

## **Lower limb co-contraction during walking in subjects with stroke: a systematic review**

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](mailto:marlenerosa@ua.pt)

Phone number: 351 968918915

*Address: 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 Developmental Biokinetics

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](mailto:amarques@ua.pt)

**Sara Demain**

Graduate Diploma Physiotherapy

Master of Science 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](mailto: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](mailto:c.d.metcalf@soton.ac.uk)

1 **Lower limb co-contraction during walking in subjects with stroke: a systematic review**

2 Keywords: co-contraction; coactivation; gait; locomotion; walking; stroke; cerebrovascular disease.

3 **ABSTRACT**

4 **Purpose:** The aim of this paper was to identify and synthesise existing evidence on lower limb  
5 muscle co-contraction (MCo) during walking in subjects with stroke.

6 **Methods:** An electronic literature search on Web of Science, PubMed and B-on was conducted.  
7 Studies from 1999 to 2012 which analysed lower limb MCo during walking in subjects with stroke,  
8 were included.

9 **Results:** Eight articles met the inclusion criteria: 3 studied MCo in acute stage of stroke, 3 in the  
10 chronic stage and 2 at both stages. Seven were observational and 1 had a pretest-posttest  
11 interventional design. The methodological quality was “fair to good” to “high” quality (only 1  
12 study). Different methodologies to assess walking and quantify MCo were used. There is some  
13 controversy in MCo results, however subjects with stroke tended towards longer MCo in both lower  
14 limbs in both the acute and chronic stages, when compared with healthy controls. A higher level of  
15 post-stroke walking ability (speed; level of independence) was correlated with longer thigh MCo in  
16 the non-affected limb. One study demonstrated significant improvements in walking ability over  
17 time without significant changes in MCo patterns.

18 **Conclusions:** Subjects with stroke commonly present longer MCo during walking, probably in an  
19 attempt to improve walking ability. However, to ensure recommendations for clinical practice,  
20 further research with standardized methodologies is needed.

21

## 22 **1. Introduction**

23

24           Stroke is defined by the World Health Organization as a focal or global neurological  
25 impairment of cerebrovascular cause (Lamontagne et al. 2000; Truelsen et al. 2007). It is one of the  
26 most chronic disabling diseases (Olesen et al. 2003) and the major cause of persistent motor  
27 impairments on one side of the body, which interfere with arm function and the ability to sit up,  
28 stand and walk (Staines et al. 2009).

29           Walking ability is severely impaired in 25% of people with stroke (Hendricks et al. 2002;  
30 Jang 2010), limiting functional independence and leading to reduced quality of life (Lord et al.  
31 2004). Walking impairment may result from a combination of deficits in perception, muscle  
32 strength, sensation, muscle tone and motor control (Yavuzer 2006; Patterson et al. 2007). A deficit  
33 in motor control is one of the most common walking deficits following stroke (Roerdink et al.  
34 2007). Motor control is the process by which the Central Nervous System (CNS) generates  
35 purposeful and coordinated movements whilst the body interacts with the environment (Latash et al.  
36 2010). This process depends on precisely timed and appropriately modulated synergies between  
37 muscles, including synergies between functionally opposite muscles (agonist and antagonist  
38 muscles) (Latash et al. 2010).

39           Muscle Co-contraction is the simultaneous activity of agonist and antagonist muscles  
40 crossing the same joint (MCo) (Busse et al. 2005). When agonist/antagonist muscles work  
41 synergistically, the antagonist muscle acts as stabiliser during agonist muscle contraction (Busse et

42 al. 2005). This synergy is important for providing optimal joint stability, good movement accuracy  
43 and energy efficiency during functional activities, such walking (Milner 2002; Arias et al. 2012;  
44 Knarr et al. 2012). MCo can be estimated using temporal or magnitude dimensions of  
45 electromyographic (EMG) recordings from the muscles involved (Criswell 2007). Temporal MCo is  
46 defined as the time during which opposing muscles are simultaneously active and is usually  
47 classified using terms such normal, longer or shorter MCo duration. Magnitude of MCo is defined  
48 as the relative magnitude of simultaneous contraction between opposing muscles (Hortobágyi et al.  
49 2009) and is classified using terms such normal, high or reduced magnitude of MCo (Criswell  
50 2007).

51 Some differences have been found in MCo patterns between subjects with CNS disorders (Hesse et  
52 al. 2000; Lamontagne et al. 2000; Lamontagne et al. 2002; Busse et al. 2005) and healthy subjects  
53 (Den Otter et al. 2004; Prosser et al. 2010) during walking. In healthy subjects, MCo is at a  
54 maximum around the knee in the loading period of gait (e.g., vastus lateralis/medial hamstrings) to  
55 provide increased knee stability (Fonseca et al. 2006) and around the ankle in mid-stance (e.g.,  
56 tibialis anterior/soleus) to generate an efficient plantarflexor moment necessary to move the limb  
57 forward efficiently (Fonseca et al. 2006; Sasaki et al. 2009). MCo increases in healthy and impaired  
58 participants whilst learning a new skill (Vereijken et al. 1992) or in the presence of instability  
59 (Nakazawa et al. 2004). However, adverse effects of this increased MCo have been reported, such  
60 as the increase in compressive joint loading and decreased movement flexibility, resulting in  
61 decreased movement adaptability (Busse et al. 2005).

62 Busse et al. (Busse et al. 2005) conducted a systematic review of MCo patterns in subjects with  
63 CNS disorders during upper and lower limb tasks, concluding that the most successful rehabilitation  
64 outputs were found in people with MCo patterns similar to those found in healthy subjects.  
65 However, only two studies included in their review assessed MCo during walking in subjects with  
66 stroke. These studies reported increases in inter-subject variability and duration and magnitude of  
67 MCo in subjects with stroke.

68 This research therefore systematically identified and synthesised evidence on lower limb  
69 MCo during walking in subjects with stroke.

70

## 71 **2. Methods**

72

### 73 **2.1. Research Question**

74 The two main research questions in this study were:

75 1. Which MCo patterns characterise the affected and non-affected lower limbs during the  
76 acute and chronic stages of stroke recovery?

77 2. How do MCo patterns relate to walking ability?

