1	Moderate-Intensity Exercise Versus High-Intensity Interval Training to Recover Walking
2	Post-Stroke: Protocol for a Randomized Controlled Trial
3	
4	Allison Miller PT, DPT, NCS <sup>1</sup> , Darcy S. Reisman PT, PhD <sup>1,2</sup> , Sandra A. Billinger PT,
5	PhD <sup>3</sup> , Kari Dunning PT, PhD <sup>4</sup> , Sarah Doren BS <sup>4</sup> , Jaimie Ward MS <sup>3</sup> , Henry Wright PT,
6	DPT <sup>2</sup> , Erin Wagner MS <sup>4</sup> , Daniel Carl PhD <sup>4</sup> , Myron Gerson MD <sup>5</sup> , Oluwole Awosika MD,
7	MS <sup>6</sup> , Jane Khoury PhD <sup>7</sup> , Brett Kissela MD <sup>6</sup> , Pierce Boyne PT, DPT, PhD, NCS <sup>4</sup>
8	
9	<sup>1</sup> Department of Biomechanics and Movement Sciences Program, University of Delaware, Newark,
10	Delaware 19713
11	<sup>2</sup> Department of Physical Therapy, University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware 19713
12	<sup>3</sup> Department of Physical Therapy and Rehabilitation Science, University of Kansas Medical Center,
13	Kansas City, Kansas
14	<sup>4</sup> Department of Rehabilitation, Exercise and Nutrition Sciences, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio
15	<sup>5</sup> Departments of Cardiology and Internal Medicine, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio
16	<sup>6</sup> Department of Neurology and Rehabilitation Medicine, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio
17	<sup>7</sup> Division of Biostatistics and Epidemiology, Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, Department of
18	Pediatrics, University of Cincinnati College of Medicine, Cincinnati, Ohio
19	
20	Corresponding Author: Pierce Boyne PT, DPT, PhD, NCS, University of Cincinnati, 3225 Eden Avenue,
21	Cincinnati, Ohio, PH: 513-558-7499, FAX: 513-558-7474, boynepe@ucmail.uc.edu
22	

## 23 **ABSTRACT:**

Background: Stroke results in neurologic impairments and aerobic deconditioning that 24 25 contribute to limited walking capacity which is a major barrier post-stroke. Current 26 exercise recommendations and stroke rehabilitation guidelines recommend moderateintensity aerobic training post-stroke. Locomotor high-intensity interval training is a 27 28 promising new strategy that has shown significantly greater improvements in aerobic fitness and motor performance than moderate-intensity aerobic training in other 29 30 populations. However, the relative benefits and risks of high-intensity interval training and moderate-intensity aerobic training remain poorly understood following stroke. In 31 this study, we hypothesize that locomotor high-intensity interval training will result in 32 greater improvements in walking capacity than moderate-intensity aerobic training. 33 Methods: Using a single-blind, 3-site randomized controlled trial, 50 chronic (>6 34 months) stroke survivors are randomly assigned to complete 36 locomotor training 35

sessions of either high-intensity interval training or moderate-intensity aerobic training. 36 Main eligibility criteria are: age 40-80 years, single stroke for which the participant 37 received treatment (experienced 6 months to 5 years prior to consent), walking speed 38  $\leq$ 1.0 m/s, able to walk at least 3 minutes on the treadmill at  $\geq$  0.13 m/s (0.3 mph), stable 39 cardiovascular condition (American Heart Association class B), and the ability to walk 40 41 10 meters overground without continuous physical assistance. The primary outcome (walking capacity) and secondary outcomes (self-selected and fast gait speed, aerobic 42 fitness and fatigue) are assessed prior to initiating training and after 4 weeks, 8 weeks, 43 44 and 12 weeks of training.

45	Discussion: This study will provide fundamental new knowledge to inform the selection
46	of intensity and duration dosing parameters for gait recovery and optimization of aerobic
47	training interventions in chronic stroke. Data needed to justify and design a subsequent
48	definitive trial will also be obtained. Thus, the results of this study will inform future
49	stroke rehabilitation guidelines on how to optimally improve walking capacity following
50	stroke.
51	Trial Registration: ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT03760016. First posted: November
52	30, 2018. https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT03760016
53	Keywords: gait, rehabilitation, dose, locomotion, treadmill, overground, clinical trial,
54	aerobic
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	
60	
61	
62	
63	
64	

## 65 **BACKGROUND**:

#### 66 Background and Rationale:

Approximately 6.6 million Americans are currently living with chronic sequelae of 67 stroke of which a primary impairment is reduced walking capacity (1). Limited walking 68 capacity is a major barrier to recovery after stroke (2), and less than 10% of stroke 69 survivors have adequate walking speed and endurance to allow for normal daily 70 functioning, such as grocery shopping and occupational requirements (1, 3-6). Thus, 71 72 improving walking capacity is a primary goal of rehabilitation after stroke (2, 7). To address impairments in walking capacity, current exercise recommendations 73 74 and stroke rehabilitation guidelines recommend moderate-intensity aerobic training 75 (MAT) (2, 8). Compared to conventional rehabilitation approaches and lower intensity

training, MAT has shown significant benefits across a range of outcomes, such as

improvements in aerobic fitness (9-11), walking capacity (10-14), and overall disability

(14). However, this approach has known limitations that has restricted its adoption in

79 most clinical stroke rehabilitation settings (2). In particular, MAT has shown small and

inconsistent effects on gait speed, a primary outcome of stroke rehabilitation (10, 11,

13). In addition, most laboratory-based MAT protocols have involved training durations

82 (typically 45 minutes, 3x/week for 6 months) (15-22) beyond what is possible in clinical

practice due to issues related to patient adherence (23-25) and reimbursement (26, 27).

84 Thus, to improve walking capacity post stroke, there is a critical need for a more

85 efficacious and time-efficient intervention.

Recent evidence suggests that a more vigorous training intensity (>60% vs. 40-86 60% heart rate reserve) may be a 'critical ingredient' for greater and more rapid 87 improvements in walking capacity (28). However, the presence of neurologic gait 88 impairments in individuals post stroke can make it challenging to reach this vigorous 89 intensity (29, 30). Locomotor high-intensity interval training (HIT) is a promising new 90 91 strategy for stroke rehabilitation that uses bursts of maximum speed walking alternated with recovery periods, which allows individuals to sustain higher aerobic intensities than 92 93 physiologically possible with continuous exercise (28). Adding treadmill HIT to inpatient stroke rehabilitation has been shown to significantly improve gait outcomes (31, 32). A 94 preliminary study in chronic stroke demonstrated that treadmill HIT can elicit significant 95 increases in walking capacity, gait speed and aerobic fitness in just 4 weeks (33). A 96 subsequent report showed the feasibility of combining treadmill and overground HIT in 97 an effort to better translate treadmill gait improvements into the normal overground 98 walking environment (34). Thus, HIT serves as a promising new strategy to target 99 impairments in aerobic fitness and motor impairment through its ability to achieve higher 100 aerobic intensities and demonstrate improvements in walking capacity in shorter training 101 102 durations.

Despite promising preliminary evidence, no previous studies have compared HIT with the current model recommended by stroke rehabilitation guidelines (MAT). In addition, the optimal training duration dose for HIT remains unknown. The present study intends to fill these gaps through completion of the following objectives: 1) Determine the optimal locomotor training intensity for eliciting immediate improvements in walking capacity among chronic stroke survivors, 2) Determine the minimum locomotor training

duration required to maximize immediate improvements in walking capacity in chronic
stroke, and 3) Understand the feasibility of implementing HIT at multiple sites across the
United States. The primary study hypothesis is that 4 weeks of HIT will elicit significantly
greater improvement in walking capacity compared to 4 weeks of MAT. Based on data
from a different gait intervention in a similar population (35), we also hypothesize that
compared with 4 and 8 weeks of HIT, 12 weeks of HIT will elicit significantly greater
improvements in walking capacity and increased benefit over MAT.

