

1 A novel approach to identify the fingerprint of stroke gait  
2 using deep unsupervised learning

3

4 \*Sina David<sup>a,b</sup>, Sonja Georgievska<sup>d</sup>, Cunliang Geng<sup>d</sup>, Yang Liu<sup>d</sup>, Michiel Punt<sup>c,d</sup>

5 <sup>a</sup> Department of Human Movement Sciences, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The  
6 Netherlands

7 <sup>b</sup> Amsterdam Movement Sciences, Rehabilitation and Development, Amsterdam, The  
8 Netherlands, Maibergdreef 9, 1105 AZ Amsterdam, The Netherlands

9 <sup>c</sup> Research Group Lifestyle and Health, Hogeschool Utrecht, Utrecht, The Netherlands

10 <sup>d</sup> Netherlands eScience Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

11 \* Corresponding author: Sina David, [s.david@vu.nl](mailto:s.david@vu.nl)

12

# 13 A novel approach to identify the fingerprint of stroke gait 14 using deep unsupervised learning

15

16 \*Sina David<sup>a,b</sup>, Sonja Georgievska<sup>d</sup>, Cunliang Geng<sup>d</sup>, Yang Liu<sup>d</sup>, Michiel Punt<sup>c,d</sup>

17 <sup>a</sup> Department of Human Movement Sciences, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The  
18 Netherlands

19 <sup>b</sup> Amsterdam Movement Sciences, Rehabilitation and Development, Amsterdam, The  
20 Netherlands, Maibergdreef 9, 1105 AZ Amsterdam, The Netherlands

21 <sup>c</sup> Research Group Lifestyle and Health, Hogeschool Utrecht, Utrecht, The Netherlands

22 <sup>d</sup> Netherlands eScience Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

23 \* Corresponding author: Sina David, [s.david@vu.nl](mailto:s.david@vu.nl)

## 24 **Abstract**

25 Background: The gait pattern results from a complex interaction of several body parts,  
26 orchestrated by the (central) nervous system that controls the active and passive systems of the  
27 body. An impairment of gait due to a stroke results in a decline in quality of life and  
28 independence. Setting up efficient gait training requires an objective and wholesome  
29 assessment of the patient's movement pattern to target individual gait alterations. However,  
30 current assessment tools are limited in their ability to capture the complexity of the movement  
31 and the amount of data acquired during gait analysis.

32 Aims: In this study, we explore the potential of variational autoencoders (VAE) to learn and  
33 recognise different gait patterns within both, pathologic and healthy gait.

34 Methods: For this purpose, the lower-limb joint angles of 71 participants (29 stroke survivors,  
35 42 healthy controls) were used to train and test a VAE.

36 Results: The good reconstruction results (range  $r = 0.52 - 0.91$ , average normalized RMSE  
37  $23.36 \% \pm 4.13$ ) indicate that VAEs extract meaningful information from the gait pattern.  
38 Furthermore, the extracted latent features are sensitive enough to distinguish between the gait  
39 patterns of stroke survivors and a healthy cohort ( $p < 0.001$ ).

40 Conclusions: The presented approach allows the assessment of gait data in an objective and  
41 wholesome manner, thereby integrating the individual characteristics of each person's gait,  
42 making it a suitable tool for monitoring the progress of rehabilitation efforts.

43 Keywords: gait; artificial intelligence; pattern recognition; unsupervised deep learning; joint  
44 angles, stroke, pathologic

## 45 **Introduction**

46 Human gait is highly individual just like a fingerprint. The fact that one can recognize a known  
47 person from a far distance is utilized for gait biometrics, identifying the individual solely by  
48 their gait pattern [1–3].

49 A gait pattern results from a complex interaction of several body parts, orchestrated by the  
50 (central) nervous system. Therefore, pathologic gait is an expression of altered motor function.  
51 Individuals who have had a stroke exhibit different gait patterns than healthy individuals [4].  
52 Their gait pattern is usually not optimal resulting in an increased energy cost [5,6] and a  
53 reduction of stability of walking [7] when compared to healthy elderly.

54 As walking is the most frequently executed form of locomotion, this impacts participation and  
55 quality of life [8]. Therefore, regaining gait quality is one of the main goals of stroke  
56 rehabilitation [9].

57 To assess gait quality and potential therapy success, researchers and clinicians seek to identify  
58 meaningful information in the gait pattern using instrumented 3D gait analysis to collect  
59 predefined segment motions [10]. The result is a high dimensional data set where each time  
60 series non-linearly interacts with others resulting in a problem of high complexity.[11] One  
61 common solution to reduce complexity is the preselection of variables of interest. However,  
62 this selection is dependent on the background and experience which might result in partly  
63 subjective interpretations of the formerly objective gait data [12,13]. Moreover, this approach  
64 could result in the neglect of key features by focusing on predefined outcome measures and  
65 does not reflect the complexity of human gait where the emphasis should be put on the  
66 interaction of different variables [11,14].