78

### 79 **2.2. Search strategy**

80 The electronic literature search was performed in April 2013 on the following databases:  
81 Web of Science (1970-date), MEDLINE via PubMed (1948-date) and B-on Knowledge Library  
82 (1999-2013). The following search terms were applied: “co-contraction” OR “coactivation” AND  
83 “gait” OR “locomotion” OR “walking” AND “stroke” OR “cerebrovascular disease”. The search  
84 was limited to titles and abstracts. Articles were included if they: (i) studied people with walking  
85 impairment due to stroke and ii) analysed lower limb MCo with surface electromyography (sEMG)  
86 during walking. Articles clearly unrelated to the theme (e.g., did not include subjects with stroke,  
87 assessed activities other than walking), written in languages other than English or Portuguese and  
88 unpublished studies were excluded. Review papers, abstracts of communications or meetings,  
89 papers on conference proceedings, editorials, commentaries to articles and study protocols were not  
90 considered suitable for this review. Nevertheless, their reference lists, in addition to the reference  
91 lists of all included studies, were scanned to find other potentially eligible articles.

92 This systematic review was reported according to Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic  
93 Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines (Moher et al. 2009). The PRISMA guidelines  
94 consist of a 27-item checklist and a four-phase flow diagram to ensure the transparent and complete  
95 reporting of systematic reviews and meta-analyses (Moher et al. 2009).

96

### 97 **2.3. Data extraction**

98 Data from the included studies was extracted by one reviewer and then checked by a second  
99 reviewer using a data extraction table which identified: author identification, year of publication,

100 study design, sample, walking and MCo assessment protocols, muscles assessed, main results for  
101 MCo and walking ability. Muscles assessed were reported in two different categories: muscles of  
102 the affected lower limb and muscles of the non-affected lower limb. In each sub-category, muscles  
103 were classified as thigh or shank muscles.

104

## 105 **2.4. Quality assessment**

106 The quality of the studies was independently assessed by two reviewers using a modified  
107 version of the scoring system developed by Hailey and co-workers (Hailey D et al. 2004). This  
108 score classifies the studies on 5 levels of quality, from grade A (high quality) to E (poor quality),  
109 according to the study design and characteristics (patient selection, protocol description, statistical  
110 methods and sample size, patient disposal and outcomes reported) (Hailey D et al. 2004). Two  
111 independent reviewers assessed the quality of the studies. Results were compared and differences  
112 were resolved by discussion.

113

## 114 **3. Results**

115

### 116 **3.1. Study Selection**

117 Ninety-nine studies were identified: 34 duplicates were removed. The title and abstract of 65  
118 articles were screened. Fifty-seven articles were excluded as they: (i) did not include subjects with  
119 stroke (n=3), (ii) assessed activities other than walking (n=52) and (iii) were not written in English

120 or Portuguese (n= 2). Eight studies addressed MCo during walking in subjects with stroke and were  
121 included in this review (Figure 1).

122

123 Figure 1: Flow diagram according to the different phases of the systematic review as proposed by PRISMA.

### 124 **3.2. Study Characteristics**

125 From the included studies, 7 were observational assessing MCo during walking with no  
126 intervention (Lamontagne et al. 2000; Lamontagne et al. 2002; Detrembleur et al. 2003; Den Otter  
127 et al. 2006; Den Otter et al. 2007; Chow et al. 2012), one of which was longitudinal (Den Otter et  
128 al. 2006), with data collected at 5 time-points. One study used a pretest-posttest design (Massaad et  
129 al. 2009), assessing walking ability before and after an intervention based on feedback about center  
130 of mass. Three studies included subjects in the acute stage of stroke (Lamontagne et al. 2000;  
131 Lamontagne et al. 2002; Den Otter et al. 2006), 3 in the chronic stage (Detrembleur et al. 2003;  
132 Massaad et al. 2009; Chow et al. 2012) and 2 in both stages (Hesse et al. 1999; Den Otter et al.  
133 2007).

134 In total, 142 subjects with stroke (54% male) participated in the included studies. Sample  
135 sizes varied from 6 (Massaad et al. 2009) to 30 patients with stroke (Lamontagne et al. 2000). The  
136 ages ranged from 35 (Hesse et al. 1999) to 81 (Lamontagne et al. 2000) years old. The sample in the  
137 Hesse et al. (Hesse et al. 1999) study was equally distributed in terms of the hemisphere affected  
138 (50% of right hemiparesis); was 43% right hemisphere in the Lamontagne et al (2000); and, was not  
139 described in the other studies.

140 Details on the functional status of included stroke subjects are limited in the included  
141 studies. Where functional status is described a range of measures have been used, each with a  
142 different focus, raising difficulties with comparison and synthesis of findings: Fugl-Meyer Scale  
143 (FM) (Lamontagne et al. 2000; Lamontagne et al. 2002), Functional Independent Measure (FIM)  
144 (Detrembleur et al. 2003), Stroke Impairment Assessment Set (SIAS) (Massaad et al. 2009) and  
145 Ashworth Scale (AS) (Detrembleur et al. 2003; Chow et al. 2012).

146 All except two studies (Hesse et al. 1999; Massaad et al. 2009) included a group of healthy  
147 age and gender-matched controls. Although these two studies do not contribute to our  
148 understanding about how MCo patterns differ between healthy subjects and people post-stroke (1st  
149 review question) they are included in this review because of their analysis exploring relationships  
150 between different MCo patterns and walking ability (functional parameters, e.g. energy cost,  
151 walking speed, temporal symmetry , foot contact, etc.) post-stroke (2<sup>nd</sup> review question).