*Trial Design:* This is a single-blind, 3-site randomized controlled trial in which 116 participants are randomly assigned to one of two groups: locomotor moderate-intensity 117 aerobic training (MAT) or locomotor high-intensity interval training (HIT). Prior to 118 randomization, participants undergo a screening assessment and pre-training (PRE) 119 blinded outcome testing to determine eligibility. Once deemed eligible, participants 120 begin the intervention period of the study. The goal of the intervention period is to 121 complete 36 training sessions within 12 weeks, with up to one additional week for 122 makeup sessions in each 4-week training block. The intervention period consists of 123 three intervention blocks separated by repeated outcome testing after 4 weeks, 8 weeks 124 125 and 12 weeks of training (see Figure 1). Outcome testing is conducted by a blinded physical therapist at each time point. The primary outcome for this study is walking 126 capacity (6-Minute Walk Test, (6MWT)), and the secondary outcomes are comfortable 127 and fastest gait speed (10-Meter Walk Test, (10MWT)), aerobic fitness (VO<sub>2</sub> at 128 ventilatory threshold), and PROMIS Fatigue Scale total score. Exploratory measures 129 are scores on the Activities-Specific Balance Confidence Scale, EuroQOL-5D-5L. 130 Functional Ambulation Category, participant ratings of change, daily walking activity, 131

132 spatiotemporal measures of comfortable speed instrumented walkway gait testing,

resting heart rate and blood pressure, body mass index, metabolic cost of gait during

treadmill exercise testing, heart rate cost of gait during 6MWT (average heart rate

divided by average speed in meters/minute), difference in gait speed from the beginning

to end of the 6MWT, and other measures of aerobic fitness (e.g. VO<sub>2</sub> peak).

137

## 138 METHODS: PARTICIPANTS, OUTCOMES, INTERVENTIONS

139 **Study Setting:** This is a multisite clinical trial in which participants are recruited at three

sites: University of Cincinnati (UC), University of Delaware (UD), and University of

141 Kansas Medical Center (KUMC).

142 **Study Enrollment:** The target enrollment for this study is a total of 50 participants over

143 3 years (approximately 6 enrolled participants per site per year). As we anticipate a

screen failure rate of up to 40%, we expect to consent up to 70 participants

145 (approximately 8 consented participants per site per year) to meet the target enrollment.

146 *Recruitment:* Recruitment will utilize multiple approaches, including: 1) Continuous

outreach to regional therapists and physicians, 2) Outreach to stroke support groups, 3)

148 Advertisements in newspapers, magazines, social media, physician offices and/or

therapy clinics, 4) Leveraging existing databases of local stroke survivors interested in

participating in research, 5) Screening medical records for potentially eligible

151 participants (UC and KUMC sites only).

Screening Process: A member of the study team provides an overview of the study
 and determines initial interest in participation either in-person or via phone. The

potential risks and benefits of participation are described. Potential participants are
informed that participating in the study is completely voluntary and that he/she may
discontinue participation at any time. For individuals who express interest, the study
team member asks pre-screening questions to determine initial eligibility and answer
any participant questions. For individuals who meet criteria according to pre-screening
questions, a screening visit is scheduled. Each study site maintains a log to document
the potential number of participants (or caregivers) contacted.

Informed Consent: A study team member describes the study procedures and potential risks and benefits in detail at the start of the screening visit. Prior to signing informing consent, participants are asked standardized questions to ensure that the individual understands the study before consenting.

*Eligibility Criteria:* The inclusion criteria for this study are as follows: 1) Age 40-80 165 years at the time of consent, 2) Single stroke for which the participant sought treatment, 166 6 months to 5 years prior to consent, 3) Walking speed  $\leq$  1.0 m/s on the 10-meter walk 167 test, 4) Able to walk 10m over ground with assistive devices as needed and no 168 169 continuous physical assistance from another person, 5) Able to walk at least 3 minutes on the treadmill at  $\geq$  0.13 m/s (0.3 mph), 6) Stable cardiovascular condition (American 170 Heart Association class B, allowing for aerobic capacity <6 METs), 7) Able to 171 172 communicate with investigators, follow a 2-step command and correctly answer consent comprehension questions. 173

Exclusion criteria for this study are: 1) Exercise testing uninterpretable for ischemia or arrhythmia, 2) Evidence of significant arrhythmia or myocardial ischemia on treadmill ECG graded exercise test in the absence of recent (past year) more definitive

clinical testing with negative result, 3) Hospitalization for cardiac or pulmonary disease 177 within the past 3 months, 4) Implanted pacemaker or defibrillator, 5) Significant ataxia or 178 neglect (score of 2 on NIH stroke scale item 7 or 11), 6) Severe lower limb spasticity 179 (Ashworth >2), 7) Recent history (<3 months) of illicit drug or alcohol abuse or 180 significant mental illness, 8) Major post-stroke depression (Patient Health Questionnaire 181 182  $(PHQ-9) \ge 10$  in the absence of depression management by a health care provider, 9) Currently participating in physical therapy or another interventional study, 10) Recent 183 botulinum toxin injection to the paretic lower limb (<3 months) or planning to have lower 184 limb botulinum toxin injection in the next 4 months, 11) Foot drop or lower limb joint 185 instability without adequate stabilizing device, as assessed by a physical therapist, 12) 186 Clinically significant neurologic disorder other than stroke or unable to walk outside the 187 home prior to stroke, 13) Other significant medical condition likely to limit improvement 188 or jeopardize safety as assessed by a physical therapist, 14) Pregnancy, 15) Previous 189 exposure to fast treadmill walking (>3 cumulative hours) during clinical or research 190 therapy in the past year. 191

Participant Timeline: After obtaining informed consent, participants undergo a 192 193 Screening Visit to determine preliminary eligibility and record some clinical characteristics. If the participant is potentially eligible after completing the Screening 194 Visit, the participant then performs a PRE testing visit with a blinded testing therapist to 195 complete the eligibility assessment and obtain baseline data for the outcome measures. 196 In total, there are four evaluation periods throughout study participation. Participants 197 undergo evaluation assessments by a blinded testing therapist before starting the 198 intervention period (PRE), after 4 weeks of training (4-WK), after 8 weeks of training (8-199

WK), and after completing 12 weeks of training (POST), see Figure 1. The evaluation 200 procedures occurring at each of these four time points are the same and include the 201 following measures: 6-Minute Walk Test, comfortable and fastest gait speed testing, 202 treadmill graded exercise testing (GXT), questionnaires and recording of daily stepping 203 activity. In addition, at the 4-WK, 8-WK, and POST evaluation time points, a global 204 205 rating of change questionnaire is included that inquires about perceived changes in the participant's walking abilities and fatigue levels as they progress through the study 206 207 protocol.

208 Screening Visit Eligibility Measures: During the Screening Visit, a study team member obtains the participant's medical history, screens for the presence of 209 depressive symptoms, performs impairment and mobility assessments of the 210 participant, and performs StepWatch calibration procedures to begin step activity 211 212 monitoring. Medical history information includes characteristics of the participant's 213 stroke, comorbidities, medications, surgical history, previous therapies, pain, and mobility status prior to their stroke. Additionally, the study team member instructs the 214 participant to complete the Patient Health Questionnaire-9 to screen for depressive 215 216 symptoms (36). Assistance is provided to the participant by the study team member if needed to complete the questionnaire. 217

The physical assessment portion of the Screening Visit consists of impairment testing and mobility assessments. During impairment testing, the following measures are administered:

221	٠	Two-step command following: The participant is asked to "close your eyes and
222		make a fist". If the individual is unable to follow two-step commands, they are
223		ineligible for this study.

Lower extremity Fugl-Meyer (LEFM): The LEFM is a stroke-specific measure of
 lower extremity motor impairment and includes an assessment of the participant's
 reflexes and their ability to perform movements requiring different amounts of
 fractionated control (37). It will be used to characterize the study sample.

• Ashworth Hypertonia Assessment: This includes an assessment of the

229 participant's passive resistance to joint movement at their paretic lower extremity

(38). The Ashworth Scale is scored as "excessive" (Ashworth  $\geq$  3) or "acceptable"

231 (Ashworth <3). Individuals with Ashworth scores of  $\geq$  3 at their paretic lower

extremity are ineligible for this study.

Ataxia and neglect testing: Two items from the National Institutes of Health Stroke 233 Scale (NIHSS) are used to screen for severe ataxia or neglect to determine 234 235 participant eligibility (39). An assessment of upper and lower extremity coordination is used to determine the presence or absence of limb ataxia. Participants with ataxia 236 in more than one out of four limbs (i.e. ataxia score of 2) are ineligible for study 237 participation. Neglect testing includes an assessment of extinction to bilateral 238 simultaneous visual and tactile stimulation. Participants who present with extinction 239 to both sensory modalities or demonstrate behavioral evidence of profound hemi-240 inattention (i.e. extinction score of 2) are ineligible for study participation. 241 The mobility assessment of the Screening Visit consists of the following: 242

Walking-related pain assessment: A study team member queries the participant about any pain related to walking. If the participant's walking is limited by pain, the participant is asked further questions related to how the pain changes during walking. Based on the severity and characteristics of the participant's pain, this may exclude them from study participation if it is determined that pain is likely to limit improvement or jeopardize safety.