67 Lately, advanced data processing and analysis methods were developed to tackle the  
68 complexity problem. Both supervised and unsupervised methods showed promise to classify  
69 different stroke gait patterns. Algorithms such as support vector machines, principal component  
70 analysis, and decision trees have been studied for their ability to extract clinically relevant  
71 information from gait data [15–20], distinguish patient [21,22] or identify the representatives  
72 of individual gait [23].

73 These approaches although objective, are often in need of conventional gait features for  
74 training and clustering algorithms are not capable of reflecting the individual characteristics of  
75 a patient's gait pattern [14] or neglect that the differences between gait patterns are continuous.  
76 To this end, we propose a novel method for analysing 3D gait data. We opt for a wholesome  
77 quantitative approach that incorporates all collected information utilizing the interactions  
78 between multiple joints and motion planes, extracts characteristics of the input data and  
79 therefore objectively reduces the number of dimensions.

80 Variational autoencoders (VAE) are a type of generative model that can learn a compressed,  
81 probabilistic representation of high-dimensional data, such as gait patterns [24]. This

82 representation, known as a latent space, can capture the essential features of the data and enable  
83 efficient analysis. A VAE extracts a defined number of latent features by encoding the input  
84 data as a Gaussian distribution over the latent space, rather than only as a vector [24]. This  
85 allows for regularization of the latent space in addition to minimization of the reconstruction  
86 error. Therefore, VAEs are an unsupervised method to generate regular latent representations  
87 of the input data [25].

88 The aim of this paper is twofold. First, we propose a new method based on a VAE to learn gait  
89 patterns, assessed via the network's reconstruction accuracy. Second, we aim to do a first  
90 exploration of to what extent the VAE's latent space can be used to represent an individual's  
91 gait fingerprint. We do so in two ways, (1) by exploring whether the gait pattern of each  
92 participant forms clusters distinguishable from another and (2) by analysing whether the  
93 location of the participant within the latent space is meaningful, expressed through different  
94 gait patterns. Further, we hypothesized that the area covered by a stroke survivor's data within  
95 the latent space is larger than the areas of the healthy controls, due to the higher expected  
96 variability contained in stroke gait [26].

## 97 **Methods**

98 **Participants.** For this study, two data sets were combined. The first sample contains the  
99 kinematic data of 29 stroke survivors which was derived from the [27]. Participants were  
100 included when they were at least six months post-stroke, aged > 40 years, had a Mini-Mental-  
101 State-Examination (MMSE) score of at least 24 to follow instructions [28] and had a minimum  
102 functional ambulation category (FAC) of 3. The second sample contains the kinematic data of  
103 42 healthy participants and was derived from the publicly available data set of Fukuchi et al.  
104 (approval number: CAAE: 53063315.7.0000.5594) [29]. All participants were capable of  
105 walking without handrail support during the data collection period. Further participant  
106 characteristics are displayed in Table 1.

107 **Set-up and Procedure.** Both data sets were collected during treadmill walking. The 3D  
108 trajectories of 47 retroreflective markers of the stroke survivors were captured with ten infrared  
109 cameras (100 Hz, Vicon, Vicon Motion Systems, Oxford) [27]. As for the healthy cohort, their  
110 kinematic data using the 3D trajectories of 26 retroreflective markers were collected with 12  
111 infrared cameras (150 Hz, Raptor-4; Motion Analysis Corporation, Santa Rosa, CA, USA)  
112 [29]. Further information on the experimental setup we refer to the cited articles.

113 **Data pre-processing.** The marker trajectories of the stroke survivors were mirrored if their  
114 paretic limb was on the left side. This ensured that the side of the impairment was not affecting  
115 the outcome of the VAE model.

116 Joint angles in 3D were calculated according to the ISB recommendations [30] for the hip, knee  
117 and ankle joints of both limbs. To ensure that the joint angles were not affected by either within-  
118 study sample or between-study sample differences in marker placement, the 3D joint angles of  
119 the reference pose were subtracted from the dynamic joint angles.

120 All data were resampled towards 50 Hz as the two data sets were acquired at different sampling  
121 frequencies.

122 The right foot contact events were determined using the coordinate-based treadmill algorithm  
123 [31] and were used to segment each participant's measurement into multiple epochs of four  
124 seconds (200 frames) of data. Each epoch had a maximum of 50% overlap with the previous  
125 epoch depending on the moment of foot contact. The different joint angle trajectories were  
126 min-max normalized before training the model.