152 Methodologies used to assess MCo during walking differed between studies: 3 assessed  
153 subjects with stroke walking on the floor (Lamontagne et al. 2000; Lamontagne et al. 2002;  
154 Detrembleur et al. 2003); 3 assessed subjects whilst they were walking on a treadmill (Den Otter et  
155 al. 2006; Den Otter et al. 2007; Massaad et al. 2009) and 1 study compared walking on a treadmill  
156 with body-weight support and walking on the floor (Hesse et al. 1999). In most studies, subjects  
157 were instructed to walk at their normal speed (Hesse et al. 1999; Lamontagne et al. 2000;  
158 Lamontagne et al. 2002; Detrembleur et al. 2003; Den Otter et al. 2007; Massaad et al. 2009; Chow  
159 et al. 2012) and in 1 study to walk at their maximum speed (Den Otter et al. 2006). Distances

160 walked by subjects with stroke differed across the studies from 7 (Chow et al. 2012) to 10 meters  
161 (Lamontagne et al. 2000; Lamontagne et al. 2002; Detrembleur et al. 2003)

162 The MCo quantification also varied: in 1 study two raters visually inspected the graphs of an  
163 averaged and normalised sEMG signal of two antagonists muscles and classified MCo considering  
164 both temporal and magnitude of MCo (Hesse et al. 1999); 2 studies assessed the time of overlap  
165 between the linear envelopes of antagonists muscles (Lamontagne et al. 2000; Lamontagne et al.  
166 2002) and 4 studies calculated the percentage of gait cycle in which both antagonist muscles were  
167 active based on "onset" sEMG signal determination (Detrembleur et al. 2003; Den Otter et al. 2006;  
168 Den Otter et al. 2007; Massaad et al. 2009). Only 1 study explored the ratio between the temporal  
169 dimension and the magnitude of MCo using automatic computation methods, by implementing the following  
170 formula: the area of overlap between the linear envelopes of antagonists muscles (equivalent to MCo  
171 magnitude), divided by the overlap duration (equivalent to temporal MCo) (Chow et al. 2012).

172

### 173 **3.3. Quality assessment**

174 The Den Otter et al. study (Den Otter et al. 2006) was the only one rated as A (high quality).  
175 The other 7 studies were rated as C (fair to good quality) (Hesse et al. 1999; Lamontagne et al.  
176 2000; Lamontagne et al. 2002; Detrembleur et al. 2003; Den Otter et al. 2007; Massaad et al. 2009;  
177 Chow et al. 2012).

178

### 179 **3.4. Synthesis of the results**

180 The results were organised into three main categories: i) MCo in the affected lower limb  
181 (Figure. 2); ii) MCo in the non-affected lower limb (Figure 2) and iii) MCo and walking ability after  
182 stroke. The first two categories were subdivided into shank and thigh muscles. Table 1 summarizes  
183 the data extracted from the included studies.

184

185 **Figure 2:** Thigh and shank MCo in both affected and non-affected lower limbs and in acute and chronic stages of recovery after  
186 stroke.

187

188 **Table 1:** Characteristics of the studies included in the analysis of MCo during walking in subjects with stroke

189

### 190 **3.4.1. MCo patterns in the affected lower limb**

191

#### 192 **Shank Muscles (affected limb)**

193 A variety of MCo patterns were identified for the shank muscles of the affected lower limb  
194 in subjects with stroke (Hesse et al. 1999; Lamontagne et al. 2000; Lamontagne et al. 2002;  
195 Detrembleur et al. 2003; Den Otter et al. 2006; Den Otter et al. 2007; Chow et al. 2012). In the  
196 acute stage of stroke recovery, 2 studies reported shank MCo within normal values (Lamontagne et  
197 al. 2002; Den Otter et al. 2006); however, Lamontagne et al. (Lamontagne et al. 2000) found that  
198 subjects with acute stroke tended to present with a shorter MCo ( $p < 0.001$ ) between tibialis anterior  
199 (TA) and gastrocnemius (GAS) during stance phase, when compared to healthy controls.

200 In the chronic stage, subjects with stroke presented longer MCo between the TA and the  
201 medial gastrocnemius (GM) during the whole gait cycle (Detrembleur et al. 2003), with longer and  
202 higher values during the first ( $p=0.005$ ) and second double support phases ( $p=0.015$ ) (Chow et al.  
203 2012).

204

### 205 **Thigh Muscles (affected limb)**

206 MCo values between rectus femoris (RF) and biceps femoris (BF) were longer in subjects  
207 with stroke than in healthy controls (Den Otter et al. 2007) in both acute (Den Otter et al. 2006) and  
208 chronic stages (Detrembleur et al. 2003). This finding was statistically significant during single  
209 stance (63%;  $p<0.05$ ) in the acute stage (Den Otter et al. 2006).

210

### 211 **3.4.2. MCo patterns in the non-affected lower limb**

#### 212 **Shank Muscles (non-affected limb)**

213 Contradictory findings were found for MCo of the shank in the non-affected lower limb.  
214 Two studies identified statistically significant longer shank (TA/GAS) MCo (Lamontagne et al.  
215 2000; Lamontagne et al. 2002) in subjects in the acute stage of stroke when compared to healthy  
216 controls, specifically during the first and second double support phases ( $p<0.001$ ) (Lamontagne et  
217 al. 2000) and during the entire stance phase ( $p<0.05$ ) (Lamontagne et al. 2002). However, Den Otter  
218 et al. (Den Otter et al. 2006), identified non-statistically significant shorter shank (TA/GM) MCo  
219 during the whole gait cycle, in subjects in the acute stage compared to healthy controls.

220 One article reported shank MCo in the chronic stage (Chow et al. 2012) and concluded that  
221 the non-affected lower limb presented with a greater MCo (considering both magnitude and  
222 temporal domain) (Chow et al. 2012) during the first double support phase, when compared to  
223 healthy subjects ( $p=0.038$ ).

224

### 225 **Thigh Muscles (non-affected limb)**

226 Thigh MCo between vastus lateralis (VL) and BF of the non-affected lower limb was only  
227 assessed in the acute stage by Den Otter et al. (Den Otter et al. 2006). These authors found a  
228 significantly longer thigh MCo during single stance phase (61%;  $p<0.05$ ) in subjects with stroke  
229 than in healthy subjects. No data were available for the chronic stage of the disease.

230

### 231 **3.4.3. MCo and walking ability after stroke (both limbs)**

232 In the included studies, the relationship between MCo and several walking outcomes was  
233 assessed: initial contact pattern (Hesse et al. 1999), energy cost (Detrembleur et al. 2003; Massaad  
234 et al. 2009), total mechanical work (Detrembleur et al. 2003), mobility index, functional ambulation  
235 classification (Den Otter et al. 2006), walking speed (Lamontagne et al. 2000; Den Otter et al.  
236 2006), temporal asymmetry (Den Otter et al. 2006), ankle strength, postural stability (Lamontagne  
237 et al. 2000), plantarflexor and dorsiflexor moments (Lamontagne et al. 2002) and center of mass  
238 displacement (Massaad et al. 2009).

