Title: “**Fast gait speed and self-perceived balance as valid predictors and discriminators of independent community walking at 6 months post-stroke.**

Proofs and reprint requests should be addressed to:

Marlene Cristina Neves Rosa – corresponding author

Degree in Physiotherapy

Master in Motor Development

PhD student at University of Aveiro, *Department of Health Sciences (Secção Autónoma de Ciências da Saúde – SACS), University of Aveiro, Aveiro, Portugal*

E-mail: marlenerosa@ua.pt

Phone number: 351 968918915

Adress: Department of Health Sciences (Secção Autónoma de Ciências da Saúde – SACS), University of Aveiro, Campus Universitário de Santiago, Edifício III, 3810-193 Aveiro, Portugal.

Alda Marques

Degree in Physiotherapy

Master in Biokinetics of the Development

PhD in Physiotherapy.

Senior lecturer at the University of Aveiro. *School of Health Sciences, University of Aveiro, Portugal*

Member of the research unit UniFAI (Unidade de Investigação e Formação sobre Adultos e Idosos), *Portugal*

E-mail: amarques@ua.pt

Sara Demain

Degree in Physiotherapy

Master in Rehabilitation and Research

PhD in Rehabilitation

Lecturer at the Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Southampton.

E-mail: s.h.demain@soton.ac.uk

Cheryl D. Metcalf

Bachelor of Arts (Honours) in Computer Studies (B.A. (Hons.)

Master of Science in Evolutionary & Adaptive Systems (MSc)

Ph.D. in Biomechanics.

Lecturer at the Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Southampton.

E-mail: c.d.metcalf@soton.ac.uk

Abstract

Purpose: To determine the validity of walking speed, muscle strength, function of the hemiparetic lower limb and self-perceived balance to predict and discriminate independent community walkers (ICW) within the first 6 months post-stroke.

Methods: Inpatients with a first ischemic stroke (<3 months), able to walk, were evaluated (T0) and re-evaluated after 6 months post-stroke (T1). Comfortable, fast speed and the difference between fast and comfortable speed, muscle strength of knee flexors and extensors, sensory-motor function of the hemiparetic lower limb and self-perceived balance were assessed at T0 and T1. At T1, a self-reported question was used to discriminate ICW vs Dependent Community Walkers (DCW). ROC curve analysis was used to determine valid predictive (T0) and discriminative (T1) cut-offs of ICW.

Results: Only 25.7% of the 35 participants were ICW at T1. Valid predictive cut-offs at T0 were found for fast speed (≥0.42m/s) and Falls Efficacy Scale (<57). Valid discriminators were found at T1 for fast speed (>0.84m/s) and FES (<18.50).

Conclusion: Fast speed and self-perceived balance appear to be important characteristics of ICW at 6 months and may be useful early predictors of the potential for patients to achieve this. Further research is needed to ensure the precision of these functional cut-offs.

Implications for Rehabilitation:

1) Prognostic information is important for people with stroke and health services. The ability to walk faster than 0.42m/s and a fear of falling on the Falls Efficacy Scale of less than 57 in the first 3 months after stroke predict who will be an independent community walker at 6 months.

2) At 6 months after stroke, people who cannot walk faster than 0.84m/s or who have a have Falls Efficacy Scale score <18.5 are unlikely to be walking independently in the community.

3) Rehabilitation to promote independent walking should focus on walking speed, balance re-education and strategies to reduce fear of falling.

Background

Stroke is a major cause of disability worldwide [1, 2]. For many patients, improving walking ability after a stroke is one of the most important goals [3], that is only accomplished when they are able to walk independently in the community [3, 4].

Community walking (CW) has been defined as the ability to confidently walk in outdoor terrains [5], enabling visits to the supermarket, shopping and banking and enabling participation in social events or recreation activities [3]. Based on this definition, several functional measures have been used to reflect the dimensions of CW, in particular distance and temporal components and postural stability [6]. Walking speed has been considered a key outcome associated with CW [7] based on the assumption that subjects who cannot walk fast enough to safely cross the road or perform activities such as shopping with adequate speed will avoid walking in these out-of-home contexts [8]. However, using walking speed as a proxy measure for CW has been criticised, in part because there is a lack of consensus about the required speed to walk independently in the community after a stroke [8]. Therefore, other functional measures, such as balance have been considered relevant for describing the CW [9, 10], as it could capture complementary aspects of this ability, providing information on the maintenance of postural stability while walking around physical obstacles [9].

Muscle strength and motor function of the hemiparetic lower limb have also been considered important components of functional walking capacity in the clinical context [11, 12], but no studies have explored their relevance for discriminating different dependency levels of CW post-stroke. Theoretically, it may be possible to identify cut-off values for various functional components of walking which may have the potential to predict and discriminate different dependency levels of CW.