249 **Comfortable and fast gait speed measurements:** The 10MWT is used to assess the participant's comfortable and fastest gait speeds. An untimed 2-meter 250 251 acceleration distance is provided, followed by 10 meters of timed walking, and a 2meter untimed deceleration distance. Participants are asked to use the assistive and 252 orthotic devices that they most often use when walking. During the Screening Visit, 253 comfortable gait speed is averaged over two trials. Participants whose average gait 254 speed is greater than 1.0 m/s are excluded from study participation. If eligibility 255 criteria are met at comfortable gait speed, a 10MWT at the participant's fastest gait 256 speed is performed. The 10MWT is a valid and reliable measure of walking speed in 257 258 individuals post stroke (40).

Height and weight assessment: The participant's height and weight are obtained
 at the Screening Visit. Weight is reassessed at the 4-WK, 8-WK, and POST time
 points and used to normalize metabolic data from GXT testing at these time points.

• **Treadmill acclimation and screening assessment:** This assessment is used to determine eligibility and for preparation for exercise testing. As this study involves considerable treadmill walking, the treadmill acclimation provides the participant with the opportunity to acclimate to the treadmill and provides the study team with an

idea of how fast the participant can safely walk on the treadmill. During treadmill 266 walking, the participant's heart rate (HR) is monitored using a Polar heart rate 267 monitor synched to the Digifit iCardio app to provide real-time HR monitoring. The 268 study team member administering the test ensures that the participant's HR does 269 not exceed 80% age-predicted heart rate reserve (HRR) during this test. The 270 271 participant wears a harness that is attached to an overhead system for protection in the event of a fall and is asked to hold onto the handrail during testing. The treadmill 272 is started at a slow speed and gradually increased in communication with the 273 participant. The speed goal for this test is the participant's fast overground speed or 274 0.3 mph, whichever is higher. Rest breaks are provided to maintain <80% HRR, and 275 a post-exercise blood pressure is taken upon completing the test. Participants must 276 be able to walk at least 0.3 mph on the treadmill to be eligible for study participation. 277

278

After the Screening Visit (but before the PRE evaluation visit), pertinent medical records are obtained to ensure the participant is safe to participate in the study. A radiology report confirming stroke and its location is also obtained. Participants who do not meet one or more of the eligibility criteria that can be assessed from the Screening Visit are excluded (see Eligibility Criteria above).

284

Step Activity Monitoring: For participants that meet eligibility criteria at the time of the Screening Visit, a step activity monitor (Modus StepWatch) is calibrated and issued to the participant to wear throughout the study protocol during all waking hours except bathing. The StepWatch is calibrated per the manufacturer's instructions and synced to

an iPad app that enables study team members to download the participant's stepping 289 activity throughout the study protocol. At the start of each subsequent study visit, a 290 study team member "reads" the step activity data and records the stepping activity and 291 respective dates in the study's electronic data management system, REDCap 292 (Research Electronic Data Capture). Stepping activity data is also recorded at the end 293 294 of each study visit which enables study team members to discern steps taken within each study session from steps taken outside of study visits. While reading step activity 295 data, the study team member checks for data irregularities (e.g. missing steps in the 296 297 first or last half of non-study-visit days) and gueries the participant to determine if a particular day should be deemed a valid recording day. If it is likely that >10% of walking 298 bouts that day were not recorded, then it is documented as not a valid recording day. 299 Outcomes: The following measures are assessed at the PRE, 4-WK, 8-WK, and POST 300

evaluation time points and are conducted by a licensed physical therapist who is blinded 301 to group randomization. The goal is to complete all of the tests in the same visit and 302 within 2-7 days since the last training session in the preceding intervention block. 303 Whenever possible, gait testing (i.e. 6MWT and 10MWT) is completed prior to graded 304 305 exercise testing, as gait testing includes the primary outcome measure. Blood pressure and HR are taken at each visit. For all guestionnaires, the participant is encouraged to 306 self-administer (if able) to reduce any influence that the study team member may have 307 on their responses. 308

6-Minute Walk Test (6MWT): The 6MWT is a measure of walking capacity and is
 the primary outcome measure for this study. Study team members ensure that the
 participant is provided with adequate rest prior to performing this measure.

Participants are instructed to walk as far and fast as they can for six minutes and are 312 asked to use the orthotic and assistive devices they most often use during normal 313 daily walking (41). Participants walk along a marked pathway that was required to be 314 at least 20 meters long at each site. At UC and KUMC, participants walk back and 315 forth between two cones spaced 25 meters apart. At UD, participants walk around a 316 317 rectangular course with a 103.6-meter perimeter. The participant is informed that they may stop and rest as needed but that the timer will keep counting down. 318 Participants are notified how much time has elapsed in 1-minute intervals, and HR is 319 monitored and continuously recorded throughout the test. The total distance walked, 320 time to walk the first 25-meter length or 100 feet, time to walk the last complete 25-321 meter length or 100 feet, average HR, and max HR are recorded in REDCap. The 322 6MWT is a valid and reliable measure of walking endurance in individuals post 323 stroke (40, 42). 324

• **Comfortable and Fast 10-meter Walk Test:** The participant's comfortable and fast gait speeds are assessed using the 10MWT in the same manner as described above. Two comfortable speed trials and two fast speed trials are taken at each of the four outcome testing time points.

Treadmill Exercise Testing with Metabolic Cart: At each evaluation time point
 during the study, a treadmill graded exercise test (GXT) is performed. Exercise
 testing is performed on a motorized treadmill with a 12-lead electrocardiogram
 (ECG) and metabolic cart for analysis of VO<sub>2</sub>. At the start of the test, the participant's
 resting vital signs and ECG are obtained. Participants then walk on a treadmill
 wearing a harness attached to an overhead system for fall protection and hold onto

the treadmill handrail. The starting treadmill speed is 0.3 mph for the first 3 minutes 335 and then gradually increases in increments of 0.1 mph every 30 seconds until peak 336 volitional exertion. The incline of the treadmill remains 0% unless the participant 337 achieves a speed of 3.5 mph at which time the incline increases in increments of 338 0.5% every 30 seconds while the speed remains fixed. Ratings of perceived exertion 339 340 (RPE) (43) and blood pressure are assessed every two minutes during the test. Test termination criteria include the participant's request to stop, the participant drifting 341 backward on the treadmill and being unable to recover, gait instability judged to pose 342 an imminent safety risk by the testing therapist, and other stop criteria according to 343 American College of Sports Medicine guidelines (44). After completion of this test 344 and a 10-minute rest period, participants are asked to attempt a 3-minute verification 345 test to determine whether maximum heart rate was reached. During the verification 346 test, the speed is increased to the last successfully completed stage from the GXT, 347 348 and a 3-minute timer is started once the treadmill has reached this target stage. Participants are encouraged to try and complete the full 3 minutes of the verification 349 test when possible. VO<sub>2</sub> is not measured during the verification test. Guidelines for 350 351 stopping criteria are the same as the GXT, except that the verification phase can be stopped once the participants completes the 3 minutes. The instantaneous peak HR 352 353 from the verification test is recorded in the study's electronic database. During the 354 PRE period, a physician or medical monitor reviews the test results to ensure safety to continue with the study protocol. In this study, the peak heart rate achieved during 355 356 the GXT or verification test (whichever is higher) is used to derive training intensity 357 zones. If the participant does not achieve 85% of their age-predicted maximum heart

rate during the GXT or verification test (44), the peak GXT or verification test heart 358 rate (whichever is higher) is also used as a heart rate limit during subsequent 359 training sessions.  $VO_2$  at the ventilatory threshold is a secondary outcome for this 360 study as evidence suggests that this measure may be a more valid assessment of 361 aerobic capacity compared to  $VO_2$  peak in individuals with stroke (45). 362 PROMIS Fatigue Scale (Version 8a): The PROMIS Fatigue Scale is an 8-item self-363 report questionnaire that inquires about the participant's fatigue over the past seven 364 days (46). Responses are rated on a 5-point Likert scale from 'not at all' to 'very 365 much'. 366 Functional Ambulation Category (FAC): The FAC is a measure of walking 367 independence and is scored on a scale of 0-5 (47). A member of the study team 368 rates the participant's level of walking independence based on their walking 369 performance during the 10MWT and 6MWT. For this study, only scores of 2-4 are 370 permitted as individuals obtaining lower scores would not meet the eligibility criteria, 371 and a score of 5 would require observation of the participant walking on different 372 373 types of non-level surfaces, which is not part of this study. EQ-5D Quality of Life Questionnaire (Version 5L): The EQ-5D is a 6-item 374 questionnaire about quality of life as it relates to mobility, self-care, usual activities. 375 pain/discomfort, anxiety/depression, and overall health (48). 376 Activities Specific Balance Confidence Scale (ABC): The ABC is a 16-tem 377 questionnaire that asks participants to rate their balance confidence during everyday 378 tasks on a scale from 0% to 100% (49). Scores are averaged to provide an overall 379 380 value representing the participant's perceived balance confidence.