239 Relationships between these variables and MCo in both the affected and non-affected lower  
240 limbs were found. In the affected lower limb, longer shank and thigh MCo was associated with  
241 increased mechanical work (the work performed by muscles) and energy costs (energy  
242 expenditure/walking speed). However, no relationship with work production efficiency (mechanical  
243 work/energy expenditure) was observed (Detrembleur et al. 2003). Normal values of shank MCo  
244 were related to a normal foot position at initial contact (Hesse et al. 1999) and to a higher dynamic  
245 ankle strength, estimated from the peak plantarflexor moment of force during a gait cycle  
246 (Lamontagne et al. 2000). In the study of Massaad et al. (Massaad et al. 2009), both energy cost and  
247 MCo of thigh muscles in both affected and non-affected lower limbs were decreased after an  
248 intervention using center of mass feedback. In the non-affected lower limb, significantly longer  
249 thigh MCo was associated with an improvement in walking speed and higher level of walking  
250 independence (Den Otter et al. 2006). An increase in shank MCo of the non-affected lower limb  
251 was associated with reduced motor ability of the affected lower limb in terms of the plantarflexor  
252 moment (Lamontagne et al. 2002), dynamic ankle strength and postural stability (Lamontagne et al.  
253 2000). Subjects with stroke presenting with measures of postural stability, dynamic ankle strength  
254 (Lamontagne et al. 2000) and temporal asymmetry (Den Otter et al. 2006) close to normal ranges  
255 were those with normal shank MCo in the affected lower limb.

256 In the study of Den Otter et al. (Den Otter et al. 2006), subjects with stroke were followed for  
257 10 weeks after walking acquisition and showed a significant improvement in walking speed, general  
258 mobility and ambulatory independence. However, these improvements were not associated with

259 significant changes in temporal MCo of thigh or shank muscles which remained longer throughout  
260 the 10 weeks. This study therefore observed that walking recovery was not associated with duration  
261 of MCo.

262

## 263 **Discussion**

264 This systematic review identified and synthesised the existing evidence on lower limb MCo during  
265 walking in subjects with stroke. Only 8 studies were included, and these used a range of different  
266 methods, restricting comparison of the results across studies and the degree of confidence in the  
267 evidence. Nevertheless, this systematic review did enable us to identify some specific trends in the  
268 available MCo data and to explore MCo contribution to the recovery of walking ability post-stroke  
269 as outlined below.

270

### 271 **MCo in the affected lower limb**

272         Only three studies have explored thigh MCo (Detrembleur et al. 2003; Den Otter et al. 2006;  
273 Den Otter et al. 2007) and six have explored shank MCo (Lamontagne et al. 2000; Lamontagne et  
274 al. 2002; Detrembleur et al. 2003; Den Otter et al. 2006; Den Otter et al. 2007; Chow et al. 2012).  
275 Despite this limited evidence, results suggest specific trends for MCo patterns of subjects with  
276 stroke.

277         Longer thigh MCo was observed for single leg stance in the acute stage (Den Otter et al.  
278 2006). It is known that the greatest difficulties in the acute stage are experienced during stance, in

279 particular in controlling knee position during loading (Werner et al. 2002). Longer thigh MCo  
280 might, therefore, be an important adaptation strategy in the early days after stroke.

281           Longer shank MCo in the chronic stage during double support phase (Chow et al. 2012),  
282 suggests that these muscles may also play an important adaptation role later in stroke recovery  
283 (Detrembleur et al. 2003; Massaad et al. 2009; Chow et al. 2012). Walking places different  
284 functional demands dependent on the stage of recovery. For instance acute patients rarely walk  
285 outside the home, but as recovery occurs, people often commence community walking and thus face  
286 increasing demands due to the variability and uncertainty of the environment. Consequently  
287 different MCo strategies may be required and developed to adapt not only to the differing abilities  
288 but also the varying environments. During the acute stage, people with stroke present significant  
289 weakness in the dorsiflexors (Olney et al. 1996), limiting the ability of these muscles to contribute  
290 to walking stability through MCo. Dorsiflexor strength increases with recovery, enabling the  
291 necessary ankle stability required to walk in community environments which may explain the  
292 finding of increased MCo in the chronic stage. These findings support the idea that MCo after  
293 stroke may represent an important adaptation strategy to enhance a safer gait, producing different  
294 patterns according to different stages of stroke recovery (Paul Cordo et al. 1997).

295

#### 296 **MCo in the non-affected lower limb**

297           Few studies have explored thigh MCo in the non-affected lower limb in the acute stage (Den  
298 Otter et al. 2006; Den Otter et al. 2007) and none in the chronic stage. The longer thigh MCo

299 observed during stance can probably be attributed to the need for greater stability (Raja et al. 2012)  
300 required to sustain the prolonged stance phase commonly seen on the non-affected lower limb. This  
301 prolonged stance is often a motor adaptation for the limited efficiency of the affected lower limb to  
302 support body weight (Olney et al. 1996). In general, MCo of the non-affected lower limb can be an  
303 important strategy developed to adapt the walking pattern to physical impairments in the affected  
304 side and therefore, might play an important role in the walking efficiency post-stroke (Buurke et al.  
305 2008).

306         Three studies assessing shank MCo of the non-affected lower limb in the acute stage of  
307 recovery produced contradictory results (Lamontagne et al. 2000; Lamontagne et al. 2002; Den  
308 Otter et al. 2006) and only one study explored these muscles in the chronic stage (Chow et al.  
309 2012). Some trends can be observed in acute and chronic stages: longer thigh MCo was identified in  
310 single stance phase in the acute stage (Den Otter et al. 2006) and longer shank MCo was identified  
311 for double support phases in both acute (Lamontagne et al. 2000; Lamontagne et al. 2002) and  
312 chronic stages (Detrembleur et al. 2003; Chow et al. 2012).

313         During the double support phase, longer shank MCo might be an adaptation strategy for  
314 disturbed inter-limb coordination and lack of efficiency in weight transference from one lower limb  
315 to another (Geurtsa et al. 2005). Olney et al. (Olney et al. 1996) argued that efficiency in weight  
316 transference depends on good medio-lateral control, obtained through a strong ankle plantarflexor  
317 moment at push-off of the unloading limb. In this way, longer shank MCo during push-off from the  
318 non-affected lower limb may help generate a stronger ankle plantarflexor moment necessary to

319 move this limb forward quickly and efficiently thus reducing the duration of loading on the affected  
320 leg.

