work used a visual scanning task (describing a picture), the talking task here did not

306 require visual processing. It is possible that speech deficits when describing a picture  
307 are compounded by ocular-motor deficits that affect visual scanning. Additionally,  
308 participants ranged from 8-14 days post-concussion with varying symptom burdens in  
309 the present study. A relatively longer time since injury and the heterogeneous symptom  
310 burden at the time of testing revealed a strong relationship between self-reported  
311 symptoms, particularly vestibular-related symptoms, and the total duration of pauses  
312 during extemporaneous speech. While the mechanisms underlying the association  
313 between vestibular symptoms and ST speech, ST gait, and DT gait remain unclear, we  
314 speculate that such results originate from attention / rumination on symptoms. Since the  
315 strongest associations were with vestibular symptom scores, rather than cognitive  
316 scores, we posit that individuals may have been allocating attention to minimize head  
317 motion / rotation to avoid exacerbating vestibular symptoms<sup>40</sup>. Dedicating attention to  
318 limiting aversive vestibular stimulation would effectively add a third motor task and  
319 another implicit goal to the walking and talking tasks. Further, while we failed to detect  
320 statistically significant differences for total speech pause duration, we observed notable  
321 between-group effect sizes, especially in DT walking conditions, supporting differences  
322 in attention allocation after concussion that warrant further study. Given the associations  
323 between vestibular symptoms and our outcomes, future studies should work to  
324 understand how concussion affects talking while standing as an intermediary postural  
325 challenge to measure cognitive-motor status as a function of vestibular demands (e.g.  
326 seated and speaking, standing and speaking, walking and speaking).

327         While we did not observe a significant group difference in DTC in speech pauses  
328 (DTC<sub>S</sub>), we did detect a difference in DTC to walking (DTC<sub>G</sub>), indicated by the



329 group\*task interaction, for gait speed. Increased DTC<sub>G</sub> have been well-documented  
330 after concussion, especially in symptomatic individuals within 14 days post-injury <sup>5</sup>.  
331 Previous work used standardized cognitive tasks such as reciting months of the year in  
332 reverse, spelling a five-letter word backwards, or serial subtraction, but such tasks lack  
333 ecological relevance to daily life. Both cognitive and motor task complexity affect the  
334 ability of dual-tasking to differentiate those with concussion from healthy controls <sup>41,42</sup>,  
335 with generally more difficult tasks eliciting larger concussion-related dual-task deficits.  
336 Our results extend prior studies and demonstrate that even during ecologically relevant  
337 cognitive tasks such as extemporaneous speech, individuals with concussion  
338 demonstrate greater motor deficits during a DT compared to healthy controls. However,  
339 it remains unclear whether dual-task performance would degrade if extemporaneous  
340 speech were paired with more complex motor tasks (e.g., obstacle crossing, turning,  
341 etc.). Motor complexity drives task prioritization and the combination of cognitive  
342 demand plus added motor challenge could elicit different results <sup>15,18</sup>. Plummer D'Amato  
343 and colleagues (2011) used an obstacle crossing task and revealed that a clock-  
344 monitoring task elicited less dual-task costs than spontaneous speech in impaired older  
345 adults. Therefore, pairing extemporaneous speech with ecologically relevant gait tasks  
346 of increasing motor complexity might further elucidate the impact of concussion-related  
347 dual-task deficits on daily life.

348         Despite the lack of group differences in speech-related outcomes, our results  
349 indicate that an extemporaneous speech task elicits a strong dual-task effect overall, in  
350 agreement with prior work <sup>18,23,43</sup>. Both concussion and control groups exhibited greater  
351 speech pause durations, slower gait speeds, and slower cadences during the DT

352 compared to the ST condition. Thus, the walking-while-talking task successfully elicited  
353 mutual interference on both extemporaneous speech and gait in the majority of  
354 participants, regardless of group (see Figure 1). The consistent effect of walking while  
355 talking further supports its use as an ecologically relevant cognitive task to assess dual-  
356 task gait in young adults.