127 **Training and test set:** In total, 5876 periods of 4 seconds formed the input data for the VAE.  
128 Each period contains the time series of the six lower-limb joints angles in three dimensions,  
129 thus an 18 by 200 input matrix. The data was split into a train and test set subject-wise to avoid

130 data leakage, whereby the test set consisted of 2300 periods (35%). A detailed description of  
131 the train and test split is presented in Table 1.

132 **Models and validation.** A one-dimensional convolutional variational autoencoder (VAE) [32]  
133 was used as an unsupervised deep-learning technique to analyse the gait patterns. The encoder  
134 contains 3 convolutional layers, a flatten and dense layer. The information from the encoder is  
135 represented in a defined number of latent variables, each containing a mean and standard  
136 deviation. The decoder was used to reconstruct the input based on the latent space. The decoder  
137 is symmetrical to the (supplementary material, S1). To approximate the intractable posterior, a  
138 Gaussian distribution (which consists of two trainable parameters  $\mu$  and  $\sigma$ ) is chosen as the  
139 variational inference scheme. The VAE was trained to minimize the summed reconstruction  
140 error between the input and reconstructed signal and the Kullback-Leibler divergence loss [33].  
141 Minimizing the latter at the same time as the reconstruction error allows for a “smooth” and  
142 “regular” latent space, in which two similar vectors decode to similar signals, and in which a  
143 sampled vector decodes to a realistic signal. The model was trained on the training data set  
144 using 40 epochs. Model validation was based on the test split. The training process was stopped  
145 in case the validation loss did not improve anymore for at least 25 repetitions.

146 To minimize the number of latent features while preserving maximum information we  
147 developed models using 2, 3, 4 and 6 latent features. The final decision on the number of latent  
148 features was based on a minimal number of latent features without a significant reduction in  
149 model performances.

150 These were evaluated by determining how well the VAE was able to reconstruct the walking  
151 pattern. We calculated the root mean squared error (RMSE), RMSE normalized to the joint’s  
152 range of motion (nRMSE) and Pearson correlation coefficient  $r$  between the original and

153 reconstructed time series. Additionally, to validate the regularity of the latent space, the time  
154 series of three randomly chosen points of the latent space were reconstructed (Figure S3).

### 155 **Identification of the individual's gait fingerprint**

156 Finally, the size of the area covered by each individual within the latent space was assessed.  
157 Therefore the centre of their latent features and the Euclidean distance  $\varepsilon$  of the data points to  
158 the participant's centre were calculated:

$$159 \quad \varepsilon_{LF1,LF2,LF3} = \sqrt{\sum (centre_{LF1,LF2,LF3} - latentfeature_{LF1,LF2,LF3})^2} / N$$

160 Where  $\varepsilon$  is the root mean of the sum of the squared distances normalized to the number of gait  
161 trails (N) per participant.

162 The size of each individual's data cloud within the latent space was then expressed as the  
163 volume calculated from the three Euclidean distances:

$$164 \quad \varepsilon_{LF1} \times \varepsilon_{LF2} \times \varepsilon_{LF3}$$

165 To compare the data cloud sizes between the stroke survivors and the healthy controls, the  
166 Mann-Whitney-U t-test was performed.

167 All procedures follow the EQUATOR network Recommendations for Reporting Machine  
168 Learning Analyses in Clinical Research [34].

## 169 **Results**

### 170 **Optimising the number of latent features**

171 While the reconstruction error was not significantly different when decoding the latent space  
172 from two, three, four or six latent features, the correlation coefficient between the  
173 reconstructed and the original signal improved when increasing the number of latent features  
174 from two to three without further improvements when increasing the number of latent



175 features even more (*Figure 1A*). All results presented in the following are therefore based on  
176 three latent features.

### 177 **Evaluation of VAE model**

178 To assess the ability of the network to reduce the gait data to three latent features with minimal  
179 loss of relevant information, the time series of the training and the test set were reconstructed  
180 from the latent features. The error between the reconstructed and the raw input data is displayed  
181 in *Figure 1B*. The RMSE and the nRMSE for the test and the train set showed comparable  
182 results (RMSE:  $6.03^\circ \pm 2.71$  and  $5.76^\circ \pm 2.68$ , nRMSE:  $23.02\% \pm 4.05$  and  $23.36\% \pm 4.13$ ).  
183 Due to the higher variability relative to the range of motion, the nRMSE was higher for the  
184 non-sagittal movements while the RMSE was highest for the knee flexion angle ( $11.70^\circ \pm 0.23$   
185 averaged over training and test set).