321

322 Overall, the findings of this review suggest increased duration of MCo during walking after  
323 stroke in both the affected and non-affected limb, most likely as an adaptation strategy to increase  
324 walking stability. In particular, different patterns were seen for different walking phases and  
325 different muscle groups. This may be indicative of recovery mechanisms, an artifact of the various  
326 methods employed in the studies (e.g. different walking speeds and surfaces) (Gross et al. 2013) or  
327 of confounding factors not carefully addressed in the analysis and interpretation (Zhang et al. 1997).  
328 For instance, walking post-stroke is characterised by significantly slower speeds and high inter-  
329 subject variability which will affect stride parameters and consequently MCo patterns (Peterson et  
330 al. 2010; Gross et al. 2013). Slowest walking speeds post-stroke are usually associated with  
331 inability to recruit additional MCo (Gross et al. 2013). MCo patterns seen in subjects with stroke  
332 may therefore be an artifact more reflective of gait speed than any other underlying stroke related  
333 impairment. Therefore, methodologies of analysis that control for the effect of walking speed are  
334 needed to clarify the single contribution of MCo to walking function. Variations in joint position  
335 also impact on muscle length and consequently influence MCo (Zhang et al. 1997). Considering the  
336 high variability in walking patterns and therefore joint positions during post-stroke gait, (Quervain.  
337 et al. 1996), this presents a further confounding factor which needs to be considered and/or  
338 controlled in future studies.

339

#### 340 **MCo and walking ability after stroke**

341           The studies in this review identified several relationships between walking ability  
342 parameters and MCo. Subjects with stroke with MCo values within normal ranges in the affected  
343 lower limb tended to exhibit greater walking performance, characterised by more efficient  
344 kinematics patterns (Hesse et al. 1999) and higher dynamic strength (Lamontagne et al. 2000). The  
345 opposite tends to be observed in the non-affected lower limb: walking speed and level of walking  
346 independence were greater in subjects with thigh MCo above normal when compared to healthy  
347 individuals (Den Otter et al. 2006). Findings from the included studies suggest strong relationships  
348 between MCo and kinematics, dynamic strength, postural stability, walking speed and walking  
349 independence in subjects with stroke. Similar relationships have been reported in osteoarthritis  
350 (Heiden et al. 2009), cerebral palsy (Poon et al. 2009) and Parkinson's disease (Ramsey et al. 2004)  
351 and in healthy elderly people (Melzer et al. 2004).

352 In addition, longer MCo was reported as being related to increased energy costs of walking. This is  
353 in accordance with previous literature identifying MCo as a costly metabolic process (Missenard et  
354 al. 2008). Despite this, Detrembleur, et al. (Detrembleur et al. 2003) argued that increased MCo in  
355 the non-affected lower limb helps establish a well-balanced efficiency in walking. By increasing  
356 MCo, the non-affected lower limb increases its mechanical work and replaces some of the work that  
357 cannot be performed by the affected lower limb. Therefore, despite MCo being an energy  
358 consuming process, it may help restoring walking efficiency (Detrembleur et al. 2003).

359           Only one longitudinal study explored the relationship between changes in MCo and changes  
360 in walking ability (Den Otter et al. 2006). In this study, subjects with stroke were followed over 10  
361 weeks and a significant improvement in walking ability reported with no significant changes in  
362 temporal MCo. This finding contradicts the associations seen in the observational studies. However,  
363 in the analysis of these results several limitations must be considered. In this study, walking was  
364 assessed on a treadmill at maximum walking speed (which differs from the gait protocol in the other  
365 studies) and may not reflect the natural functional demands which subject's experience. Therefore,  
366 during this walking assessment, subjects might have exhibited different adaptation strategies from  
367 those developed in daily living conditions (Hesse et al. 1999). Hence, this is an important  
368 methodological limitation. Moreover, only temporal MCo was assessed and its magnitude ignored.  
369 However, for MCo assessment both temporal and magnitude dimensions should be considered as  
370 both are important aspects of motor control (Fonseca et al. 2001).

371

## 372 **Limitations and recommendations for future research**

373           This review identified some trends in MCo patterns during walking post-stroke and has  
374 found relationships between these patterns and walking ability parameters. However, given the  
375 limited number of studies that have been conducted in this field and their methodological  
376 limitations some inconsistent findings were presented. These methodological limitations include  
377 small sample sizes and lack of standardisation in: walking assessment protocols, the methods for  
378 measuring and analysing MCo and the walking ability outcome measures selected. Moreover, data

379 on mean MCo and respective measures of variation were not reported in all studies, instead only  
380 levels of significance were provided. This lack of quantitative MCo data made comparison of  
381 results across studies difficult. Given the small number of studies and the diversity of methods more  
382 research, with standardised designs, is needed to further our understanding of MCo patterns during  
383 walking after stroke. In particular, longitudinal studies exploring changes in MCo over time and the  
384 relationship of these to improvements in walking ability parameters are urgently required.

385

386 **Development and validation of methods for MCo assessment during walking in subjects with**  
387 **stroke**

- 388 • Application of the ICF Core Set for stroke to characterise the subject's general functionality  
389 would facilitate the agreement of functional outcomes across studies, providing further  
390 understanding of relationships between MCo patterns and subject's clinical and functional  
391 status;
- 392 • Standardisation of walking protocols (surface, speed, distance) for MCo assessment  
393 purposes would reduce confounding MCo factors when comparing results across studies;
- 394 • Adherence to guidelines for sEMG acquisition and analysis would avoid significant  
395 differences in the muscle activity measurement across studies;
- 396 • Establishment of an expert working group to generate recommendations about the most  
397 appropriate formulas/computational approaches for MCo quantification in subjects with  
398 stroke would facilitate comparison of MCo across studies;

399

## 400 **Conclusions**

401 In this review, subjects with stroke tended to exhibit longer MCo during walking than  
402 healthy controls, however MCo patterns appeared to vary depending on the stage of stroke  
403 recovery. MCo strategies during walking may change to adapt the walking pattern to the different  
404 functional demands specific to acute or chronic stages. These strategies may be developed in both  
405 the affected and non-affected lower limbs, with MCo patterns in the non-affected lower limb  
406 helping to establish normal walking efficiency. Establishing consensus, using robust study designs,  
407 is important for enhancing the design of interventions for walking recovery.