357         Results indicating different relationships between cognitive tests and speech  
358 pauses or gait speed suggest people with concussion may recruit compensatory  
359 cognitive networks during dual-tasking. Here, we observed ST and DT gait speed had  
360 moderate, positive relationships with measures of processing speed, cognitive flexibility,  
361 and attention, but this relationship was only observed in people with concussion.  
362 Associations between gait speeds and cognitive functions mirror those where ST and  
363 DT gait speed was associated with measures of associative learning and attention in  
364 people with persisting symptoms after concussion, but not in healthy controls<sup>44</sup>. Our  
365 results support prior work suggesting that attention and processing speed is more  
366 important for gait in people with concussion compared to controls<sup>11,41,45</sup>, similar to  
367 compensatory recruitment in other mobility-impaired populations<sup>46,47</sup>. Finally, pauses  
368 during an extemporaneous speech task were moderately associated with cognitive  
369 processing speed in controls, supporting its validity as a marker of cognitive function.

### 370 **Limitations**

371         The primary limitations of this work include the relatively modest sample size and  
372 the reliance on silent speech pauses to infer cognitive task performance. Despite the  
373 sample size, the consistent chronicity (8-14 days post-injury) and symptomatic nature of  
374 the participants is a strength of the study. The reliance on silent speech pauses was

375 grounded in prior work using walking and talking tasks. However, it is possible that  
376 examining the syntactic or lexical complexity of the speech may better elucidate  
377 differences between groups or tasks compared to only using pauses. Finally,  
378 participants were only tested cross-sectionally at a single point in time. Without a  
379 baseline from the concussion participants, we cannot determine if their current speech  
380 performance was directly caused by the concussion.

### 381 **Conclusions**

382 Extemporaneous speech offers an ecologically relevant cognitive DT that elicited  
383 larger gait DTC in people after a concussion. While we did not observe significant group  
384 differences in speech performance, effect sizes and strong associations between  
385 vestibular-related symptoms, total pause duration, and gait speed suggest DTC are  
386 variable based on a person's post-concussion symptomology. Further studies should  
387 probe compensatory recruitment of different cognitive processes during DT walking  
388 after a concussion, and how such effects may differ based on symptomology. Overall,  
389 these results suggest that DT deficits after concussion may have deleterious effects on  
390 tasks that are essential to daily life.

391

392 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

393 The authors would like to especially thank Cecilia Martindale, Sarah Hill, Dr. Ryan Pelo,  
394 Gabrielle Gaudette, Emma Nilsson Read, and Elizabeth Hovenden for their assistance  
395 with participant recruitment and data collection on this project.

396

397 **DISCLOSURES / CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

398 None

399

400 **FUNDING**

401 Research reported in this publication was supported by the Eunice Kennedy Shriver  
402 National Institute of Child Health & Human Development of the National Institutes of  
403 Health under Award Number R21HD100897 (PI: Fino). The content is solely the  
404 responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the  
405 National Institutes of Health.