Global Rating of Change (GROC): This questionnaire asks participants to rate their
 perceived change in areas related to their walking abilities and walking habits since
 beginning the study (not applicable at PRE testing) (50). Responses are scored on a
 7-point ordinal scale ranging from 'much better' to 'much worse'.

- Electronic Walkway Gait Assessment: Before starting the first training session in
- each intervention block (i.e. training sessions 1, 13, and 25) and the final training
- session (i.e. session 36), the participant's comfortable speed gait parameters are
- recorded with two passes across an electronic walkway (e.g. GaitRITE). Participants
- are asked to use their habitual assistive and orthotic devices. The following gait
- 390 parameters are recorded in REDCap: gait velocity, cadence, right and left step
- lengths (cm), right and left step times (s), right and left single limb support (% of gait
- 392 cycle), and right and left stride velocity (cm/s).

393 Allocation: Eligible participants are randomized after the PRE blinded outcome testing visit and before the first training session. Participants are randomized in a 1:1 ratio to 394 either HIT or MAT, using the REDCap randomization module. This module ensures 395 concealed allocation by requiring the study team member to confirm participant eligibility 396 prior to revealing the randomization allocation and not permitting anyone to un-397 randomize a participant. The study statistician who computer-generated the 398 randomization sequence and uploaded it to REDCap is the only person who has access 399 to view it and has no interaction with study participants (e.g. not involved with 400 401 recruitment or enrollment). Randomization is stratified by site and baseline walking speed (<0.4,  $\geq$  0.4 m/s) to help ensure that groups are balanced within sites and on this 402 critical prognostic factor (51, 52). Within each stratum, block size is randomly permuted 403

to prevent study personnel from being able to predict the last randomization within a
block. SAS® (SAS Institute, Cary, NC) PROC PLAN was used to create the
randomization scheme.

*Interventions:* Participants are randomly assigned to either MAT or HIT. Study
interventions are administered under the direction of a licensed physical therapist. For
each intervention block, the goal is to complete 12 training sessions within 4 weeks,
with an additional week allowed for makeup sessions. The target frequency of training is
3 sessions per week (with one day of rest between training sessions, when possible).

The following procedures are common to both intervention groups. Each training 412 visit involves 45 minutes of exercise that consists of a 3-minute warm-up of overground 413 walking, 10 minutes of overground training, 20 minutes of treadmill training, 10 minutes 414 of overground training, and a 2-minute cool-down of overground walking. Throughout 415 training, participants use their customary orthotic devices. During overground training, 416 participants use the assistive device that best enables achievement of intervention 417 goals (fastest speed for HIT; target HR for MAT). The participant's overground gait 418 training speed is measured at the beginning and end of each overground bout. During 419 treadmill walking, participants wear a harness connected to an overhead support 420 system for fall protection and are asked to use a handrail for balance support. Guarding 421 422 is provided by the training therapist to help prevent falls or injury. No assistance or cueing is provided to improve the participant's gait pattern. 423

During training, participants wear a heart rate monitor and step activity monitor to monitor heart rate and stepping activity, respectively. Heart rate is monitored using the Polar H7 Bluetooth 4.0 transmitter synched to an Apple iPod application (Digifit iCardio)

to enable continuous HR monitoring throughout the training session. The iPod
application is also used to time the duration of each component of training (e.g. 20minute treadmill bout). The target HR for training sessions is based on the participant's
highest HR achieved during the GXT or verification test. Resting HR values are
obtained at the start of the training visit in a standing position. Stepping activity data is
recorded before and after each treatment session to monitor steps taken during the
session.

Rating of Perceived Exertion (RPE), blood pressure, and blood lactate are also 434 monitored throughout the intervention protocol. Participants are shown an RPE chart at 435 the end of each training session and asked how hard they were working during the 436 session on average. Blood pressure is monitored at least once per session until a 437 consistent response within safety limits is established. Blood lactate concentrations are 438 measured in the middle session of each training week (i.e. every 3 training sessions 439 starting at session 2) immediately after completing the treadmill training portion of the 440 session. Immediately after treadmill training, the participant is instructed to sit on a chair 441 on the treadmill, and the training therapist obtains a measure of blood lactate via 442 443 fingerstick with caution taken to avoid sweat contamination and alterations in lactate concentration due to vigorous finger squeezing. 444

If any of the following occur during a training session, exercise is paused (timer
will continue) and the training therapist decides whether early termination and/or
physician notification is warranted: 1) New onset pain, 2) HR consistently exceeding
peak HR achieved on most recent GXT or verification test (only if the participant has not
reached 85% age-predicted maximum heart rate during exercise test), 3) Difficulty

monitoring heart rate or blood pressure, 4) Participant requests a break. If any of the 450 following occur during a training session, the session is terminated, the participant's 451 physician is notified, and the site primary investigator decides whether to withdraw the 452 participant from the study: 1) Signs of poor perfusion, 2) Drop in systolic blood pressure 453  $\geq$  10 mmHg below the resting level from that day despite an increase in workload, 3) 454 455 Hypertensive response with systolic blood pressure >240 mmHg and diastolic blood pressure >110 mmHg, 4) New onset of significant nervous system symptoms or 456 claudication pain, 5) Chest pain or angina, 6) Severe fatigue or shortness of breath in 457 excess of what would be expected from exercise, 7) Serious injury. 458

Locomotor moderate-intensity aerobic training (MAT). Individuals 459 randomized to the MAT group perform continuous walking on the treadmill and 460 overground. During training, speed is continuously adjusted to maintain the following 461 target HR ranges: Training Sessions 1-6: 40 ± 5% HRR; Training Sessions 7-12: 45 ± 462 5% HRR, Training Sessions 13-18: 50 ± 5% HRR; Training Sessions 19-36: 55 ± 5% 463 HRR. All attempts are made to keep heart rates below 60% HRR during MAT training 464 sessions as this is generally considered the threshold for vigorous intensity (44). During 465 466 overground MAT, the participant is instructed to walk continuously for 10 minutes, and the training therapist instructs the participant to speed up or slow down to maintain their 467 heart rate in the desired training zone. 468

For treadmill MAT, participants walk continuously for 20 minutes if possible. At the start of each session, the training therapist selects a speed that brings the participant as close as possible to, but not exceeding, the target HR. For the first training session, treadmill speeds start at ~75% of the participant's comfortable gait

473 speed from the most recent 10MWT. The training therapist then adjusts the speed as 474 needed to keep the participant's HR in the target zone. The training therapist decreases 475 the speed if the participant requests a speed decrease, the participant drifts backward 476 and does not immediately recover, gait instability is observed and judged to pose an 477 immediate safety risk, toe drag that persists into mid-swing is observed, or there is 478 evidence of excessive joint instability with risk of harm.

Locomotor high-intensity interval training (HIT). Individuals randomized to the 479 HIT group perform repeated 30 second bursts of walking at their maximum safe speed, 480 alternated with 30-60 second rest periods. During overground HIT, burst speed is 481 increased using visual feedback about the distance covered during each burst and 482 encouragement to increase distance. During treadmill HIT, speed is systematically 483 increased throughout each training session based on performance criteria. Speed is the 484 primary intensity target for the HIT group, and HR is secondary after speed is 485 maximized. This is primarily because the 30 second bursts are not long enough for 486 heart rate to reach steady state, so it fluctuates between burst and recovery and trends 487 upward over the session (53, 54). The target average HR for each session is  $\sim$ 70% 488 489 HRR, with a range from 60% to 95% HRR. If the participant reached their target HR of 85% of their age-predicted maximum (not adjusted for beta-blockers) during the GXT 490 and had normal results, then no HR limit is enforced. However, if the participant did not 491 reach their target HR once during any previous GXTs, their training HR is limited to their 492 maximum HR achieved across all previous GXTs. 493

494 During overground HIT training, the participant is instructed to walk as fast as 495 they can for 30 seconds. A marker is placed at the participant's starting position as well

as their final position after the 30-second burst. For future bursts, participants are 496 encouraged to achieve at least the distance they covered during previous bursts and 497 further if they are able. Sixty seconds of rest is provided after the first three bursts and 498 then decreased to 30 seconds rest periods thereafter. However, the training therapist 499 may consider extending the rest periods if the participant needs to sit down during 500 501 recovery, if the distance covered during the previous bursts significantly decreases with shorter rest periods, if the participant requests an extended rest break, or if the 502 participant exceeds their heart rate limit. 503

When selecting speeds for treadmill HIT during bursts, the goal is to quickly find 504 the participant's fastest safe challenge speed and increase this speed as able 505 throughout the burst. The challenge speed is defined as the speed at which the 506 participant can safely complete the burst but has some backward drift or gait instability 507 with recovery. During the first treadmill HIT session, treadmill speeds start at ~75% of 508 509 the participant's peak successful speed from their most recent GXT. To determine an initial challenge speed during bursts, the training therapist waits 15 seconds to allow the 510 speed to ramp up and the participate to acclimate, and then increases the speed by 0.1 511 512 mph every 5 seconds. Once the challenge speed is found, specific criteria are used to determine whether subsequent burst speeds will be increased, maintained, or 513 514 decreased. If a burst is performed safely with no gait instability or backward drift, the speed is increased by 0.1 mph for the next burst. If the challenge speed criteria are met. 515 the speed is kept the same for the next burst. If a burst is not performed safely or must 516 be stopped early due to backward drift without recovery or unsafe gait instability, the 517 speed is decreased by 0.1 mph for the next burst. Similar to overground HIT, 60 518

seconds of rest are provided in between the first three bursts, followed by 30 second
rest periods between subsequent bursts and similar criteria are used during treadmill
HIT to determine if an extended rest period is required.