The aim of this study was to determine the potential of functional measures such as walking speed, muscle strength, function of the hemiparetic lower limb and self-perceived balance to predict and discriminate independent walkers in community within the first 6 months post-stroke.

Methods

2.1. Design and Participants

A diagnostic study was conducted in four hospitals of the central region of Portugal. The study received full approval from the Institutional Ethics Committees of each hospital. Inpatients with stroke were included if they (i) had a first ischemic stroke within the previous 3 months; (ii) were able to walk 5 meters without a walking device but with human assistance, if needed; (iii) scored less than 34 on the Fugl-Meyer leg sub-scale indicating a lower limb sensory-motor impairment and (iv) had no previous history of severe cardiovascular diseases [13]. Subjects were excluded if they had (i) involvement of the brainstem or cerebellum structures and (ii) a score less than 27 in the Mini-Mental State Examination, indicative of cognitive impairment [14]. Before data collection, more detailed information about the study was provided and written informed consent was obtained. Forty subjects fulfilled the inclusion criteria and all agreed to participate in the study. Participants were then evaluated (T0) and re-evaluated at 6 months post-stroke onset in their ambulatory setting (T1).

2.2. Measures and Procedures

Sociodemographic and anthropometric data (age, gender, body mass index) and clinical diagnosis [15] (partial anterior circulation syndrome - PACS; posterior circulation syndrome - POCS; and lacunar syndromes - LACS) were obtained to characterise the sample.

Walking speed, muscle strength, sensory-motor function of the hemiparetic lower limb and self-perceived balance were assessed at T0 and T1.

Walking speed is an easy and reliable measure of walking function and a highly recommended tool for monitoring the progress of hemiplegic gait [16]. Walking at comfortable and fast speeds provides complementary information on walking function after stroke [17, 18]. Subjects with a significant difference between comfortable and fast speeds, have greater potential to adapt to different modes of locomotion and, consequently, are more likely to be able to walk in the community. Walking speed was assessed with the 5-meters walk test (5mWT), a shortened variation of the 10-meters walk test [17] widely used in acute stroke patients to minimize participant fatigue [19]. Tape was placed on the floor, following the standard procedures [19]. Subjects performed three trials at their comfortable speed, with a 5-minute interval between each trial and then repeated the same procedures at their fastest speed.

Muscle strength was measured in the knee flexors and extensors of the hemiparetic lower limb. A lack of knee muscle strength has been associated with reduced gait stability after a stroke [20, 21]. Maximal isometric contractions values were recorded using a hand held dynamometer (Microfet, Hoogan Health Industries, Draper, UT USA) following standard procedures [11, 22, 23]. Three trials were performed for each muscle group, with 30 to 60-seconds interval between each trial.

Sensory-motor function of the hemiparetic lower limb was assessed using the leg sub-score of the Fulg-Meyer scale. This scale is a well-designed, feasible and efficient clinical method for measuring sensory-motor stroke recovery [24]. The leg sub-score is a numerical scoring system for measurement of reflexes, joint range of motion, coordination and speed. Each item is scored on a 3-point ordinal scale: 0=cannot perform; 1= perform partially and 2= perform fully. A maximum score of 34 can be reached [25].

Self-perceived balance was assessed using the Falls Efficacy Scale (FES) [26], which measures the fear of falling while performing common daily activities. After a stroke, the fear of falling is a common cause of dependence and decline in social participation. The FES, a valid and reliable measure of self-perceived balance in subjects with stroke [27, 28], is a 10-item self-report questionnaire describing common daily activities, each rated from 1 (no fear of falling) to 10 (fear of falling). A subject with no fear of falling scores a minimum of 10; a maximum score of 100, means a substantial fear of falling.

The ability to walk in the community was assessed at T1 using a self-reported question about difficulties in walking out of home after the stroke. Five responses were provided: (1) have no difficulty in walking in the community and do not require physical assistance or supervision; (2) mild difficulty in walking in the community, requiring supervision to walk far away from home; (3) moderate difficulty, needing supervision to walk near and far away from the home; (4) severe difficulty in walking in the community, always requiring physical assistance from another person; (5) does not walk outside of the home. Subjects who responded to the first category were categorized as “Independent Community Walkers (ICW)”; those responding with categories 2- 5 were categorized as “Non-Independent Community Walkers (NICW)”.

2.3. Statistical Analysis

Data analyses were performed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS, Version 19). A significance level of 0.05 was used for all statistical tests.