406 **REFERENCES**

- 407 1. Manaseer TS, Gross DP, Dennett L, Schneider K, Whittaker JL. Gait Deviations  
408 Associated With Concussion: A Systematic Review. *Clin J Sport Med Off J Can*  
409 *Acad Sport Med*. 2020;30 Suppl 1:S11-S28. doi:10.1097/JSM.0000000000000537
- 410 2. Parker TM, Osternig LR, VAN Donkelaar P, Chou LS. Gait stability following  
411 concussion. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2006;38(6):1032-1040.  
412 doi:10.1249/01.mss.0000222828.56982.a4
- 413 3. Wood TA, Hsieh KL, An R, Ballard RA, Sosnoff JJ. Balance and Gait Alterations  
414 Observed More Than 2 Weeks After Concussion: A Systematic Review and Meta-  
415 Analysis. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil*. 2019;98(7):566-576.  
416 doi:10.1097/PHM.0000000000001152
- 417 4. Catena RD, van Donkelaar P, Chou LS. Altered balance control following  
418 concussion is better detected with an attention test during gait. *Gait Posture*.  
419 2007;25(3):406-411. doi:10.1016/j.gaitpost.2006.05.006
- 420 5. Fino PC, Parrington L, Pitt W, et al. Detecting gait abnormalities after concussion or  
421 mild traumatic brain injury: A systematic review of single-task, dual-task, and  
422 complex gait. *Gait Posture*. 2018;62:157-166. doi:10.1016/j.gaitpost.2018.03.021
- 423 6. Martini DN, Sabin MJ, DePesa SA, et al. The chronic effects of concussion on gait.  
424 *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2011;92(4):585-589. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2010.11.029
- 425 7. Parker TM, Osternig LR, Lee HJ, Donkelaar P van, Chou LS. The effect of divided  
426 attention on gait stability following concussion. *Clin Biomech*. 2005;20(4):389-395.  
427 doi:10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2004.12.004
- 428 8. Jain D, Graci V, Beam ME, et al. Neurophysiological and gait outcomes during a  
429 dual-task gait assessment in concussed adolescents. *Clin Biomech Bristol Avon*.  
430 2023;109:106090. doi:10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2023.106090
- 431 9. Martini DN, Mancini M, Antonellis P, et al. Prefrontal Cortex Activity During Gait in  
432 People With Persistent Symptoms After Concussion. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*.  
433 2024;38(5):364-372. doi:10.1177/15459683241240423
- 434 10. Büttner F, Howell DR, Ardern CL, et al. Concussed athletes walk slower than non-  
435 concussed athletes during cognitive-motor dual-task assessments but not during  
436 single-task assessments 2 months after sports concussion: a systematic review and  
437 meta-analysis using individual participant data. *Br J Sports Med*. 2020;54(2):94-101.  
438 doi:10.1136/bjsports-2018-100164
- 439 11. Howell DR, Kirkwood MW, Provance A, Iverson GL, Meehan WP. Using concurrent  
440 gait and cognitive assessments to identify impairments after concussion: a narrative  
441 review. *Concussion Lond Engl*. 2018;3(1):CNC54. doi:10.2217/cnc-2017-0014

- 442 12. Bryk KN, Passalugo S, Chou LS, et al. Dual task cost in adults with persistent  
443 concussion symptoms. *Gait Posture*. 2023;101:120-123.  
444 doi:10.1016/j.gaitpost.2023.02.008
- 445 13. Martini DN, Parrington L, Stuart S, Fino PC, King LA. Gait Performance in People  
446 with Symptomatic, Chronic Mild Traumatic Brain Injury. *J Neurotrauma*.  
447 2021;38(2):218-224. doi:10.1089/neu.2020.6986
- 448 14. Yogev-Seligmann G, Hausdorff JM, Giladi N. The role of executive function and  
449 attention in gait. *Mov Disord Off J Mov Disord Soc*. 2008;23(3):329-342; quiz 472.  
450 doi:10.1002/mds.21720
- 451 15. Yogev-Seligmann G, Hausdorff JM, Giladi N. Do we always prioritize balance when  
452 walking? Towards an integrated model of task prioritization. *Mov Disord Off J Mov*  
453 *Disord Soc*. 2012;27(6):765-770. doi:10.1002/mds.24963
- 454 16. Kleiner M, Wong L, Dubé A, Wnuk K, Hunter SW, Graham LJ. Dual-Task  
455 Assessment Protocols in Concussion Assessment: A Systematic Literature Review.  
456 *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*. 2018;48(2):87-103. doi:10.2519/jospt.2018.7432
- 457 17. Dromey C, Jarvis E, Sondrup S, Nissen S, Foreman KB, Dibble LE. Bidirectional  
458 interference between speech and postural stability in individuals with Parkinson's  
459 disease. *Int J Speech Lang Pathol*. 2010;12(5):446-454.  
460 doi:10.3109/17549507.2010.485649
- 461 18. Raffegeau TE, Haddad JM, Huber JE, Rietdyk S. Walking while talking: Young  
462 adults flexibly allocate resources between speech and gait. *Gait Posture*.  
463 2018;64:59-62. doi:10.1016/j.gaitpost.2018.05.029
- 464 19. Miyake A, Friedman NP. The Nature and Organization of Individual Differences in  
465 Executive Functions: Four General Conclusions. *Curr Dir Psychol Sci*. 2012;21(1):8-  
466 14. doi:10.1177/0963721411429458
- 467 20. Lovett MC. A Strategy-Based Interpretation of Stroop. *Cogn Sci*. 2005;29(3):493-  
468 524. doi:10.1207/s15516709cog0000\_24
- 469 21. Kubose TT, Bock K, Dell GS, Garnsey SM, Kramer AF, Mayhugh J. The Effects of  
470 Speech Production and Speech Comprehension on Simulated Driving Performance.  
471 *Appl Cogn Psychol*. 2006;20(1):43-63. doi:10.1002/acp.1164
- 472 22. Lee AMC, Cerisano S, Humphreys KR, Watter S. Talking is harder than listening:  
473 The time course of dual-task costs during naturalistic conversation. *Can J Exp*  
474 *Psychol Rev Can Psychol Exp*. 2017;71(2):111-119. doi:10.1037/cep0000114
- 475 23. Raffegeau TE, Brinkerhoff SA, Clark M, et al. Walking (and talking) the plank: dual-  
476 task performance costs in a virtual balance-threatening environment. *Exp Brain Res*.  
477 2024;242(5):1237-1250. doi:10.1007/s00221-024-06807-w