522 **Personnel Training and Standardization:** A systematic training and competency assessment program for all study therapists and coordinators has been implemented to 523 524 maintain standardization of study procedures across sites. Study personnel cannot perform an official study role until certified for that role. The site primary investigator (PI) 525 and site coordinator ensure that the study team member meets competency 526 requirements. Study personnel training procedures include the following: 1) Reading the 527 study manual of operating procedures (MOP), 2) Complete online personnel training 528 529 modules related to their study roles 3) Practice using the study's electronic data management system, REDCap, 4) Practice using all equipment required for their study 530 roles. Trainees must show competency in all aspects of their role before certification. 531 532 Recertification is done as needed based on the discretion of the site PI. A delegation of authority log is maintained at each site to delineate the job roles of study team 533 members. Communication between the site PIs is maintained through meetings, 534 535 conference calls, or emails as needed to maintain consistency in study procedures across sites. 536

537

## 538 METHODS: DATA MANAGEMENT AND ANALYSIS

*Data Management:* This study uses both electronic and hard-copy data management
procedures. For electronic database management, the secure data platform REDCap is

used, and the majority of study data is directly entered into the REDCap database using 541 an iPad during each study visit. This database includes automated calculations, guality 542 control checks and prompts (e.g. notification if entered data indicate participant is not 543 eligible, calculation of intensity targets, notification of whether entered intensity data are 544 within target range, prompts to fill in any missing data or to double check any values 545 546 outside of the expected range). Each study team member is provided a secure login for the University of Cincinnati REDCap portal through the UC regulatory coordinator and 547 provided data access rights based on their study role such that blinded personnel 548 cannot access randomization or intervention data. 549

This study also generates some electronic data outside of REDCap that could be 550 further processed to obtain additional variables of interest. Examples of such data 551 include metabolic cart files, electronic walkway files, and StepWatch activity files. These 552 data files are uploaded and stored in a secure OneDrive folder that is designated for 553 research data so that they can be processed centrally. To maximize data security, no 554 participant identifiable information is entered into these files or the software that creates 555 these files. In addition, hard-copy records containing information that could be used to 556 557 identify participants (e.g. consent forms, medical records) and any hard copy forms containing study data (e.g. temporary backup paper forms in case of power, internet or 558 559 REDCap server downtime) are maintained in a locked storage unit inside a controlledaccess room throughout the study. Regulatory documents are maintained according to 560 institutional requirements and guidelines specific to each site. 561

Sample Size: This study is powered to detect the minimally clinically important
 difference (MCID) of 20 meters in walking capacity (6MWT) change between groups

(55). The 6MWT change estimate for the MAT group was extrapolated from a 4-week 564 pilot study and resulted in a change estimate of 15 meters every 4 weeks (33). The 565 6MWT change estimate for the HIT group was calculated by adding the MCID to the 566 MAT group estimate (15+20=35 meters every 4 weeks). Variance and covariance 567 parameters were estimated by pooling data across two previous 4-week studies (n=20), 568 569 using the mean variance for each time point and the highest suggested exponential decay rate (0.5) (56) for the repeated measures correlations to extrapolate parameters 570 for the 8-WK and POST time points. These calculations indicated a target sample size 571 572 of 40 (20/group) for 80% power. To account for up to 20% attrition, the target enrollment is 50 participants. 573

574 Statistical Methods: SAS v9.4 will be used for data analysis, and the study statistician will remain blinded to study group. Data related to baseline variables, intervention 575 fidelity and concurrent outside interventions will be compared between groups using t-576 tests and X<sup>2</sup>. If a baseline prognostic factor is found to differ between groups, it will be 577 considered for inclusion as a covariate during hypothesis testing. The primary analysis 578 will follow intent-to-treat methods and any missing data will be handled with the 579 580 maximum likelihood method, assuming that patterns of missingness do not violate the missing at random assumption (57). To test robustness of different ways to handle 581 missing data, sensitivity analyses will be used. 582

583 <u>Hypothesis 1:</u> To test our primary hypothesis that, compared with 4 weeks of 584 MAT, 4 weeks of HIT will elicit significantly greater improvement in the 6MWT distance, 585 a general linear model will be used. In this model, we will use fixed effects for group 586 (HIT, MAT), time (PRE, 4-WK, 8-WK, POST), [group x time], site (UC, KUMC, UD), [site

x time], baseline speed category (<0.4, ≥0.4 m/s), and [baseline speed category x time] with an unstructured covariance matrix. This hypothesis will be tested by the significance of the [group x time] contrast from the PRE to 4-WK for the 6MWT at  $\alpha$ =0.05. Secondary outcomes will be tested separately using this same model to identify the most sensitive measures to carry forward into future studies (58). The Benjamini-Hochberg procedure (59) will be used to control the false discovery rate for the secondary outcomes.

Hypothesis 2: To test the hypothesis that, compared with 4 and 8 weeks of HIT, 594 595 12 weeks of HIT will elicit significantly greater improvements in walking capacity and increased benefit over MAT, the same general linear model described above will be 596 597 used. The hypothesis that 12 weeks of HIT will elicit greater improvements in primary and secondary outcomes compared to 4 and 8 weeks of HIT will be tested by the 598 significance of the respective time contrasts within the HIT group. The hypothesis that 599 600 HIT will elicit significantly greater improvements in primary and secondary outcomes from PRE to 8-WK and PRE to POST compared to MAT will be tested by the 601 significance of the respective [group x time] contrasts. False discovery rate control will 602 603 be applied for secondary outcomes (59).

We will also test for baseline cofactors that may influence a stroke survivor's response to the interventions in this study. To do this, we will utilize a multivariate prognostic model that includes comfortable gait speed, lower extremity Fugl-Meyer motor scores, and scores on the Activities-Specific Balance Confidence Scale. These measures were selected based on previous studies suggesting that comfortable gait speed (52, 60-64), lower limb Fugl-Meyer motor scores (64-66), and balance abilities

610	(67) may influence response to gait rehabilitation interventions in individuals with
611	chronic stroke. Other potential cofactors will also be explored to inform future studies.
612	Based on safety data from preliminary studies (33, 53) and extensive previous
613	HIT research among participants with heart disease (24, 68-74) and MAT research
614	among individuals post stroke (15), we expect a similar rate of non-serious adverse
615	events (AEs) between HIT and MAT (e.g. temporary exercise-related soreness and
616	fatigue), without any study-related serious AEs. In the unexpected event of one or more
617	serious adverse events (SAE), the SAE rate will be compared between groups to
618	confirm that there is no significant difference in major safety risk between HIT and MAT.
619	A logistic regression model will be used for this analysis with SAE (yes/no) as the
620	dependent variable and fixed effects for group, site, and baseline gait speed category. If
621	there are SAE(s) in one group only, a continuity correction (0.5 SAEs added to each
622	group) will still allow the odds ratio to be calculated (33).

623

### 624 METHODS: MONITORING

*Data Monitoring:* The Data and Safety Monitoring Board (DSMB) for this study consists
of three independent members separate from the study team at institutions outside of
UC, UD and KUMC. Collectively, the DSMB has experience in the management of
patients with stroke, exercise, and clinical trials. Persons with a significant conflict of
interest were not permitted to be DSMB members. The role of the DSMB is to monitor
participant accrual, randomization balance and safety data to assess the risks of study
participation.