186 The correlation between the reconstructed and the raw data showed a high coefficient (range  
187  $0.70 - 0.91$ ) for the sagittal knee and all motion planes of the left and right hip joint angles  
188 (*Figure 1B*). A moderate relationship (range  $0.52 - 0.69$ ) for all other joints and planes except  
189 the right frontal knee joint angle which only showed a low to moderate correlation ( $r = 0.40$ ).

190 The reconstruction accuracy was not systematically different between the healthy cohort and  
191 the stroke survivors (*Figure S2*), which indicated that the network is capable of learning both  
192 healthy and pathologic, potentially more inconsistent gait patterns. There was no difference  
193 between the left and right leg's joint angles (*Figure 1B*). Further, the reconstruction of three  
194 arbitrary points from the latent space resulted in realistic gait patterns (*Figure S3*).

### 195 **Gait fingerprint**

196 The quality of the network was assessed in its ability to preserve relevant information which  
197 resulted in the successful discrimination between the gait pattern of stroke survivors and the

198 healthy controls. Figure 2A displays the encoded data of the test set. The stroke survivors  
199 manifest into three main groups, located on the outer rim of the healthy controls.  
200 The covered space of the included stroke patients, represented as the 3D Euclidean distance  
201 from the participant's centre is significantly higher than those of the healthy controls for all  
202 latent features except LF2 ( $p < 0.001$ , see Table 2). Also, the stroke survivors' volume of the data  
203 cloud was significantly larger ( $p < 0.001$ ), expressing that stroke gait pattern is less uniform.

## 204 **Discussion**

205 This study aimed to determine if a VAE can describe gait data with a limited number of features  
206 while preserving all relevant information, free from theory-driven constraints. It was  
207 hypothesized that a VAE is capable of recognizing gait patterns of healthy and pathologic gait.  
208 For this purpose, the data set of stroke survivors and a healthy population were merged, and  
209 their 3D lower-limb joint angles were used as the input for the VAE, which encoded the input  
210 into three latent features. These latent features were used as the 3D coordinates to map each of  
211 the gait segments in the 3D space to further analyse the specific location within this space.

212 The most promising result of this study was that the VAE recognizes distinct characteristics of  
213 gait patterns and locates them in different regions of the latent space (Figure 3). Most  
214 participants covered only a small area, which indicates that the network indeed recognized a  
215 participant-specific gait pattern distinguishing the individual from others. However, some  
216 participants covered larger areas, expressed also in larger Euclidean distances from the centre  
217 of their data (Figure 2B-D) and an overall larger data cloud. The stroke survivors' areas were  
218 significantly larger, which is not a surprising result, as they are reported to have less uniform  
219 gait patterns than healthy individuals [16]. We propose that the centre and the area covered by  
220 one's data cloud within the latent space as an easy-to-report measure of this gait pattern to be  
221 monitored throughout gait training. Variability in gait is a well-discussed parameter, usually

222 assessed using entropy, standard deviation or similar approaches. While the standard deviation  
223 as a linear measure is not a good representation of a non-linear data set [11], entropy is, but its  
224 interpretation is difficult. Both, the location and the size of the area are clear representatives of  
225 the individual's gait fingerprint. The size of the data cloud is the direct outcome of the  
226 variability, and a decrease represents a more uniform gait pattern. However, using the size of  
227 a patient's data cloud as a variability measure is just a side product of the VAE. A network that  
228 is capable of learning complex information, can be utilised in several ways, not just for  
229 variability estimation.

230 As all lower limb joint angles were used to train the VAE, the location of a single patient within  
231 the latent space represents wholesome information about the gait pattern. This location is not  
232 biased by any hypothesis, it is data-driven. Further, the transition of location is continuous,  
233 which is advantageous as also small changes in the gait pattern are likely to be recognized. This  
234 makes the use of VAEs superior to classification methods where the features are forced into  
235 groups which neglects the continuity of changes. This opens a new opportunity to assess the  
236 gait quality of a patient. Simply speaking, the location of the patient on the map relative to e.g.  
237 a healthy cohort can be used as a starting point for the rehabilitation process. By knowing the  
238 characteristics of a certain region of the map, the joint and plane of highest priority can be  
239 defined and prioritized during rehabilitation. During treatment, the patient can be monitored by  
240 presenting the new gait data to the VAE and tracking the location within the latent space. With  
241 this, the clinician's assessment of the rehabilitation can be supported in an objective, efficient  
242 and wholesome manner.