- 478 24. Mitchell HL, Hoit JD, Watson PJ. Cognitive-linguistic demands and speech  
479 breathing. *J Speech Hear Res.* 1996;39(1):93-104. doi:10.1044/jshr.3901.93
- 480 25. Love LR, Starbuck HB, Christensen JM. Pause Frequency in Fluent and Nonfluent  
481 Speech. *J Acoust Soc Am.* 1972;51(1A\_Supplement):122. doi:10.1121/1.1981351
- 482 26. Krivokapić J, Styler W, Parrell B. Pause postures: The relationship between  
483 articulation and cognitive processes during pauses. *J Phon.* 2020;79:100953.  
484 doi:10.1016/j.wocn.2019.100953
- 485 27. Lee J, Huber J, Jenkins J, Fredrick J. Language planning and pauses in story retell:  
486 Evidence from aging and Parkinson's disease. *J Commun Disord.* 2019;79:1-10.  
487 doi:10.1016/j.jcomdis.2019.02.004
- 488 28. Huber JE, Darling M. Effect of Parkinson's disease on the production of structured  
489 and unstructured speaking tasks: respiratory physiologic and linguistic  
490 considerations. *J Speech Lang Hear Res JSLHR.* 2011;54(1):33-46.  
491 doi:10.1044/1092-4388(2010/09-0184)
- 492 29. Wang YT, Kent RD, Duffy JR, Thomas JE. Dysarthria associated with traumatic  
493 brain injury: speaking rate and emphatic stress. *J Commun Disord.* 2005;38(3):231-  
494 260. doi:10.1016/j.jcomdis.2004.12.001
- 495 30. Patel S, Grabowski C, Dayalu V, Testa AJ. Speech error rates after a sports-related  
496 concussion. *Front Psychol.* 2023;14:1135441. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1135441
- 497 31. Wall C, Powell D, Young F, et al. A deep learning-based approach to diagnose mild  
498 traumatic brain injury using audio classification. *PloS One.* 2022;17(9):e0274395.  
499 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0274395
- 500 32. Oldham J, Lent B, Peretiatko S, Dec K. Predictors of Speech Language Pathology  
501 Referral After Pediatric Concussion Using a Speech Language Checklist. *Am J Phys*  
502 *Med Rehabil.* 2023;102(10):919-922. doi:10.1097/PHM.0000000000002293
- 503 33. Cicerone KD, Kalmar K. Persistent postconcussion syndrome: The structure of  
504 subjective complaints after mild traumatic brain injury. *J Head Trauma Rehabil.*  
505 1995;10(3):1.
- 506 34. Hodes RJ, Insel TR, Landis SC. The NIH Toolbox. *Neurology.* 2013;80(11 Suppl  
507 3):S1. doi:10.1212/WNL.0b013e3182872e90
- 508 35. Morris R, Stuart S, McBarron G, Fino PC, Mancini M, Curtze C. Validity of  
509 MobilityLab (version 2) for gait assessment in young adults, older adults and  
510 Parkinson's disease. *Physiol Meas.* 2019;40(9):095003. doi:10.1088/1361-  
511 6579/ab4023