408

## 409 **Acknowledgements**

410 This work was funded by a PhD grant from Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia (FCT),  
411 Portugal (Ref. SFRH/BD/74927/2010).

412

413 Arias, P., Espinosa, N., Robles-García, V., Cao, R., et al. (2012). "Antagonist muscle co-activation during  
414 straight walking and its relation to kinematics: Insight from young, elderly and Parkinson's disease."  
415 Brain Research **1455**(0): 124-131.  
416 Busse, M.E., Wiles, C.M. and Van Deursen, R.W. (2005). "Muscle co-activation in neurological conditions."  
417 Physical Therapy Reviews **10**(4): 247-253(247).  
418 Buurke, J.H., Nene, A.V., Kwakkel, G., Erren-Wolters, V., et al. (2008). "Recovery of Gait After Stroke: What  
419 Changes?" Neurorehabilitation and Neural Repair **22**(6): 676-683.  
420 Chow, J.W., Yablon, S.A. and Stokic, D.S. (2012). "Coactivation of ankle muscles during stance phase of gait  
421 in patients with lower limb hypertonia after acquired brain injury." Clinical Neurophysiology **123**(8):  
422 1599-1605.  
423 Criswell, E. (2007). Cram's Introduction to Surface Electromyography. Canada, Jones and Barlett Publishers.  
424 Den Otter, A.R., Geurts, A.C.H., Mulder, T. and Duysens, J. (2004). "Speed related changes in muscle activity  
425 from normal to very slow walking speeds." Gait & Posture **19**(3): 270-278.

426 Den Otter, A.R., Geurts, A.C.H., Mulder, T. and Duysens, J. (2006). "Gait recovery is not associated with  
427 changes in the temporal patterning of muscle activity during treadmill walking in patients with  
428 post-stroke hemiparesis." Clinical Neurophysiology **117**(1): 4-15.

429 Den Otter, A.R., Geurts, A.C.H., Mulder, T. and Duysens, J. (2007). "Abnormalities in the temporal  
430 patterning of lower extremity muscle activity in hemiparetic gait." Gait & Posture **25**(3): 342-352.

431 Detrembleur, C., Dierick, F., Stoquart, G., Chantraine, F., et al. (2003). "Energy cost, mechanical work, and  
432 efficiency of hemiparetic walking." Gait & Posture **18**(2): 47-55.

433 Fonseca, S.T., Vaz, D.V., De Aquino, C.F. and Brício, R.S. (2006). "Muscular co-contraction during walking  
434 and landing from a jump: Comparison between genders and influence of activity level." Journal of  
435 Electromyography and Kinesiology **16**(3): 273-280.

436 Fonseca, S.T.D., Silva, P.L.P.D., Ocarino, J.D.M. and Ursine, P.G.S. (2001). "Análise de um método  
437 eletromiográfico para quantificação de co-contracção muscular." Revista Brasileira de Ciência e  
438 Movimento **Vol. 9**.

439 Geurtsa, A.C.H., Haarta, M.D., Nesa, I.J.W.V. and Duysens, J. (2005). "A review of standing balance recovery  
440 from stroke." Gait & Posture **22**(3): 267-281.

441 Gross, R., Leboeuf, F., Hardouin, J.B., Lempereur, M., et al. (2013). "The influence of gait speed on co-  
442 activation in unilateral spastic cerebral palsy children." Clinical Biomechanics **28**(3): 312-317.

443 Hailey D, Ohinmaa A and R., R. (2004). "Study quality and evidence of benefit in recent assessments of  
444 telemedicine." J Telemed Telecare. **10**(6): 318-324.

445 Heiden, T.L., Lloyd, D.G. and Ackland, T.R. (2009). "Knee joint kinematics, kinetics and muscle co-  
446 contraction in knee osteoarthritis patient gait." Clinical Biomechanics **24**(10): 833-841.

447 Hendricks, H.T., Van Limbeek, J., Geurts, A.C. and Zwarts, M.J. (2002). "Motor recovery after stroke: A  
448 systematic review of the literature." Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation **83**(11): 1629-  
449 1637.

450 Hesse, S., Brandl-Hesse, B., Seidel, U., Doll, B., et al. (2000). "Lower limb muscle activity in ambulatory  
451 children with cerebral palsy before and after the treatment with Botulinum toxin A." Restorative  
452 Neurology and Neuroscience **17**(1): 1-8.

453 Hesse, S., Konrad, M. and Uhlenbrock, D. (1999). "Treadmill walking with partial body weight support  
454 versus floor walking in hemiparetic subjects." Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation  
455 **80**(4): 421-427.

456 Hortobágyi, T., Solnik, S., Gruber, A., Rider, P., et al. (2009). "Interaction between age and gait velocity in  
457 the amplitude and timing of antagonist muscle coactivation." Gait & Posture **29**(4): 558-564.

458 Jang, S.H. (2010). "The recovery of walking in stroke patients: a review." International Journal of  
459 Rehabilitation Research **33**(4): 285-289 210.1097/MRR.1090b1013e32833f30500.

460 Knarr, B.A., Zeni Jr, J.A. and Higginson, J.S. (2012). "Comparison of electromyography and joint moment as  
461 indicators of co-contraction." Journal of Electromyography and Kinesiology **22**(4): 607-611.

462 Lamontagne, A., Malouin, F., Richards, C.L. and Dumas, F. (2002). "Mechanisms of disturbed motor control  
463 in ankle weakness during gait after stroke." Gait & Posture **15**(3): 244-255.

464 Lamontagne, A., Richards, C.L. and Malouin, F. (2000). "Coactivation during gait as an adaptive behavior  
465 after stroke." Journal of Electromyography and Kinesiology **10**(6): 407-415.

466 Latash, M.L., Levin, M.F., Scholz, J.P. and Schöner, G. (2010). "Motor Control Theories and Their  
467 Applications." Medicina (Kaunas) **46**(6): 382-392.

468 Lord, S.E., Mcpherson, K., Mcnaughton, H.K., Rochester, L., et al. (2004). "Community ambulation after  
469 stroke: how important and obtainable is it and what measures appear predictive?" Archives of  
470 Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation **85**(2): 234-239.

471 Massaad, F., Lejeune, T.M. and Detrembleur, C. (2009). "Reducing the Energy Cost Of Hemiparetic Gait  
472 Using Center of Mass Feedback: A Pilot Study." Neurorehabilitation and Neural Repair.