243 The quality of the used VAE was high enough to satisfyingly reduce the high dimensional gait  
244 data towards three latent features while still being able to distinguish between individuals. This  
245 is reflected by high Pearson correlation coefficients and low RMSE and nRMSE results.  
246 However, it has to be mentioned that the reconstruction of the non-sagittal plane joint angles

247 was less accurate than the sagittal plane movement. This is not a specific issue of VAEs but  
248 has also been reported for supervised learning algorithms – resulting from the combination of  
249 low movement amplitude and high movement variability [35–37]. Therefore, it is more  
250 difficult for any algorithm to learn the pattern. To extract individual gait patterns, high  
251 reconstruction accuracy is preferred, but the current accuracy is sufficient since the joint angles  
252 aren't used for decision-making. Increasing the dataset could further improve accuracy. The  
253 outer edge of the latent space had lower reconstruction accuracy than the centre, as it represents  
254 the gait patterns of the slowest and fastest walkers, trained on limited data. To extend the area  
255 of high accuracy, the network could be trained with more data from noisy conditions or more  
256 impaired gait patterns.

257 The latent space forms a spiral structure, contrary to the ideal of finding completely  
258 disentangled latent features where changes in one unit affect only one generative factor [38]. In  
259 this case, all three latent features together describe the data variation. It's noted that improving  
260 disentanglement often increases reconstruction loss [38,39]. Future research should explore  
261 whether a different balance between entanglement and reconstruction loss could enhance the  
262 research outcomes.

263 The presented results are explorative. To be applicable in clinical practice, it is necessary to  
264 increase the sample size of the training set especially with data coming from pathologic gait.  
265 Having data sets of patients that were collected in comparable environments was restricted in  
266 the past, however, this will change in the future. In recent years, the number of publicly  
267 available data sets increased. With many initiatives promoting open science, this process  
268 should become the new normal soon, enabling us to reach the aim of increasing sample size.

269 Optical motion capture data, like in this study, is often impractical in clinical settings due to  
270 high costs and time requirements. Future efforts will focus on using data from wearable sensors  
271 or 2D video cameras, which are more affordable and user-friendly.

## 272 **Conclusion**

273 The results demonstrate that deep unsupervised learning algorithms effectively assess  
274 individual movement patterns. VAEs can detect subtle gait differences, providing objective  
275 and data-driven evaluations of patient gait alterations. Representing complex data in a 3D map  
276 enables clinicians to assess gait without predefined assumptions, while monitoring extracted  
277 features helps track rehabilitation progress. This approach enhances clinical efficiency and  
278 improves patient outcomes through personalized therapy.

## 279 **Acknowledgement.**

280 The authors would like to thank the research group of Fukuchi et al. for making their data  
281 publicly available.

## 282 **Author contributions.**

283 SD wrote the manuscript and prepared the data for analysis and postprocessing of the results.  
284 MP collected the stroke data set, was responsible for generating the network architecture and  
285 edited the manuscript. SD and MP were responsible for interpreting the results. SG, CG and  
286 YL consulted and optimized the network architecture and edited the manuscript.

## 287 **Data availability statement.**

288 The initialized and trained weights together with the network code are available at:  
289 <https://github.com/SinaDavid/VAE>.