Medians and associated confidence interval at 95%were calculated for each functional measure for ICW and NICW groups. Mann-Whitney tests were performed to explore significant differences between groups at T0, at T1 and in their extent of recovery, considering median differences between T1 and T0. Data from functional measures were used at T0 to determine functional predictors and at T1 to determine discriminative functional characteristics of ICW.

A receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve analysis was performed, the area under the curve (AUC: fair:0.50 to 0.75; good:0.75 to 0.92; very good: 0.92 to 0.97; and excellent:0.97 to 1.00, probability [29]), sensitivity (true positive rate) and specificity (false negative rate) values and the percentage of agreement (the number of agreement scores divided by the total number of scores; minimum acceptable is of 80% [30]) were calculated to determine optimal cut-offs for functional components. An optimal cut-off is considered to be the one that maximizes the sum of sensitivity and specificity (participants that were DCW and are misclassified as ICW), assuming the highest sensitivity as the most important factor (as the focus was on the ICW identification). The cut-off values obtained were used to stratify subjects by dichotomous variables (i.e., 0="walking speed below the cut-off" or 1="walking speed above the cut-off).

3. Results

3.1. Sample characteristics

Forty subjects with stroke (27 men) were assessed at T0 however, 5 participants dropped out at T1 due to: another stroke episode (n=2); hip fracture (n=1) and no reasons specified (n=2). Thirty-five (23 men) subjects with stroke (mean post-stroke onset of 45.5±22.1 days at T0) completed the study. On average, subjects with stroke were 69.3±11.2 years old and had a mean body mass index of 25.5±3.2kg/m^2. Nineteen (54%) subjects were affected on the right side and 16 (46%) on the left side. The stroke event was classified as PACS for 15 subjects (43%), POCS for 4 subjects (11%) and LACS for 16 subjects (46%). Socio-demographic, anthropometric and clinical data of subjects with stroke are presented in Table 1.

[Insert Table 1]

Based on the self-administered question that distinguishes 5 levels of CW, 25.7% (n=9) of the subjects had no difficulty in walking in the community, 28.6% (n=10) required supervision to walk far away from home, 22.9% (n=8) needed supervision to walk near or far away from home, 14.3% (n=5) always required physical assistance to walk outside of the home and 8.6% (n=3) could not walk in the community. Subjects allocated to the first level were classified as ICW (25.7%) and the others were classified as DCW (74.3%).

Results from functional measures of ICW and DCW at T0, at T1 and median differences between T1 and T0 are presented in Table 2.

Subjects identified as ICW presented with significantly higher comfortable walking speed (p=0.005), higher fast speed (p=0.003), larger difference between fast and comfortable speed (p=0.0004), higher strength of knee extensors (p=0.016) and lower scores on the FES scale (p=0.002) at T0 than DCW. At T1, ICW presented with significantly higher fast speed (p=0.001), larger difference between fast and comfortable speed (p=0.010) and significantly lower scores on the FES scale (p=0.001) than DCW. Differences between groups in the extent of recovery from T0 to T1 (median differences) were borderline significant (p=0.067) for the difference between fast and comfortable speed.

[Insert Table 2]

3.2. Functional predictors of independent walkers in the community.

Table 3 presents cut-offs, AUC, sensitivity and specificity values and the percentage of agreement between dichotomous functional measures at T0 and the subsequent classification into ICW or DCW (T1).

Valid cut-offs, with a good probability (AUC between 0.75 and 0.92) of accurately predicting ICW subjects at an early stage post-stroke (T0) were found for fast walking speed (AUC=0.83; p=0.004) and for the FES scale (AUC=0.83; p=0.003). A cut-off of >0.42m/s for fast speed correctly allocated 8 ICW and 20 NICW and misclassified 8 subjects as ICW who were DCW (80% agreement). A cut-off for FES scale <57 allocated correctly 8 ICW and 20 DCW and misclassified 6 subjects as DCW and 1 subject as ICW (80% agreement).

[Insert Table 3]

3.2. Functional discriminators of independent walkers in the community.

Table 4 presents cut-offs, AUC, sensitivity and specificity values and the percentage of agreement between dichotomous functional measures (T1) and the classification into ICW or DCW (T1). Valid discriminative characteristics of ICW after a stroke were found for fast speed (AUC=0.95; p=0.001) and for FES scale (AUC=0.90; p=0.001). A cut-off of >0.84m/s for fast speed revealed a very good probability (AUC between 0.92 and 0.97) to properly classify ICW´s. This cut-off misclassified only 3 DCW that in fact were ICW (91.40 % agreement). A cut-off of <18.50 for the FES scale revealed a good probability of correctly classifying ICW´s (AUC between 0.75 and 0.92). Using this cut-off, only 5 subjects who were ICW were incorrectly classified as DCW (85.71% agreement).