The DSMB meets annually throughout the study, either in person or via 632 teleconference. Additional meetings may be scheduled as requested by the 633 investigators, IRB or DSMB members. The DSMB remains blinded unless it requires the 634 group identities to perform its duties. DSMB meetings include open sessions where the 635 DSMB may discuss any issues with the study team as well as closed sessions where 636 637 the DSMB alone decides on its recommendations. After each DSMB meeting, the DSMB provides a written report of their discussions and recommendations as to 638 639 whether the study should continue, whether modifications to the study are needed, or if the study should be terminated. These reports are sent to the investigators, the 640 Institutional Review Board (IRB) and the sponsor. The study may be modified or 641 discontinued at any time by the research team, DSMB, IRB or sponsor to ensure the 642 protection of research participants. 643 Outcome Data Monitoring. A blinded co-investigator monitors REDCap 644

644 **Outcome Data Monitoring.** A blinded co-investigator monitors REDCap 645 outcome data for missing or implausible values.

Study Intervention Fidelity Monitoring. The site PIs and/or coordinators
monitor REDCap intervention data for missing or implausible values and intervention
fidelity. Monitored data include the following:

Adherence: This is measured by the number of training sessions attended and
 completed.

Aerobic intensity: This includes the mean and maximum training session HR
 relative to the target HR range and relative to the previous training sessions. It
 also includes time spent in target HR zones.

654	Anaerobic intensity: This is measured using blood lactate concentration after
655	the treadmill training portion of one session each training week, using a finger
656	stick and a point-of-care blood lactate analyzer.
657	Neuromotor intensity: This is measured by treadmill and overground training
658	speeds each session.
659	• Repetition of practice: This includes step counts during each session,
660	measured by an activity monitor placed on the participant's non-paretic lower
661	extremity.
662	Adverse Event and Protocol Deviation Reporting: All identified AEs and protocol
663	deviations are reported to the UC IRB and DSMB annually. Unanticipated problems
664	requiring prompt reporting are reported per UC IRB policy (described below). AEs and
665	protocol deviations are reported by study staff to the site PIs on a regular basis and are
666	discussed during study conference calls.
667	We define an AE as 'any unfavorable and unintended sign, symptom, or disease
668	temporally associated with study participation that may or may not be related to study
669	procedures, including any adverse change that occurs at any time following consent
670	and before completing study participation'. An SAE is an AE that results in any of the
671	following outcomes: death, a life-threatening situation, inpatient hospitalization or
672	prolongation of existing hospitalization, or a persistent or significant disability/incapacity.
673	Important medical events that may not result in death, be life-threatening, or require

hospitalization may also be considered SAEs when, based on appropriate medical

judgment, they may jeopardize the patient and may require medical or surgical

676 intervention to prevent one of the outcomes in this definition.

674

Anticipated AEs are either listed in the study protocol or consent form or have a 677 reasonable likelihood of occurrence in the study population (adults and older adults with 678 stroke). Possible events listed in the protocol or consent form (regardless of likelihood) 679 include discomfort, worry, pain, fatigue, stiffness, skin breakdown, local infection, 680 faintness, nausea, bruising, scarring, fall, injury, myocardial infarction, or other serious 681 682 heart problems. Events with greater likelihood of occurrence in adults and older adults with stroke include (but are not limited to): pain, fatigue, stiffness, faintness, syncope, 683 vertigo, fall, skin breakdown, bruising, orthopedic injury, recurrent stroke, angina, 684 myocardial infarction, blood clot and seizure. 685 All identified AEs are named using terminology from the Common Terminology 686

however, "Dizziness" will be categorized as either "Lightheadedness" or "Vertigo". The CTCAE criteria are also used as a guideline to provide a severity grade for the AE which will range from 1 (mild) to 5 (death). For this study, a serious adverse event is defined as grade  $\geq$  3/5 (75).

Criteria for Adverse Events version 4.03 (CTCAE, National Cancer Institute, 2010);

687

The relationship of an AE to study testing or interventions is determined using 692 pre-defined criteria that considers when the event occurs in relation to testing/training 693 procedures, whether the AE follows a pattern consistent with study procedures, whether 694 695 it improves when the procedure has stopped or reappears when the procedure is resumed or repeated, and whether an alternative cause or influence may also be 696 present. We also consider the impact of the AE on study interventions. The AE is 697 698 considered to have no impact on study interventions if study interventions do not require any alteration because of the event. Modification to study interventions would occur 699

when study interventions are modified such that they differ in a substantive way from
what is described in the protocol because of the AE. The AE may also result in
termination such that the participant withdraws or is withdrawn from the study before
completing the intervention because of the AE.

Participants are gueried about any adverse events at the start and end of each 704 705 study visit. AEs that are specifically queried include falls, injuries, pain, lightheadedness and fatigue. During study visits, participants are monitored for signs or symptoms of 706 707 cardiorespiratory insufficiency, new neurologic impairments or orthopedic injury. 708 Whenever a study team member identifies an AE, an Adverse Event Form in REDCap is started and any additional information needed is collected. If the AE is not already 709 resolved when discovered, the study team member follows up on the AE during each 710 visit and/or by phone until it is resolved. The study team member completing the AE 711 form provides a description of the event, its severity, its timing relative to study testing 712 713 and/or intervention procedures, any possible alternative causes or contributing factors, any AE-related interventions (e.g. pain medicine), any follow up, and if/when the event 714 is resolved. The study team member completing the form also preliminarily grades and 715 716 categorizes the event using the above guidelines. All AE reports identify participants only by their study ID as these reports are viewed by blinded study team members. 717 718 Once resolved, AE reports are adjudicated by the blinded study physician to determine 719 the official severity grade and categorization using the information provided by the study team member (the blinded study physician may also request additional information if 720 needed). Withdrawal from the study and modifications to study procedures as a result of 721

an AE or because of therapeutic measures taken to treat an AE are at the discretion of
 the site PIs, in consultation with the study neurologists or cardiologists as appropriate.

724 A protocol deviation is when one or more procedures described in the study IRB 725 protocol are not followed, either intentionally or unintentionally. Each site maintains a protocol deviation log that is sent to the UC regulatory coordinator upon request. This 726 727 log includes: 1) a description of the protocol deviation, 2) the date of the deviation, 3) the participant ID(s) affected, 4) whether the protocol deviation was related to 728 screening/enrollment, outcome testing, and/or study intervention, and 5) either a 729 730 description of the corrective actions taken to prevent recurrence or a rationale of why such actions are not needed. 731

All AEs and protocol deviations are reported by study staff to site PIs on a regular 732 basis and discussed on study conference calls. Any major AEs or protocol deviations 733 are reported to site PIs and the UC PI as soon as possible. All identified AEs and 734 protocol deviations are compiled by UC and reported to the IRB and DSMB annually. 735 The IRB of record for all sites in this study is the University of Cincinnati and requires 736 prompt reporting (within 10 days of discovery) of any unanticipated problems involving 737 risk to participants or others. Events resulting in temporary or permanent interruption of 738 the study activities by a site PI to avoid potential harm to participants are reported to the 739 740 UC IRB within 48 hours of discovery. The lead site PI reviews the event and determine if it meets criteria for prompt reporting. 741

742

### 744 **DISCUSSION**:

This is the first study designed to compare HIT and MAT post-stroke and the first 745 746 to compare different HIT durations. Previous work has shown that among healthy 747 adults, HIT delivers significant benefits remarkably faster (within 6 sessions over 2 weeks) (76-78), achieving similar improvements to MAT with up to 76% less training 748 749 time (77, 79-81). If HIT elicits comparable changes among individuals with stroke in 4 weeks of training (objective 1 of this study), it would provide a clinically feasible and 750 resource-efficient alternative to the current best-practice model (MAT), which could 751 752 result in increased exercise engagement among stroke survivors. In addition, no previous studies have compared different HIT durations or examined the time course of 753 outcome changes. This study intends to fill that gap (objective 2) and will provide 754 foundational information to guide dosing of locomotor intensity and duration in future 755 studies and clinical practice. 756

This study is also the first U.S. multi-site trial of post-stroke HIT. Thus, the results of this study will also aid in our understanding of the feasibility of implementing HIT across multiple sites nationally (objective 3). Depending on the results of this research, the next step would be a larger efficacy trial. To that end, this study will provide needed data to design a subsequent definitive trial of the relative efficacy of HIT and MAT for eliciting clinically meaningful and sustained improvements in walking function.

763

Trial Status: Protocol version 2020-01-21. Recruitment start date: 2019-01-04.
Estimated completion date: 2022-02-28.