## 290 **Conflict of interest statement.**

291 All authors declare no financial or non-financial competing interests.

292

## 293 References

- 294 [1] W. Yu, H. Yu, Y. Huang, L. Wang, Generalized Inter-class Loss for Gait Recognition, (2022).  
295 <https://doi.org/10.1145/3503161.3548311>.
- 296 [2] D. Pinčić, D. Sušan, K. Lenac, Gait Recognition with Self-Supervised Learning of Gait Features  
297 Based on Vision Transformers, *Sensors* 22 (2022) 7140. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s22197140>.
- 298 [3] K.A. Duncanson, S. Thwaites, D. Booth, G. Hanly, W.S.P. Robertson, E. Abbasnejad, D. Thewlis,  
299 Deep Metric Learning for Scalable Gait-Based Person Re-Identification Using Force Platform  
300 Data, *Sensors* 23 (2023) 3392. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s23073392>.
- 301 [4] H.-S. Kim, S.-C. Chung, M.-H. Choi, S.-Y. Gim, W.-R. Kim, G.-R. Tack, D.-W. Lim, S.-K. Chun, J.-  
302 W. Kim, K.-R. Mun, Primary and secondary gait deviations of stroke survivors and their  
303 association with gait performance, *J Phys Ther Sci* 28 (2016) 2634–2640.  
304 <https://doi.org/10.1589/jpts.28.2634>.
- 305 [5] J.W. Gersten, W. Orr, External work of walking in hemiparetic patients., *Scand J Rehabil Med*  
306 3 (1971) 85–8.
- 307 [6] P.J. Corcoran, R.H. Jepsen, G.L. Brengelmann, B.C. Simons, Effects of plastic and metal leg  
308 braces on speed and energy cost of hemiparetic ambulation., *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 51  
309 (1970) 69–77.
- 310 [7] C.B. de Oliveira, Í.R.T. de Medeiros, N.A. Ferreira, M.E. Greters, A.B. Conforto, Balance control  
311 in hemiparetic stroke patients: main tools for evaluation., *J Rehabil Res Dev* 45 (2008).  
312 <https://doi.org/10.1682/JRRD.2007.09.0150>.
- 313 [8] J. Park, T.-H. Kim, The effects of balance and gait function on quality of life of stroke patients,  
314 *NeuroRehabilitation* 44 (2019) 37–41. <https://doi.org/10.3233/NRE-182467>.
- 315 [9] S. Nadeau, M. Betschart, F. Bethoux, Gait Analysis for Poststroke Rehabilitation, *Phys Med*  
316 *Rehabil Clin N Am* 24 (2013) 265–276. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmr.2012.11.007>.
- 317 [10] D. Levine, J. Richards, M.W. Whittle, Whittle’s gait analysis, Elsevier health sciences, 2012.
- 318 [11] R.T. Harbourne, N. Stergiou, Movement Variability and the Use of Nonlinear Tools: Principles  
319 to Guide Physical Therapist Practice, *Phys Ther* 89 (2009) 267–282.  
320 <https://doi.org/10.2522/ptj.20080130>.
- 321 [12] D.L. Skaggs, S.A. Rethlefsen, R.M. Kay, S.W. Dennis, R.A.K. Reynolds, V.T. Tolo, Variability in  
322 gait analysis interpretation, *Journal of Pediatric Orthopaedics* 20 (2000) 759–764.
- 323 [13] B. Toro, C. Nester, P. Farren, A review of observational gait assessment in clinical practice,  
324 *Physiother Theory Pract* 19 (2003) 137–149. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09593980307964>.
- 325 [14] D.M. Mohan, A.H. Khandoker, S.A. Wasti, S. Ismail Ibrahim Ismail Alali, H.F. Jelinek, K. Khalaf,  
326 Assessment Methods of Post-stroke Gait: A Scoping Review of Technology-Driven Approaches  
327 to Gait Characterization and Analysis, *Front Neurol* 12 (2021).  
328 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fneur.2021.650024>.

- 329 [15] H. Lau, K. Tong, H. Zhu, Support vector machine for classification of walking conditions of  
330 persons after stroke with dropped foot, *Hum Mov Sci* 28 (2009) 504–514.  
331 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.humov.2008.12.003>.
- 332 [16] M. Punt, S.M. Bruijn, K.S. van Schooten, M. Pijnappels, I.G. van de Port, H. Wittink, J.H. van  
333 Dieën, Characteristics of daily life gait in fall and non fall-prone stroke survivors and controls,  
334 *J Neuroeng Rehabil* 13 (2016) 67. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12984-016-0176-z>.
- 335 [17] C. Adans-Dester, N. Hankov, A. O'Brien, G. Vergara-Diaz, R. Black-Schaffer, R. Zafonte, J. Dy,  
336 S.I. Lee, P. Bonato, Enabling precision rehabilitation interventions using wearable sensors and  
337 machine learning to track motor recovery, *NPJ Digit Med* 3 (2020) 121.  
338 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-020-00328-w>.
- 339 [18] S. Sapienza, C. Adans-Dester, A. O'Brien, G. Vergara-Diaz, S. Lee, S. Patel, R. Black-Schaffer, R.  
340 Zafonte, P. Bonato, C. Meagher, A.-M. Hughes, J. Burridge, D. Demarchi, Using a Minimum Set  
341 of Wearable Sensors to Assess Quality of Movement in Stroke Survivors, in: 2017 IEEE/ACM  
342 International Conference on Connected Health: Applications, Systems and Engineering  
343 Technologies (CHASE), IEEE, 2017: pp. 284–285. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CHASE.2017.104>.
- 344 [19] K. Kaczmarczyk, A. Wit, M. Krawczyk, J. Zaborski, Gait classification in post-stroke patients  
345 using artificial neural networks, *Gait Posture* 30 (2009) 207–210.  
346 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2009.04.010>.
- 347 [20] S. Mulroy, J. Gronley, W. Weiss, C. Newsam, J. Perry, Use of cluster analysis for gait pattern  
348 classification of patients in the early and late recovery phases following stroke, *Gait Posture*  
349 18 (2003) 114–125. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0966-6362\(02\)00165-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0966-6362(02)00165-0).
- 350 [21] N. Razfar, R. Kashef, F. Mohammadi, Automatic Post-Stroke Severity Assessment Using Novel  
351 Unsupervised Consensus Learning for Wearable and Camera-Based Sensor Datasets, *Sensors*  
352 23 (2023) 5513. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s23125513>.
- 353 [22] P. Krondorfer, D. Slijepčević, F. Unglaube, A. Kranzl, C. Breiteneder, M. Zeppelzauer, B.  
354 Horsak, Deep learning-based similarity retrieval in clinical 3d gait analysis, *Gait Posture* 90  
355 (2021) 127–128.
- 356 [23] F. Horst, D. Slijepcevic, M. Simak, B. Horsak, W.I. Schöllhorn, M. Zeppelzauer, Modeling  
357 biological individuality using machine learning: A study on human gait, *Comput Struct  
358 Biotechnol J* 21 (2023) 3414–3423. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csbj.2023.06.009>.
- 359 [24] D.P. Kingma, M. Welling, An Introduction to Variational Autoencoders, *Foundations and  
360 Trends® in Machine Learning* 12 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1561/22000000056>.
- 361 [25] N. Simidjievski, C. Bodnar, I. Tariq, P. Scherer, H. Andres Terre, Z. Shams, M. Jamnik, P. Liò,  
362 Variational Autoencoders for Cancer Data Integration: Design Principles and Computational  
363 Practice, *Front Genet* 10 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fgene.2019.01205>.
- 364 [26] C.K. Balasubramanian, R.R. Neptune, S.A. Kautz, Variability in spatiotemporal step  
365 characteristics and its relationship to walking performance post-stroke, *Gait Posture* 29  
366 (2009) 408–414. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2008.10.061>.
- 367 [27] M. Punt, S.M. Bruijn, S. Roeles, I.G. van de Port, H. Wittink, J.H. van Dieën, Responses to gait  
368 perturbations in stroke survivors who prospectively experienced falls or no falls, *J Biomech* 55  
369 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2017.02.010>.