- 512 36. Bosker HR, Pinget AF, Quené H, Sanders T, de Jong NH. What makes speech  
513 sound fluent? The contributions of pauses, speed and repairs. *Lang Test*.  
514 2013;30(2):159-175. doi:10.1177/0265532212455394
- 515 37. Khawaja MA, Ruiz N, Chen F. Think before you talk: an empirical study of  
516 relationship between speech pauses and cognitive load. In: *Proceedings of the 20th*  
517 *Australasian Conference on Computer-Human Interaction: Designing for Habitus*  
518 *and Habitat*. OZCHI '08. Association for Computing Machinery; 2008:335-338.  
519 doi:10.1145/1517744.1517814
- 520 38. Noufi C, Lammert A, Mehta D, et al. Vocal Biomarker Assessment Following  
521 Pediatric Traumatic Brain Injury: A Retrospective Cohort Study. In: ; 2019:3895-  
522 3899. doi:10.21437/Interspeech.2019-1200
- 523 39. Hedges LV, Olkin I. *Statistical Methods for Meta-Analysis*. Academic Press; 1985.
- 524 40. Loyd BJ, Dibble LE, Weightman MM, et al. Volitional Head Movement Deficits and  
525 Alterations in Gait Speed Following Mild Traumatic Brain Injury. *J Head Trauma*  
526 *Rehabil*. 2023;38(3):E223-E232. doi:10.1097/HTR.0000000000000831
- 527 41. Howell DR, Osternig LR, Koester MC, Chou LS. The effect of cognitive task  
528 complexity on gait stability in adolescents following concussion. *Exp Brain Res*.  
529 2014;232(6):1773-1782. doi:10.1007/s00221-014-3869-1
- 530 42. Howell DR, Myer GD, Grooms D, Diekfuss J, Yuan W, Meehan WP. Examining  
531 Motor Tasks of Differing Complexity After Concussion in Adolescents. *Arch Phys*  
532 *Med Rehabil*. 2019;100(4):613-619. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2018.07.441
- 533 43. Plummer-D'Amato P, Altmann LJP, Reilly K. Dual-task effects of spontaneous  
534 speech and executive function on gait in aging: exaggerated effects in slow walkers.  
535 *Gait Posture*. 2011;33(2):233-237. doi:10.1016/j.gaitpost.2010.11.011
- 536 44. Antonellis P, Weightman MM, Fino PC, et al. Relation Between Cognitive  
537 Assessment and Clinical Physical Performance Measures After Mild Traumatic  
538 Brain Injury. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2024;105(5):868-875.  
539 doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2023.10.013
- 540 45. Cicerone KD. Attention deficits and dual task demands after mild traumatic brain  
541 injury. *Brain Inj*. 1996;10(2):79-89. doi:10.1080/026990596124566
- 542 46. Martin KL, Blizzard L, Wood AG, et al. Cognitive function, gait, and gait variability in  
543 older people: a population-based study. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*.  
544 2013;68(6):726-732. doi:10.1093/gerona/gls224
- 545 47. Morris R, Lord S, Bunce J, Burn D, Rochester L. Gait and cognition: Mapping the  
546 global and discrete relationships in ageing and neurodegenerative disease.  
547 *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*. 2016;64:326-345. doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2016.02.012