[Insert Table 4]

Discussion

The main findings of this study were that fast speed and self-perceived balance were valid predictors (<3 months post-stroke) and functional discriminative characteristics of ICW at 6 months post-stroke. These findings confirm the importance of walking speed for CW demonstrated in previous research. However, our findings are novel in identifying the importance of self-perceived balance as a predictor and characteristic of independent CW.

From a total of 35 subjects included, only 9(25.7%) became ICW. In previous studies 20% to 67% of subjects became ICW, after 9 to 48 months post-stroke [31, 32]. The variability found in these percentages might be a result of differences in the sample characteristics (e.g. degree of functional impairment), in the time post stroke when ICW were assessed or in the classification of CW. For example, some authors consider limited walkers ("independent in at least one moderate community activity ... ") as ICW [32], whereas this study and that of Lafuente et al. [31] used more stringent definitions e.g. an ICW is a " patient that could walk to stores, friends or activities in the vicinity without physical assistance or supervision".

In the present study, fast speed >0.42m/s and FES scale scores <57 (at <3 months post-stroke) were valid predictors of ICW at 6 months. No other studies have conducted longitudinal research which enables the prediction of CW ability at 6 months post-stroke, based on parameters measured in the first 3 months. However, the predictive ability of functional measures have been tested in other periods of early rehabilitation. Uitman et al. [33] found a cut-off >0.86m/s for comfortable speed, from inpatients (Functional Ambulation Categories ≥3) at discharge from a rehabilitation setting, as a valid predictor for ICW at approximately 9 months post-stroke. In addition, Bland et al. [34] found a score of >20 for Berg Balance Scale at a rehabilitation centre admission, as predictive of ICW at discharge 1 to2 months post-stroke [34]. These previous results revealed a tendency for walking speed and measures of balance to predict ICW, which reinforce our results. There is, however, a noteworthy difference between these results and those of the present study regarding the cut-offs for walking speed. Contrary to the Uitman et al. [33] study, who found valid cut-offs for comfortable speed, the present study only demonstrated validity cut-offs for fast speed. The potential of fast walking training has been demonstrated by Lamontagne and Fung [17], in terms of improvement of kinematics and muscle activation patterns. Research to test whether training fast walking speed improves the number of ICW is needed.

Fast walking speeds >0.84m/s demonstrated validity to functionally characterise ICW at 6 months post-stroke. The measurement of fast speed is currently not routinely undertaken during the first months of recovery, because of fears of causing fatigue or increasing the risk of falls [35]. However, given the relevance of fast speed to CW ability, it is advisable that research exploring the impact of various gait interventions include assessment of fast walking speed.

Interestingly, the cut-off for fast speed identified in this study (>0.84m/s) was lower than the cut-off for comfortable speed proposed by Lord and Rochester [3], despite both studies being conducted in similar periods of stroke recovery. These differences might reflect the variability in the walking test used: a 10-meter walk test was used by Lord and Rochester [3] and a 5-meter walk test was used in the present study. It is known that walking speed achieved in longer distances tend to be higher, compared with speed attained over short distances [36]. Therefore an accepted, standardised measure of walking speed is crucial for the establishment of accurate cut-offs to identify ICW.

In the present study, ICW were characterised by FES scores <18.50 , i.e. a very low fear of falling. The FES scale assesses self-perceived balance [37], whereas other measures, such as Berg Balance scale or Dynamic Gait Index [33], assess balance using direct observation. Importantly, FES is a simple and quick test that may be usefully undertaken in busy clinical settings to predict future walking outcomes. Functional balance and self-perceived balance are not always correlated [37] and therefore these two types of measures should be combined in future studies to further understand the contribution of balance to a patient's reintegration in the community.

False positive and false negative cases demonstrated some percentage of error when using the cut-offs for predicting ICW. Furthermore, the magnitude of the error may change if applied to subjects with different characteristics from those included in this study. Thus, these cut-offs should be applied with caution and used to inform clinicians about likely outcomes and most relevant treatment plans rather than for deciding on therapy discharge. Regular follow-ups to monitor recovery and accurately identify misclassified cases are recommended.

Study limitations and recommendations for future research

A number of possible limitations must be considered, regarding the present results. First, it must be noted that the definition used to discriminate ICW from NICW is different from others previously employed [4, 32]. A standard definition of ICW is needed to allow a more equitable comparison of results across studies. Its development should account for the self-reported opinion of people with stroke and their caregivers about which criteria are really of importance for defining this activity.