473 Melzer, I., Benjuya, N. and Kaplanski, J. (2004). "Postural stability in the elderly: a comparison between  
474 fallers and non-fallers." Age and Ageing **33**(6): 602-607.

475 Milner, T. (2002). "Adaptation to destabilizing dynamics by means of muscle cocontraction." Experimental  
476 Brain Research **143**(4): 406-416.

477 Missenard, O., Mottet, D. and Perrey, S. (2008). "The role of cocontraction in the impairment of movement  
478 accuracy with fatigue." Experimental Brain Research **185**(1): 151-156.

479 Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D.G., et al. (2009). "Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic  
480 Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement." PLoS Med **6**(7): e1000097.

481 Nakazawa, K., Kawashima, N., Akai, M. and Yano, H. (2004). "On the reflex coactivation of ankle flexor and  
482 extensor muscles induced by a sudden drop of support surface during walking in humans." Journal  
483 of Applied Physiology **96**(2): 604-611.

484 Olesen, J. and Leonardi, M. (2003). "The burden of brain diseases in Europe." European Journal of  
485 Neurology **10**(5): 471-477.

486 Olney, S. and Richards, C. (1996). "Hemiparetic gait following stroke. Part I: Characteristics." Gait & Posture  
487 **4**: 136 - 148.

488 Patterson, S.L., Forrester, L.W., Rodgers, M.M., Ryan, A.S., et al. (2007). "Determinants of Walking Function  
489 After Stroke: Differences by Deficit Severity." Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation  
490 **88**(1): 115-119.

491 Paul Cordo, Curtis Calvin Bell and Harnad, S.R. (1997). Motor learning and synaptic plasticity in the  
492 cerebellum, Behavioral and Brain Sciences.

493 Peterson, D.S. and Martin, P.E. (2010). "Effects of age and walking speed on coactivation and cost of  
494 walking in healthy adults." Gait & Posture **31**(3): 355-359.

495 Poon, D.M.Y. and Hui-Chan, C.W.Y. (2009). "Hyperactive stretch reflexes, co-contraction, and muscle  
496 weakness in children with cerebral palsy." Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology **51**(2): 128-  
497 135.

498 Prosser, L.A., Lee, S.C.K., Vansant, A.F., Barbe, M.F., et al. (2010). "Trunk and Hip Muscle Activation Patterns  
499 Are Different During Walking in Young Children With and Without Cerebral Palsy." Physical Therapy  
500 **90**(7): 986-997.

501 Quervain, K., A., I., Simon, S.R., Leurgans, S.U.E., et al. (1996). "Gait Pattern in the Early Recovery Period  
502 after Stroke\*." The Journal of Bone & Joint Surgery **78**(10): 1506-1514.

503 Raja, B., Neptune, R. and Kautz, S. (2012). "Quantifiable Patterns of Limb Loading and Unloading During  
504 Hemiparetic Gait: Relation to Kinetic and Kinematic Parameters." J Rehabil Res Dev. **49** (9): 1293-  
505 1304.

506 Ramsey, V.K., Miszko, T.A. and Horvat, M. (2004). "Muscle activation and force production in Parkinson's  
507 patients during sit to stand transfers." Clinical Biomechanics **19**(4): 377-384.

508 Roerdink, M., Lamoth, C.J., Kwakkel, G., Van Wieringen, P.C., et al. (2007). "Gait Coordination After Stroke:  
509 Benefits of Acoustically Paced Treadmill Walking." Physical Therapy **87**(8): 1009-1022.

510 Sasaki, K., Neptune, R.R. and Kautz, S.A. (2009). "The relationships between muscle, external, internal and  
511 joint mechanical work during normal walking." Journal of Experimental Biology **212**(5): 738-744.

512 Staines, R., McIlroy, W.E. and Brooks, D. (2009). "Functional Impairments Following Stroke: Implications for  
513 Rehabilitation." Current Issues in Cardiac Rehabilitation and Prevention.

514 Truelsen, T., Heuschmann, P.U., Bonita, R., Arjundas, G., et al. (2007). "Standard method for developing  
515 stroke registers in low-income and middle-income countries: experiences from a feasibility study of  
516 a stepwise approach to stroke surveillance (STEPS Stroke)." The Lancet Neurology **6**(2): 134-139.

517 Vereijken, B., Emmerik, R.E.a.V., Whiting, H.T.A. and Newell, K.M. (1992). "Free(z)ing Degrees of Freedom in  
518 Skill Acquisition." Journal of Motor Behavior **24**(1): 133-142.

519 Werner, C., Von Frankenberg, S., Treig, T., Konrad, M., et al. (2002). "Treadmill Training With Partial Body  
520 Weight Support and an Electromechanical Gait Trainer for Restoration of Gait in Subacute Stroke  
521 Patients: A Randomized Crossover Study." Stroke **33**(12): 2895-2901.

522 Yavuzer, M.G. (2006). WALKING AFTER STROKE: Interventions to restore normal gait pattern Thesis to  
523 obtain the degree of Doctor Erasmus University Rotterdam on the authority of the Rector  
524 Magnificus.

525 Zhang, L.-Q., Nuber, G., Butler, J., Bowen, M., et al. (1997). "In vivo human knee joint dynamic properties as  
526 functions of muscle contraction and joint position." Journal of Biomechanics **31**(1): 71-76.  
527

Table 1: Characteristics of the studies included in the analysis of MCo during walking in subjects with stroke