## Talking while Walking After Concussion

548

549


550

551

552


553

554 **FIGURE CAPTIONS**



555  
556 **Figure 1.** Scatter histograms depicting the dual-task (DT) effect for speech (y-axis) and  
557 gait (x-axis) as a percentage of single-task (ST) performance for participants with  
558 concussion (orange) and healthy controls (blue). Dual-task effects were calculated as  
559  $DTC = \frac{(DT-ST)}{ST} * 100\%$ . Kernel density plots are presented adjacent to the scatter plot  
560 indicating the distributions of each group.  
561

562



563

564 **Figure 2.** Scatter plots depicting the association between the vestibular subscore on the

565 Neurobehavioral Symptom Inventory with total pause duration and normalized gait

566 speed during single- and dual-task conditions in participants with a concussion.

567 **TABLES**  
568

<b>Table 1.</b> Demographic information about subjects in each group. All quantities are reported as mean (SD) unless otherwise noted.		
	Concussion	Control
N (M/F)*	19 (15/4)	18 (9/9)
Age (yrs)	31.4 (9.3)	27.7 (7.1)
Height (cm)	178.1 (8.7)	174.1 (12.8)
Mass (kg)	80.5 (19.7)	70.4 (12.4)
Race*		
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0
Asian	1	3
Black or African American	0	0
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	0
White	17	14
More than One Race	0	1
Time since concussion (days)	8.6 (3.1)	N/A
NSI Total Symptom Score	31.6 (21.6)	5.8 (6.0)
NSI-Affective	9.2 (7.8)	3.2 (3.9)
NSI-Vestibular	4.6 (3.3)	0.1 (0.3)
NSI-Cognitive	7.4 (4.4)	0.8 (1.2)
NSI-Somatosensory	9.2 (6.3)	1.4 (1.3)
* reported as count + reported as median (range) NSI = Neurobehavioral Symptom Inventory		

569

570

**Table 2.** Descriptive statistics of speech and gait outcomes by group and task (single-task, ST and dual-task, DT). P-values are from the linear mixed models and represented contrast-coded effects when adjusting for sex and age. Gait speed was normalized to the participant height.

	Concussion		Control		P-value (Group)	P-value (Task)	P-value (Group*Task)	Between-Group Effect sizes Hedges' <i>g</i>	
	ST	DT	ST	DT				ST	DT
<b>Speech Fluency</b>									
Total Pause Duration (s)	14.2 (2.6)	16.1 (2.7)	13.0 (3.1)	14.5 (3.1)	0.424	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.941	0.42	0.57
Pauses / min	24.2 (2.9)	26.1 (5.1)	23.9 (4.5)	23.6 (3.1)	0.394	0.353	0.316	0.06	0.57
<b>Gait</b>									
Normalized Gait Speed (m/s/m)	0.65 (0.08)	0.58 (0.09)	0.73 (0.12)	0.69 (0.12)	<b>0.010</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.032</b>	0.74	1.00
Cadence (steps / min)	106.5 (8.3)	102.4 (8.5)	111.7 (8.8)	108.7 (8.4)	0.133	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	0.099	0.60	0.73

571

572

573

**Table 3.** Correlation coefficients between self-reported symptoms on the Neurobehavioral Symptom Inventory (NSI) and primary speech (total pause duration) and gait (gait speed) outcomes within the concussion group for single-task (ST), dual-task (DT) and dual-task costs on speech (DTC<sub>S</sub>) and gait (DTC<sub>G</sub>). Bold coefficients indicate strong associations (0.7 – 0.89).