In this study, subjects were assessed during the first 3 months post-stroke and followed up at 6 months post-stroke. Additional gains in walking ability may be possible beyond this time-point and the probability of more subjects becoming ICW might subsequently increase. Therefore, follow-up subjects at longer periods post stroke i.e. 12 months might provide information on the statistical robustness of the cut-offs, by increasing the numerical representation of ICW.

Data collection on muscle strength was limited to isometric strength of the knee extensors and knee flexors muscles of the hemiparetic lower limb. Further research should collect data on isometric muscle strength for other hip muscles and for leg muscles in both hemiparetic and non-hemiparetic lower limbs. Thus, more comprehensive information will be provided about the contribution of lower limb muscle strength to CW.

In this work, a small sample was recruited (N=35). The construction of a logistic regression model, which is a popular statistical procedure to control the influence of potential cofounders, was therefore not possible. To further ensure the precision of cut-offs, future studies should recruit larger samples and the influence of factors e.g., age, gender, time post-stroke at baseline or BMI should be considered in logistic regression models.

Conclusion

This research has confirmed that fast gait speed and self-perceived balance can predict and discriminate (with 80% accuracy) those able to walk independently in the community at 6 months post-stroke. The 5-mWT and the FES are quick, easy and cheap tests to perform in clinical practice and should be used routinely to guide goal setting and treatment planning and to reduce patient uncertainty about outcomes. Interventional research should target increasing walking speed, improving balance and reducing fear of falling to enhance community independence post-stroke.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to acknowledge all institutions involved and all patients for their participation in this research.

Declaration of interest

The authors report no declaration of interest. This work was funded by a PhD grant from Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia (FCT), Portugal (Ref. SFRH/BD/74927/2010).

1. Truelsen, T., B. Piechowski-Jóźwiak, R. Bonita, C. Mathers, J. Bogousslavsky, and G. Boysen, *Stroke incidence and prevalence in Europe: a review of available data.* European Journal of Neurology, 2006. **13**: p. 581-598.
2. Patel, M.D., K. Tilling, E. Lawrence, A.G. Rudd, C.D.A. Wolfe, and C. McKevitt, *Relationships between long-term stroke disability, handicap and health-related quality of life.* Age and Ageing, 2006. **35**: p. 273-279.
3. Lord, S.E., K. McPherson, H.K. McNaughton, L. Rochester, and M. Weatherall, *Community ambulation after stroke: how important and obtainable is it and what measures appear predictive?* Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, 2004. **85**: p. 234-239.
4. Lord, S.E. and L. Rochester, *Measurement of Community Ambulation After Stroke: Current Status and Future Developments.* Stroke, 2005. **36**: p. 1457-1461.
5. Jørgensen, H.S., H. Nakayama, H.O. Raaschou, and T.S. Olsen, *Recovery of walking function in stroke patients: The copenhagen stroke study.* Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, 1995. **76**: p. 27-32.
6. Patla A, S.-C.A., *Dimensions of mobility: defining the complexity and difficulty associated with community mobility.* J Aging Phys Act., 1999. **7**: p. 7-19.
7. Fulk, G.D., C. Reynolds, S. Mondal, and J.E. Deutsch, *Predicting Home and Community Walking Activity in People With Stroke.* Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, 2010. **91**: p. 1582-1586.
8. Ada, L., C. Dean, R. Lindley, and G. Lloyd, *Improving community ambulation after stroke: the AMBULATE trial.* BMC Neurology, 2009. **9**: p. 8.
9. Knorr S, Brouwer B, and G. SJ., *Validity of the Community Balance and Mobility Scale in community-dwelling persons after stroke.* Arch Phys Med Rehabil., 2010. **91**.
10. Powell, L.E. and A.M. Myers, *The Activities-specific Balance Confidence (ABC) Scale.* The Journals of Gerontology Series A: Biological Sciences and Medical Sciences, 1995. **50A**: p. M28-M34.
11. Moriello, C., L. Finch, and N.E. Mayo, *Relationship between muscle strength and functional walking capacity among people with stroke.* Journal of Rehabilitation Research & Development, 2011. **48**: p. 267-276.
12. Lynch, E.A., S.L. Hillier, K. Stiller, R.R. Campanella, and P.H. Fisher, *Sensory Retraining of the Lower Limb After Acute Stroke: A Randomized Controlled Pilot Trial.* Arch Phys Med Rehabil, 2007. **88**: p. 1101-7.
13. RÖDÉN-JÜLlig, Å., M. Britton, C. Gustafsson, and A. Fugl-Meyer, *Validation of four scales for the acute stage of stroke.* Journal of Internal Medicine, 1994. **236**: p. 125-136.
14. Murden RA, McRae TD, Kaner S, and B. ME., *Mini-Mental State exam scores vary with education in blacks and whites.* J Am Geriatr Soc. Feb;, 1991. **39**: p. 149-55.
15. Bamford, J., P. Sandercock, M. Dennis, C. Warlow, and J. Burn, *Classification and natural history of clinically identifiable subtypes of cerebral infarction.* The Lancet, 1991. **337**: p. 1521-1526.
16. Kollen, B., G. Kwakkel, and E. Lindeman, *Hemiplegic Gait After Stroke: Is Measurement of Maximum Speed Required?* Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation, 2006. **87**: p. 358-363.
17. Lamontagne, A. and J. Fung, *Faster Is Better: Implications for Speed-Intensive Gait Training After Stroke.* Stroke, 2004. **35**: p. 2543-2548.
18. Beamana, C.B., C.L. Petersona, R.R. Neptunea, and S.A. Kautz, *Differences in self-selected and fastest-comfortable walking in post-stroke hemiparetic persons.* Gait & Posture, 2010 **31**: p. 311-316.
19. Capo-Lugo, C., C. Mullens, and D. Brown, *Maximum walking speeds obtained using treadmill and overground robot system in persons with post-stroke hemiplegia.* JOURNAL OF NEUROENGINEERING AND REHABILITATION, 2012. **9**: p. 80.