## 766 LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS:

MAT: Moderate-intensity aerobic training; HIT: High-intensity interval training; 10MWT: 767 768 10-Meter Walk Test; 6MWT: 6-Minute Walk Test; VO<sub>2</sub>-peak: peak oxygen uptake; UC: 769 University of Cincinnati; UD: University of Delaware; KUMC: Kansas University Medical Center; MOP: Manual of Operating Procedures; RPE: Rating of Perceived Exertion; 770 771 GXT: Graded Exercise Test; PRE: pre-blinded outcome testing; 4-WK: 4-week blinded outcome testing; 8-WK: 8-week blinded outcome testing; 12-WK: 12-week blinded 772 outcome testing; LEFM: Lower Extremity Fugl-Meyer; NIHSS: National Institutes of 773 Health Stroke Scale; FAC: Functional Ambulation Category; ABC: Activities Specific 774 Balance Confidence Scale; GROC: Global Rating of Change; ECG: electrocardiogram; 775 776 PI: Primary Investigator; HR: Heart Rate; HRR: Heart Rate Reserve; MCID: Minimally Clinically Important Difference; DSMB: Data and Safety Monitoring Board; AE: Adverse 777 Event; SAE: Serious Adverse Event; CTCAE: Common Terminology Criteria for 778 Adverse Events 779

780

### 781 **DECLARATIONS:**

*Ethics Approval and Consent to Participate:* This research has been approved by
the University of Cincinnati IRB. The University of Cincinnati IRB is the IRB of record for
this protocol, and the agreement is managed through SMART IRB. All participants are
providing written informed consent prior to participation.

*Consent for Publication:* Not applicable- this manuscript does not contain an
individual person's data.

Availability of Data and Materials: Data sharing is not applicable to this article as the
datasets are currently being generated and have not yet been analyzed. De-identified
data will be deposited in the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development
(NICHD) Data and Specimen Hub (DASH) repository.

792 *Competing Interests:* The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

793 *Funding:* This study is funded through a grant from the National Institutes of Health:

*R01HD093694.* Funding was also provided to AM from the Foundation for Physical

795 Therapy Research Florence P. Kendall Doctoral Scholarship. These funding sources

were not involved in the writing of this manuscript or the decision to submit this protocol

797 for publication.

Authors' Contributions: AM primary author, primary testing PT at UD. DSR secondary
 author, UD site PI. SB author, KUMC site PI. KD author, blinded co-investigator. SD

author, study coordinator at UC. JW author, KUMC site coordinator. HW author, primary

training PT at UD. EW author, primary study coordinator at UC. DC author, co-

investigator, blinded centralized assessor of ventilatory thresholds. MG author, co-

803 investigator, study cardiologist. OA author, co-investigator, blinded adverse event

adjudicator. JK author, co-investigator, study statistician. BK author, co-investigator,

study neurologist. PB senior author, Principal Investigator. All authors read and

approved the final manuscript.

807 *Acknowledgements:* Not applicable.

808 *Authors' Information (optional):* Not applicable.

## 810 **References**

- 1. Mozaffarian D, Benjamin EJ, Go AS, Arnett DK, Blaha MJ, Cushman M, et al. Heart
- Disease and Stroke Statistics-2016 Update: A Report From the American Heart Association. Circulation. 2016;133(4):e38-360.
- 2. Winstein CJ, Stein J, Arena R, Bates B, Cherney LR, Cramer SC, et al. Guidelines for
- 815 Adult Stroke Rehabilitation and Recovery: A Guideline for Healthcare Professionals
- 816 From the American Heart Association/American Stroke Association. Stroke.
- 817 2016;47(6):e98-e169.
- 3. Ada L, Dean CM, Lindley R, Lloyd G. Improving community ambulation after stroke:
  the AMBULATE Trial. BMC Neurol. 2009;9:8.
- 4. Hill K, Ellis P, Bernhardt J, Maggs P, Hull S. Balance and mobility outcomes for stroke patients: a comprehensive audit. Aust J Physiother. 1997;43(3):173-80.
- 5. Jorgensen HS, Nakayama H, Raaschou HO, Vive-Larsen J, Stoier M, Olsen TS.
- 823 Outcome and time course of recovery in stroke. Part II: Time course of recovery. The
- 824 Copenhagen Stroke Study. Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation.
- 825 1995;76(5):406-12.
- 6. Mayo NE, Wood-Dauphinee S, Cote R, Durcan L, Carlton J. Activity, participation,
  and quality of life 6 months poststroke. Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation.
  2002;83(8):1035-42.
- 7. Bohannon RW, Horton MG, Wikholm JB. Importance of four variables of walking to patients with stroke. Int J Rehabil Res. 1991;14(3):246-50.
- 831 8. Billinger SA, Arena R, Bernhardt J, Eng JJ, Franklin BA, Johnson CM, et al. Physical
- 832 activity and exercise recommendations for stroke survivors: a statement for healthcare
- professionals from the American Heart Association/American Stroke Association.
   Stroke 2014:45(8):2532-53
- 834 Stroke. 2014;45(8):2532-53.
- 9. Marsden DL, Dunn A, Callister R, Levi CR, Spratt NJ. Characteristics of exercise
- training interventions to improve cardiorespiratory fitness after stroke: a systematic
   review with meta-analysis. Neurorehabil Neural Repair. 2013;27(9):775-88.
- 10. Pang MY, Charlesworth SA, Lau RW, Chung RC. Using aerobic exercise to improve
  health outcomes and quality of life in stroke: evidence-based exercise prescription
  recommendations. Cerebrovasc Dis. 2013;35(1):7-22.
- 11. Stoller O, de Bruin ED, Knols RH, Hunt KJ. Effects of cardiovascular exercise early
   after stroke: systematic review and meta-analysis. BMC Neurol. 2012;12:45.
- 12. Kendall BJ, Gothe NP. Effect of Aerobic Exercise Interventions on Mobility among
- 844 Stroke Patients: A Systematic Review. American journal of physical medicine & 845 rehabilitation. 2016;95(3):214-24.
- 13. Mehta S, Pereira S, Janzen S, Mays R, Viana R, Lobo L, et al. Cardiovascular
- conditioning for comfortable gait speed and total distance walked during the chronic
- stage of stroke: a meta-analysis. Topics in stroke rehabilitation. 2012;19(6):463-70.

- 14. Saunders DH, Sanderson M, Brazzelli M, Greig CA, Mead GE. Physical fitness
   training for stroke patients. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2013(10):Cd003316.
- 15. Ivey FM, Hafer-Macko CE, Macko RF. Task-oriented treadmill exercise training in chronic hemiparetic stroke. J Rehabil Res Dev. 2008;45(2):249-59.
- 16. Ivey FM, Hafer-Macko CE, Ryan AS, Macko RF. Impaired leg vasodilatory function after stroke: adaptations with treadmill exercise training. Stroke. 2010;41(12):2913-7.
- 17. Ivey FM, Ryan AS, Hafer-Macko CE, Goldberg AP, Macko RF. Treadmill aerobic
  training improves glucose tolerance and indices of insulin sensitivity in disabled stroke
  survivors: a preliminary report. Stroke. 2007;38(10):2752-8.
- 18. Ivey FM, Ryan AS, Hafer-Macko CE, Macko RF. Improved cerebral vasomotor
- reactivity after exercise training in hemiparetic stroke survivors. Stroke.
- 860 2011;42(7):1994-2000.
- 19. Luft AR, Macko RF, Forrester LW, Villagra F, Ivey F, Sorkin JD, et al. Treadmill
- 862 exercise activates subcortical neural networks and improves walking after stroke: a
- randomized controlled trial. Stroke. 2008;39(12):3341-50.
- 20. Macko RF, DeSouza CA, Tretter LD, Silver KH, Smith GV, Anderson PA, et al.
- Treadmill aerobic exercise training reduces the energy expenditure and cardiovascular
  demands of hemiparetic gait in chronic stroke patients. A preliminary report. Stroke.
  1997;28(2):326-30.
- 21. Macko RF, Ivey FM, Forrester LW, Hanley D, Sorkin JD, Katzel LI, et al. Treadmill
  exercise rehabilitation improves ambulatory function and cardiovascular fitness in
  patients with chronic stroke: a randomized, controlled trial. Stroke. 2005;36(10):220611.
- 872 22. Macko RF, Smith GV, Dobrovolny CL, Sorkin JD, Goldberg AP, Silver KH. Treadmill
- training improves fitness reserve in chronic stroke patients. Archives of physical
  medicine and rehabilitation. 2001;82(7):879-84.
- 23. Jurkiewicz MT, Marzolini S, Oh P. Adherence to a home-based exercise program for individuals after stroke. Topics in stroke rehabilitation. 2011;18(3):277-84.
- 24. Moholdt T, Aamot IL, Granoien I, Gjerde L, Myklebust G, Walderhaug L, et al. Long-
- term follow-up after cardiac rehabilitation: a randomized study of usual care exercise
- training versus aerobic interval training after myocardial infarction. Int J Cardiol.2011;152(3):388-90.
- 25. Tiedemann A, Sherrington C, Dean CM, Rissel C, Lord SR, Kirkham C, et al.
- 882 Predictors of adherence to a structured exercise program and physical activity
- participation in community dwellers after stroke. Stroke Res Treat. 2012;2012:136525.
- 26. Duncan P, Studenski S, Richards L, Gollub S, Lai SM, Reker D, et al. Randomized clinical trial of therapeutic exercise in subacute stroke. Stroke. 2003;34(9):2173-80.
- 27. Kwakkel G. Impact of intensity of practice after stroke: issues for consideration.
- <sup>887</sup> Disability and rehabilitation. 2006;28(13-14):823-30.