		NSI- Vestibular	NSI- Cognitive	NSI- Somatosensory	NSI- Affective	NSI-Total
Total Pause Duration (s)	ST	<b>0.72</b>	0.55	0.66	0.60	0.66
	DT	0.37	0.26	0.41	0.30	0.37
	DTC <sub>S</sub>	-0.48	-0.40	-0.36	-0.41	-0.40
Normalized Gait Speed (m/s/m)	ST	<b>-0.75</b>	-0.50	-0.58	-0.57	-0.63
	DT	<b>-0.78</b>	-0.53	-0.55	-0.57	-0.62
	DTC <sub>G</sub>	-0.45	-0.34	-0.21	-0.29	-0.30

574

575

Talking while Walking After Concussion

576

**Table 4.** Correlation coefficients between computerized neurocognitive scores on the NIH Toolbox Cognition and primary speech (total pause duration) and gait (gait speed) outcomes within the concussion and control groups, separately, for single-task (ST), dual-task (DT) and dual-task costs on speech (DTC<sub>s</sub>) and gait (DTC<sub>G</sub>). All scores from the NIH Toolbox Cognition are fully corrected t-scores. Bold coefficients indicate moderate associations (0.4-0.69)

			Dimensional Change Card Sort	Flanker Inhibitory Control and Attention	Picture Sequence Memory	List Sorting	Pattern Comparison	Picture Vocabulary	Oral Reading Recognition	Fluid Composite	Crystallized Composite	Total Composite
Concussion	Total Pause Duration (s)	ST	-0.34	-0.26	0.09	-0.01	-0.32	-0.01	0.22	-0.23	0.18	-0.18
		DT	-0.16	-0.09	0.02	0.21	-0.28	-0.05	0.02	-0.11	-0.02	-0.15
		DTC <sub>s</sub>	0.25	0.24	-0.16	0.35	0.06	-0.09	-0.29	0.16	-0.30	0.04
	Gait Speed (m/s/m)	ST	<b>0.45</b>	0.38	-0.06	-0.01	<b>0.43</b>	0.27	-0.07	0.35	0.02	0.34
		DT	<b>0.48</b>	0.30	-0.01	0.20	0.37	0.30	-0.05	0.37	0.03	0.36
		DTC <sub>G</sub>	0.25	-0.04	0.06	<b>0.47</b>	0.00	0.16	-0.01	0.17	0.03	0.16
Control	Total Pause Duration (s)	ST	0.00	-0.09	0.12	0.04	<b>-0.47</b>	-0.03	-0.08	-0.11	-0.06	-0.11
		DT	-0.01	-0.07	0.13	-0.18	<b>-0.56</b>	-0.03	0.11	-0.19	0.06	-0.13
		DTC <sub>s</sub>	-0.07	0.03	0.02	-0.27	-0.10	-0.03	0.27	-0.11	0.15	-0.03
	Gait Speed (m/s/m)	ST	-0.01	0.37	0.29	<b>0.42</b>	0.14	-0.01	0.39	0.34	0.23	0.38
		DT	-0.14	0.20	0.20	0.31	0.08	-0.02	0.32	0.19	0.17	0.24
		DTC <sub>G</sub>	-0.34	<b>-0.45</b>	-0.26	-0.25	-0.18	-0.05	-0.16	<b>-0.41</b>	-0.14	-0.38
Combined	Total Pause Duration (s)	ST	-0.23	-0.21	0.05	0.02	<b>-0.40</b>	-0.09	0.04	-0.22	-0.02	-0.21
		DT	-0.20	-0.15	0.01	-0.02	<b>-0.43</b>	-0.13	0.02	-0.23	-0.07	-0.23
		DTC <sub>s</sub>	0.03	0.09	-0.07	-0.04	-0.03	-0.07	-0.01	-0.02	-0.06	-0.03
	Gait Speed (m/s/m)	ST	0.33	<b>0.44</b>	0.24	0.25	0.31	0.21	0.24	<b>0.43</b>	0.26	<b>0.47</b>
		DT	0.34	0.35	0.23	0.23	0.28	0.24	0.22	0.39	0.26	<b>0.44</b>
		DTC <sub>G</sub>	0.19	-0.08	0.02	0.04	0.01	0.19	0.01	0.05	0.11	0.09