20. Flansbjer, U.B., D. Downham, and J. Lexell, *Knee muscle strength, gait performance, and perceived participation after stroke.* Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, 2006. **87**: p. 974-980.
21. DJ, N. and H. SF, *Knee muscle isometric strength, voluntary activation and antagonist co-contraction in the first six months after stroke.* Disability and Rehabilitation, 2001. **23**: p. 379-386.
22. Beenakker, E.A.C., J.H.v.d. Hoeven, and N.M.M. J.M. Fock, *Reference values of maximum isometric muscle force obtained in 270 children aged 4±16 years by hand-held dynamometry.* Neuromuscular Disorders, 2001. **11**.
23. Essendrop, M., B. Schibye, and K. Hansen, *Reliability of isometric muscle strength tests for the trunk, hands and shoulders.* International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics, 2001. **28**: p. 379-387.
24. Gladstone, D.J., C.J. Danells, and S.E. Black, *The Fugl-Meyer Assessment of Motor Recovery after Stroke: A Critical Review of Its Measurement Properties.* Neurorehabilitation and Neural Repair, 2002. **16**: p. 232-240.
25. Duncan, P.W., M. Propst, and S.G. Nelson, *Reliability of the Fugl-Meyer Assessment of Sensorimotor Recovery Following Cerebrovascular Accident.* Physical Therapy, 1983. **63**: p. 1606-1610.
26. ME, T., R. D, and P. L., *Falls efficacy as a measure of fear of falling.* J Gerontol, 1990. **45**.
27. ME, T., M.d.L. CF, and B.D. Doucete JT, *Fear of falling and fall-related Efficacy in relationship to functioning among community-living elders.* J Ger Med Sci, 1994. **49**: p. 140-147.
28. ME, T., S. M, and G. SF, *Risk factors for falls among elderly persons living in the community.* N EnglJ Med, 1988. **319**: p. 1701-1707.
29. van de Port IG, Kwakkel G, and L. E., *Community ambulation in patients with chronic stroke: how is it related to gait speed?* J Rehabil Med., 2008 **40** p. 23-27
30. Medica, M.L.M.B., *Interrater reliability: the kappa statistic.* 22, 2012. **3**: p. 276-82.
31. Viosca, E., R. Lafuente, J.L. Martínez, P.L. Almagro, A. Gracia, and C. González, *Walking Recovery After an Acute Stroke: Assessment With a New Functional Classification and the Barthel Index.* Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, 2005. **86**: p. 1239-1244.
32. Perry, J., M. Garrett, J.K. Gronley, and S.J. Mulroy, *Classification of Walking Handicap in the Stroke Population.* Stroke, 1995. **26**: p. 982-989.
33. Bijleveld-Uitman M, Van de Port I, and K. G, *Is gait speed or walking distance a better predictor for community walking after stroke?* J Rehabil Med. . doi: 10.2340/16501977-1147., 2013. **45**: p. 535-40.
34. Bland, M.D., et al., *Prediction of Discharge Walking Ability From Initial Assessment in a Stroke Inpatient Rehabilitation Facility Population.* Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, 2012. **93**: p. 1441-1447.
35. Carina U. Persson, P.-O.H., Katharina S. Sunnerhagen, *Clinical tests performed in acute stroke identify the risk of falling during the first year: Postural stroke study in Gothenburg (POSTGOT)*.* J Rehabil Med, 2011. **45**.
36. Ingrid G.van de Port, Gert Kwakkel, and Eline Lindeman, *COMMUNITY AMBULATION IN PATIENTS WITH CHRONIC STROKE: HOW IS IT RELATED TO GAIT SPEED?* J Rehabil Med, 2008. **40**: p. 23-27.
37. Hansson, E.E., N.-O. Månsson, and A. Håkansson, *Balance performance and self-perceived handicap among dizzy patients in primary health care.* Scandinavian Journal of Primary Health Care, 2005. **23**: p. 215-220.