- 370 [28] M.F. Folstein, The Mini-Mental State Examination, *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 40 (1983) 812.  
371 <https://doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.1983.01790060110016>.
- 372 [29] C.A. Fukuchi, R.K. Fukuchi, M. Duarte, A public dataset of overground and treadmill walking  
373 kinematics and kinetics in healthy individuals., *PeerJ* 6 (2018).  
374 <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.4640>.
- 375 [30] G. Wu, S. Siegler, P. Allard, C. Kirtley, A. Leardini, D. Rosenbaum, M. Whittle, D.D. D'Lima, L.  
376 Cristofolini, H. Witte, O. Schmid, I. Stokes, ISB recommendation on definitions of joint  
377 coordinate system of various joints for the reporting of human joint motion—part I, *J*  
378 *Biomech* 35 (2002) 543–548. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9290\(01\)00222-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9290(01)00222-6).
- 379 [31] J.A. Zeni, J.G. Richards, J.S. Higginson, Two simple methods for determining gait events during  
380 treadmill and overground walking using kinematic data, *Gait Posture* 27 (2008) 710–714.  
381 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2007.07.007>.
- 382 [32] D.P. Kingma, M. Welling, *Auto-Encoding Variational Bayes*, (2013).
- 383 [33] I. Csiszar, I-Divergence Geometry of Probability Distributions and Minimization Problems, *The*  
384 *Annals of Probability* 3 (1975). <https://doi.org/10.1214/aop/1176996454>.
- 385 [34] L.M. Stevens, B.J. Mortazavi, R.C. Deo, L. Curtis, D.P. Kao, Recommendations for Reporting  
386 Machine Learning Analyses in Clinical Research, *Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes* 13 (2020).  
387 <https://doi.org/10.1161/CIRCOUTCOMES.120.006556>.
- 388 [35] M. Mundt, A. Koeppe, F. Bamer, S. David, B. Markert, Artificial Neural Networks in Motion  
389 Analysis-Applications of Unsupervised and Heuristic Feature Selection Techniques., *Sensors*  
390 (Basel) 20 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.3390/s20164581>.
- 391 [36] J. Lebleu, T. Gosseye, C. Detrembleur, P. Mahaudens, O. Cartiaux, M. Penta, Lower Limb  
392 Kinematics Using Inertial Sensors during Locomotion: Accuracy and Reproducibility of Joint  
393 Angle Calculations with Different Sensor-to-Segment Calibrations, *Sensors* 20 (2020) 715.  
394 <https://doi.org/10.3390/s20030715>.
- 395 [37] R.D. Gurchiek, N. Cheney, R.S. McGinnis, Estimating Biomechanical Time-Series with  
396 Wearable Sensors: A Systematic Review of Machine Learning Techniques, *Sensors* 19 (2019)  
397 5227. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s19235227>.
- 398 [38] M.D. Hoffman, M.J. Johnson, Elbo surgery: yet another way to carve up the variational  
399 evidence lower bound, in: *Workshop in Advances in Approximate Bayesian Inference, NIPS*,  
400 2016.
- 401 [39] I. Higgins, L. Matthey, A. Pal, C. Burgess, X. Glorot, M. Botvinick, S. Mohamed, A. Lerchner,  
402 beta-vae: Learning basic visual concepts with a constrained variational framework, (2016).  
403  
404