Author (year)	Design	Participants	Walking Protocol	Assessment	Muscles	Results			Walking Ability
						MCo	Non Affected Limb	Lower	
						Affected Lower Limb			
Hesse et al. (1999)	Observational	N=18 Subjects 50% R hemiparesis 72% MCA; 28% SIH Acute and chronic stages of stroke: 2.9 to 11.2 months post onset 77% males 35-77yrs	Treadmill (unsupported, with 15% of body weight support (BWS), with 30% of BWS) and floor walking (15 meters); Mean velocity = 0.27m/s;		Shank Muscles: TA/GAS	Higher and longer during ground-level walking than during treadmill walking with body weight support - Gait Cycle;			A better initial contact (with the sole instead of the forefoot) while subjects walked in the treadmill with body weight support.
Lamontagne et al.(2000)	Observational	N=30 Subjects 43% R hemiparesis 100% MCA FM 22±6 (10-32) Acute stage of stroke: less than 6 months post onset 53% males 38-81y  N=17 Healthy subjects 52% males 43-75yrs	Walk for 10 meters; Subjects with stroke: at natural speed; Healthy subjects: walk at very slow speed;		Shank Muscles: TA/GAS	Significantly shorter (p<0.01) during Single Stance;	Significantly longer (p<0.001) during 1st and 2nd Double Stance; Longer duration (p<0.001) during 1st Double Stance;		Affected Lower Limb: co-contraction durations approached normal values as gait speed, postural stability and dynamic strength increased.  Non Affected Lower Limb: longer co-contraction was associated with slower gait speed (r=0.38*), poorer postural stability (r=0.51**) and lower dynamic ankle strength on the paretic side (r=-0.37**).
Lamontagne et al. (2002)	Observational	N=30 Subjects 43% R hemiparesis FM 22±6 (10-32) Acute stage of stroke: less than 6 months post onset 70% males 37-72yrs  N=15 Healthy subjects; 67% males	Walk along 10 meters; Subjects with stroke: at natural speed; Healthy subjects: natural and very slow speed;		Shank Muscles: TA/GAS	Within normal values in SW phase + stance phase; Significant difference between both legs in 1st Double Stance + Single Stance;	Longer co-contraction, than controls walking at natural speed (p<0.05) and at very slow speed (p<0.01) during -1st Double Stance and Single Stance;		Reduced plantarflexor moment on the affected lower limb was combined with excessive antagonist co-contraction at the ankle on the non-affected lower limb;

Detrembleur et al. (2003)	Observational	N= 9 Subjects; 67% R hemiparesis; FIM 123 (118-125); SIAS (44-68); AS (0-3); Chronic stage of stroke: 6 to 85 months post onset; 55% males; 37-77yrs;	Walk across 10 meters at a comfortable speed and at fast speed;	Thigh Muscles: RF/BF  Shank Muscles: TA/LG	Around 10% and 1.5-6 times longer than normal during all Gait Cycle; ;  Around 40% and 1.5-6 longer than normal during all Gait Cycle;	Increase in muscle co-contraction was combined with an increase in energy cost of walking (energy expenditure/speed of walking), proportional to the increase in the total mechanical work (work done by muscles), but with normal work production efficiency (mechanical work/energy expended). Hypothesis to explain normal work production efficiency: unaffected lower limb performed most of the work;	
Den Otter et al. (2006)	Observational	N= 14 Subjects; 35.7% R hemiparesis; 42.8% impaired SS; 78.57% impaired TC; Acute stage of stroke: 23 to 52 days post onset; 43% males 39-71yrs  N= 14 Healthy subjects; 43% males 42.8y±12.3yrs	Walking on a treadmill: as early as possible after admission; 1, 3, 6 and 10 weeks after baseline; Tested a maximum speed (maintained during 40sec.); speed was increased as much as possible;	Thigh Muscles: BF/RF  Shank Muscles: TA/GM	Longer (p<0.05) in single Stance at baseline; no significant change during follow up. Stroke:63%±34%; Healthy:31%±21%;  Non-statistically different from controls during all Gait Cycle at baseline; no significant differences during follow ups.	Longer (p>0.05) in single stance, compared to controls during all Gait Cycle at baseline; no significant change during follow up.  Shorter duration (P>0.05) during all Gait Cycle at baseline; no significant differences during follow ups.	No changes in temporal asymmetry; Walking speed increased over time; General mobility (Rivermead Mobility Index) of subjects increased over time; Subjects ambulatory independence (Functional Ambulation Categories) increased over time;
Den Otter et al. 2007	Observational	N= 24 Subjects; 58% R hemiparesis; 37.5% impaired SS; 67% impaired TC; Acute and Chronic stages: 3 to 21 months after stroke; 42% males 58.58±13.17yrs  N= 14 Healthy Subjects;	Walking on a treadmill for 40s; Tests with a self-selected speed;	Thigh Muscles: BF/RF  Shank Muscles: TA/GAS	Exceed controls levels in affected double support phase; (p<0.05) Stroke: 61%±31;  No significant differences, compared with controls;	Exceed controls levels; all gait cycle; (p<0.05) Stroke: 62%±31;  No significant differences, compared with controls	

			43% male 42.85±12.3yrs					
Massaad et al.(2009)	Pretest- Posttest	N= 6 Subjects; 67% R hemiparesis; SIAS (47-67); Chronic stage of stroke: 48 to 285 months post onset; 67% males 47±13yrs	18 training sessions: - 30 minutes walking in a treadmill with feedback of the CM displacement (3 trials, 10 minutes each); Walking at comfortable speed;-walking period increased 5 minutes every 2 weeks;	Thigh Muscles: VL/BF  Shank Muscles: TA/GM	Decreased significantly (10%;p=0.026) during all Gait Cycle; Pre:44%±9 Post:39%±13	Decreased significantly by 15% (p=0.012) during all Gait Cycle; Pre:40%±7 Post:34%±10	Vertical CM displacement decreased; Gait energy cost decreased;	
Chow et al., (2012)	Observational	N= 11 Subjects; AS 2±0.2 Chronic stage of stroke: 45±46 months post onset; 27% males 41±9 yrs  N= 11 Healthy subjects; Gender and age matched;	Walking 7 meters (8-10 times); Stroke subjects at a self- selected speed; Healthy subjects at a self-selected very slow speed;	Shank Muscles: TA/GM	Greater (p=0.001) during 2nd Double Stance; Greater (p=0.015) during 1st Double Stance; Greater (p=0.005) during 1st Double Stance+ Single Stance;	Greater compared to controls (p=0.038) during 1st Double Stance;		

EMG: electromyography, %: percentage, TA: tibialis anterior, GAS: gastrocnemius, GM: medial gastrocnemius; LG: lateral gastrocnemius; VL: vastus lateralis; BF: biceps femoris, RF: rectus femoris; MCA, middle cerebral artery; SIH, supra intracranial hemorrhage; R, right; FM, Fugl-Meyer scale; FIM, Functional Independence Measurement; SIAS, Stroke Impairment Assessment Set; AS, Ashworth Scale; SS, sensibility Score; TC, Trunk Control; \*statistically significant at p<0.05; \*\* statistically significant at p<0.001.