Table 1-Socio-demographic, anthropometric and clinical characteristics of the subjects with stroke (n=35).

Variable	Results
Age (years)	69.3±11.2 (44-87)
Gender (F:M)	23_{M};12_{F};
BMI (Kg/m2)	25.5±3.2 (15.0-31.6)
Time post-stroke (days)	45.5±22.1 (13.0-90.0)
Hemiparesis (R:L)	19_{R};16_{L}
Stroke classification (PACS;POCS;LACS)	15_{PACS};4_{POCS};16_{LACI}

PACS, partial anterior circulation syndrome; POCS, posterior circulation syndrome; LACS, lacunar syndromes F, female; M, male; BMI, Body Mass Index; R, right; L, left.

Table 2. Median (95% Confidence Interval) at T0 and T1 and median differences (T1-T0) values of walking speed, balance, muscle strength and sensorio-motor function of the hemiparetic lower limb for walking groups (Independent Community Walkers and Dependent Community Walkers).

Functional Measures		ICW	DCW	p-value
Comfortable speed (m/s)	T0	0.31(0.19-0.49)	0.14 (0.13-0.21)	0.005**
	T1	0.40(0.29-0.69)	0.30 (0.26-0.39)	0.061
	MD	0.06 (-0.09-0.38)	0.17 (0.10-0.21)	0.469
Fast speed (m/s)	T0	0.64(0.43-1.04)	0.21(0.22-0.42)	0.003**
	T1	0.98(0.91-1.27)	0.60 (0.43-0.67)	0.001**
	MD	0.34 (0.13-0.60)	0.16 (0.14-0.33)	0.210
Fast - Comfortable (m/s)	T0	0.31 (0.17-0.61)	0.10 (0.07-0.23)	0.004**
	T1	0.58(0.39-0.83)	0.19 (0.13-0.32)	0.001**
	MD	0.28 (-0.09-53.31)	0.06 (-0.01-(-0.16))	0.067
Knee extensors strength (Kg/f)	T0	7.57(5.98-11.10)	6.02(4.31-6.52)	0.016*
	T1	8.67(6.93-10.25)	7.45(6.13-8.00)	0.101
	MD	-0.4 (-2.27-2.37)	1.7 (0.87-2.42)	0.239
Knee flexors strength (Kg/f)	T0	6.0(4.30-7.11)	4.68(3.30-5.63)	0.342
	T1	7.27(6.09-9.63)	6.90(4.77-7.06)	0.197
	MD	2.1 (0.23-4.08)	1.53 (0.89-2.01)	0.271
Leg Sub-score (Fugl-Meyer)	T0	24.00(21.49-26.73)	24.50(21.25-26.06)	0.838
	T1	29.00(24.73-31.94)	28.50(24.22-29.40)	0.697
	MD	5.00 (0.68-7.76)	3.00 (1.72-4.59)	0.446
Falls Efficacy Scale	T0	28.00(16.16-52.51)	66.50(56.00-70.92)	0.002**
	T1	7.00(3.69-13.65)	43.00(32.27-51.65)	0.001**
	MD	-23.00 (-45.01-(-6.32))	-19.00 (-30.89-(-12.11))	0.643

*p-values of Mann-Whitney test <0.05; ** p-values <0.01, for comparison between Independent Community Walkers and Dependent Community Walkers. Walking speed was assessed in meters per second (m/s); Knee extensor and flexor strength was assessed in Kilograms of force (Kg/f). ICW, Independent Community Walkers; DCW, Dependent Community Walkers; MD, median differences.

Table 3: Cut-off specified with area under the curve, sensitive and specificity values and percentage of agreement between dichotomonous functional measures at T0 and the classification into "Independent Community Walkers" and "Dependent Community Walkers" at T1.