405 Table 1: Participant characteristics of the general data set and the test split: N = number of  
 406 participants, Age in years (mean  $\pm$  standard deviation (std)), height in cm (mean  $\pm$  std), weight in kg  
 407 (mean  $\pm$  std), sex and Gait speed in m/s (mean  $\pm$  std).

		<b>N</b>	<b>Age</b>	<b>Height</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Sex m/f</b>	<b>Gait speed</b>
<b>Summary Participants</b>	<b>Stroke survivors</b>	29	58.6 $\pm$ 11.9	172.0 $\pm$ 11.4	85.4 $\pm$ 18.3	13/18	0.7 $\pm$ 0.3
	<b>Healthy controls young</b>	24	27.6 $\pm$ 18.1	171.1 $\pm$ 10.9	68.4 $\pm$ 11.2	14/10	1.2 $\pm$ 0.4
	<b>Healthy controls older</b>	18	62.4 $\pm$ 7.4	161.9 $\pm$ 9.2	66.7 $\pm$ 10.0	10/8	1.1 $\pm$ 0.4
<b>Summary test split</b>	<b>Stroke survivors</b>	8	52.8 $\pm$ 10.4	168.1 $\pm$ 12.7	90.4 $\pm$ 24.4	7/1	0.9 $\pm$ 0.2
	<b>Healthy controls young</b>	10	28.4 $\pm$ 4.6	171.4 $\pm$ 11.1	68.8 $\pm$ 9.4	5/5	1.2 $\pm$ 0.4
	<b>Healthy controls older</b>	8	64.0 $\pm$ 9.6	164.7 $\pm$ 8.6	66.7 $\pm$ 9.5	6/2	1.2 $\pm$ 0.4


408

409

410 Table 2: Covered area of the individual data clouds within the latent space represented as the Euclidean  
411 distances  $\epsilon$  of the three latent features (LF) and the resultant size. The statistical outcome of the Mann-  
412 Whitney U test is represented by the p-value.


	Stroke survivors	Healthy controls	p-value
$\epsilon$ LF 1 (mean $\pm$ std)	4.48 $\pm$ 3.32	2.61 $\pm$ 1.49	<0.001
$\epsilon$ LF 2 (mean $\pm$ std)	6.09 $\pm$ 4.89	4.16 $\pm$ 3.15	0.059
$\epsilon$ LF 3 (mean $\pm$ std)	6.06 $\pm$ 4.08	3.02 $\pm$ 2.41	<0.001
Size of data cloud (mean $\pm$ std)	266.84 $\pm$ 375.71	48.97 $\pm$ 125.65	<0.001

413  
414  
415




416

417 Figure 1: Validation results: Pearson's  $r$ , RMSE and nRMSE for all input channels. Red boxplots refer  
 418 to the reconstruction accuracy of the test set. Blue boxplots refer to the reconstruction accuracy of the  
 419 train set. Circles = median, error bars = SD. Top row: comparison of model performance for two, three,  
 420 four and six latent features (LF), results were averaged over all joints and motion planes. Lower rows:  
 421 Model performance for three LF for the knee, hip and ankle joint angles in all motion planes. The light  
 422 blue and light red boxplots indicate the reconstruction accuracy of the right (for the stroke survivors –  
 423 the affected) leg, displaying only minor differences when compared to the left leg.



424

425 Figure 2: A: The stroke survivor's data (blue) is located on the outer rim of the healthy cohort's data  
426 (pink). For interactive figures visit:  
427 <https://mybinder.org/v2/gh/SinaDavid/VAE/main?urlpath=%2Ftree%2F>  
428 B-D: Representation of the  
429 Euclidean distances and centres of the clusters of each included individual, the black dots represent  
430 the centre of each participant, while the shaded areas represent the space covered by their data. The  
431 ellipsoids are based on the Euclidean distance in the 3 directions of the latent space. The areas,  
432 represented in blue/green are representing the stroke survivors, expressing the large variability within  
their gait pattern. The areas coloured in red/yellow represent the healthy controls.



436 joint angles of six selected participants from their three latent features. Blue: right leg, red: left leg.  
437 Participants S16, S19 and S21 are from the group of stroke survivors while the other three participants  
438 are from the healthy cohort.

439