Functional Measures			**Walking in the community (self-reported question)**		
T0	AUC	Cut-off	ICW	DCW	Agreement (%)
Comfortable Speed	0.81	>0.24m/s	$2_{(TP)}$	$3_{(FP)}$	71.43
		<0.24m/s	$7_{(FN)}$	$23_{(TN)}$	
			Sensitivity= 0.40	Specificity= 0.23	
Fast Speed	0.83	>0.42m/s	$8_{(TP)}$	$6_{(FP)}$	80.00
		<0.42m/s	$1_{(FN)}$	$20_{(TN)}$	
			Sensitivity= 0.89	Specificity= 0.23	
Fast Speed-Comfortable Speed	0.82	>0.16m/s	$8_{(TP)}$	$8_{(FP)}$	74.28
		<0.16m/s	$1_{(FN)}$	$18_{(TN)}$	
			Sensitivity= 0.89	Specificity=0.31	
Knee extensor strength (Kg/f)	0.77	>6.22kg/f	$9_{(TP)}$	$12_{(FP)}$	65.71
		<6.22kg7f	$0_{(FN)}$	$14_{(TN)}$	
			Sensitivity= 1.00	Specificity= 0.46	
Knee flexor strength (kg/f)	0.61	>5.77	$6_{(TP)}$	$10_{(FP)}$	25.71
		<5.77	$3_{(FN)}$	$16_{(TN)}$	
			Sensitivity= 0.27	Specificity= 0.78	
Leg Sub-score (Fugl-Meyer)	0.48	>22.50	$7_{(TP)}$	$16_{(FP)}$	48.57
		<22.50	$2_{(FN)}$	$10_{(TN)}$	
			Sensitivity= 0.78	Specificity= 0.62	

Falls Efficacy Scale	0.83	<57.00 >57.00	8 (TP) 1 (FN)	6 (FP) 20 (TN)	80.0
			Sensitivity= 89.0	Specificity= 23.0	

AUC: Area under the curve. AUC values should be interpreted as follows: 0.50 to 0.75 = fair; 0.75 to 0.92 = good; 0.92 to 0.97 = very good; 0.97 to 1.00 = excellent probability. TP, number of true positive results; FP, number of false positive results; FN, number of false negative results; TN, number of true negative results. Sensitivity = TP/ (TP+FN); Specificity = FP/ (FP+TN). Agreement % = number of accurate results/total. ICW, Independent Community Walkers; DCW, Dependent Community Walkers

Table 4: Cut-off specified with area under the curve, sensitive and specificity values and percentage of agreement between dichotomonous functional measures at T1 and walking in the community classification ("Independent Community Walkers" and "Dependent Community Walkers"), at T1.

Functional Measures			**Walking in the community (self-reported question)**		
T1	AUC	Cut-off	ICW	NICW	Agreement (%)
Comfortable Speed	0.71	>0.29m/s <0.29m/s	7 (TP) 2 (FN)	12 (FP) 14 (TN)	60.0
			Sensitivity= 77.8	Specificity= 46.15	
Fast Speed	0.95	>0.84m/s <0.84m/s	9 (TP) 0 (FN)	3 (FP) 23 (TN)	91.40
			Sensitivity= 1.0	Specificity= 11.54	
Fast Speed-Comfortable Speed	0.86	>0.37m/s <0.37m/s	8 (TP) 1 (FN)	8 (FP) 18 (TN)	74.29
			Sensitivity= 89.0	Specificity=30.77	
Knee extensors strength (Kg/f)	0.69	>7.44kg/f <7.44kg7f	7 (TP) 2 (FN)	13 (FP) 13 (TN)	57.14
			Sensitivity= 77.8	Specificity= 50.0	
Knee flexors strength (kg/f)	0.65	>5.92 <5.92	7 (TP) 2 (FN)	15 (FP) 11 (TN)	51.43
			Sensitivity= 77.8	Specificity= 44.0	
Leg Sub-score (Fulg-Meyer)	0.54	>23.50 <23.50	8 (TP) 1 (FN)	18 (FP) 8 (TN)	45.71
			Sensitivity= 89.0	Specificity= 69.23	
Falls Efficacy Scale	0.90	<18.50 >18.50	9 (TP) 0 (FN)	5 (FP) 21 (TN)	85.71
			Sensitivity= 1.0	Specificity= 19.23	

AUC: Area under the curve. AUC values should be interpreted as follows: 0.50 to 0.75 = fair; 0.75 to 0.92 = good; 0.92 to 0.97 = very good; 0.97 to 1.00 = excellent probability. TP, number of true positive results; FP, number of false positive results; FN, number of false negative results; TN, number of true negative results. Sensitivity = TP/ (TP+FN); Specificity = FP/ (FP+TN). Agreement % = number of accurate results/total. ICW, Independent Community Walkers; DCW, Dependent-Community Walkers.