- 28. Boyne P, Dunning K, Carl D, Gerson M, Khoury J, Kissela B. High-intensity interval training in stroke rehabilitation. Topics in stroke rehabilitation. 2013;20(4):317-30.
- 29. Billinger SA, Boyne P, Coughenour E, Dunning K, Mattlage A. Does aerobic
- exercise and the FITT principle fit into stroke recovery? Curr Neurol Neurosci Rep.2015;15(2):519.
- 30. Boyne P, Billinger S, MacKay-Lyons M, Barney B, Khoury J, Dunning K. Aerobic
  Exercise Prescription in Stroke Rehabilitation: A Web-Based Survey of US Physical
  Therapists. J Neurol Phys Ther. 2017;41(2):119-28.
- 31. Lau KW, Mak MK. Speed-dependent treadmill training is effective to improve gait
  and balance performance in patients with sub-acute stroke. J Rehabil Med.
  2011;43(8):709-13.
- 32. Pohl M, Mehrholz J, Ritschel C, Rückriem S. Speed-dependent treadmill training in
  ambulatory hemiparetic stroke patients: a randomized controlled trial. Stroke.
  2002;33(2):553-8.
- 33. Boyne P, Dunning K, Carl D, Gerson M, Khoury J, Rockwell B, et al. High-Intensity
  Interval Training and Moderate-Intensity Continuous Training in Ambulatory Chronic
  Stroke: Feasibility Study. Physical therapy. 2016;96(10):1533-44.
- 34. Boyne P, Scholl V, Doren S, Carl D, Billinger SA, Reisman DS, et al. Locomotor
  training intensity after stroke: Effects of interval type and mode. Topics in stroke
  rehabilitation. 2020:1-11.
- 35. Reisman D, Kesar T, Perumal R, Roos M, Rudolph K, Higginson J, et al. Time
   course of functional and biomechanical improvements during a gait training intervention
- in persons with chronic stroke. J Neurol Phys Ther. 2013;37(4):159-65.
- 36. Williams LS, Brizendine EJ, Plue L, Bakas T, Tu W, Hendrie H, et al. Performance
  of the PHQ-9 as a screening tool for depression after stroke. Stroke. 2005;36(3):635-8.
- 913 37. Fugl-Meyer AR, Jaasko L, Leyman I, Olsson S, Steglind S. The post-stroke
- hemiplegic patient. 1. a method for evaluation of physical performance. Scand J Rehabil
   Med. 1975;7(1):13-31.
- 38. Bohannon RW, Smith MB. Interrater reliability of a modified Ashworth scale ofmuscle spasticity. Physical therapy. 1987;67(2):206-7.
- 39. Brott T, Adams HP, Jr., Olinger CP, Marler JR, Barsan WG, Biller J, et al.
- Measurements of acute cerebral infarction: a clinical examination scale. Stroke.1989;20(7):864-70.
- 40. Flansbjer UB, Holmback AM, Downham D, Patten C, Lexell J. Reliability of gait
- performance tests in men and women with hemiparesis after stroke. J Rehabil Med.
  2005;37(2):75-82.
- 41. ATS statement: guidelines for the six-minute walk test. Am J Respir Crit Care Med.2002;166(1):111-7.

- 42. Eng JJ, Dawson AS, Chu KS. Submaximal exercise in persons with stroke: test-
- retest reliability and concurrent validity with maximal oxygen consumption. Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation. 2004;85(1):113-8.
- 43. Borg G. Perceived exertion as an indicator of somatic stress. Scand J Rehabil Med.
  1970;2(2):92-8.
- 44. Pescatello LS, American College of Sports M. ACSM's guidelines for exercise
- testing and prescription. Philadelphia: Wolters Kluwer/Lippincott Williams & Wilkins
   Health: 2014.
- 45. Boyne P, Reisman D, Brian M, Barney B, Franke A, Carl D, et al. Ventilatory
- threshold may be a more specific measure of aerobic capacity than peak oxygen
- consumption rate in persons with stroke. Topics in stroke rehabilitation. 2017;24(2):149-57.
- 938 46. Tucker CA, Escorpizo R, Cieza A, Lai JS, Stucki G, Ustun TB, et al. Mapping the
- 939 content of the Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System
- 940 (PROMIS(R)) using the International Classification of Functioning, Health and Disability.
- 941 Qual Life Res. 2014;23(9):2431-8.
- 47. Mehrholz J, Wagner K, Rutte K, Meissner D, Pohl M. Predictive validity and
   responsiveness of the functional ambulation category in hemiparetic patients after
- stroke. Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation. 2007;88(10):1314-9.
- 48. Golicki D, Niewada M, Buczek J, Karlinska A, Kobayashi A, Janssen MF, et al.
  Validity of EQ-5D-5L in stroke. Qual Life Res. 2015;24(4):845-50.
- 49. Salbach NM, Mayo NE, Hanley JA, Richards CL, Wood-Dauphinee S. Psychometric
  evaluation of the original and Canadian French version of the activities-specific balance
  confidence scale among people with stroke. Archives of physical medicine and
  rehabilitation. 2006;87(12):1597-604.
- 50. Jaeschke R, Singer J, Guyatt GH. Measurement of health status. Ascertaining the minimal clinically important difference. Control Clin Trials. 1989;10(4):407-15.
- 51. Ada L, Dean CM, Lindley R. Randomized trial of treadmill training to improve
  walking in community-dwelling people after stroke: the AMBULATE trial. Int J Stroke.
  2013;8(6):436-44.
- 52. Dean CM, Ada L, Lindley RI. Treadmill training provides greater benefit to the
  subgroup of community-dwelling people after stroke who walk faster than 0.4m/s: a
  randomised trial. J Physiother. 2014;60(2):97-101.
- 53. Boyne P, Dunning K, Carl D, Gerson M, Khoury J, Kissela B. Within-session
  responses to high-intensity interval training in chronic stroke. Medicine and science in
  sports and exercise. 2015;47(3):476-84.
- 54. Boyne P, Meyrose C, Westover J, Whitesel D, Hatter K, Reisman DS, et al. Effects
- of Exercise Intensity on Acute Circulating Molecular Responses Poststroke.
- 964 Neurorehabil Neural Repair. 2020;34(3):222-34.

- 55. Perera S, Mody SH, Woodman RC, Studenski SA. Meaningful change and
- responsiveness in common physical performance measures in older adults. J Am Geriatr Soc. 2006;54(5):743-9.
- 56. Guo Y, Logan HL, Glueck DH, Muller KE. Selecting a sample size for studies with repeated measures. BMC Med Res Methodol. 2013;13:100.
- 57. Fitzmaurice G, Laird N, Ware J. Applied longitudinal analysis. 2nd ed. Hoboken, NJ:
  John Wiley & Sons, Inc.; 2011.
- 58. Dobkin BH. Progressive Staging of Pilot Studies to Improve Phase III Trials for
  Motor Interventions. Neurorehabil Neural Repair. 2009;23(3):197-206.
- 59. Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y. Controlling the False Discovery Rate: A Practical and
  Powerful Approach to Multiple Testing. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B
  (Methodological). 1995;57(1):289-300.
- 60. Dean CM, Rissel C, Sherrington C, Sharkey M, Cumming RG, Lord SR, et al.
- Exercise to enhance mobility and prevent falls after stroke: the community stroke club randomized trial. Neurorehabil Neural Repair. 2012;26(9):1046-57.
- 980 61. Hornby TG, Campbell DD, Kahn JH, Demott T, Moore JL, Roth HR. Enhanced gait-
- related improvements after therapist- versus robotic-assisted locomotor training in
  subjects with chronic stroke: a randomized controlled study. Stroke. 2008;39(6):178692.
- 62. Kim DK, Oh DW. Repeated Use of 6-min Walk Test with Immediate Knowledge of
  Results for Walking Capacity in Chronic Stroke: Clinical Trial of Fast versus Slow
  Walkers. Journal of stroke and cerebrovascular diseases : the official journal of National
  Stroke Association. 2019;28(11):104337.
- 63. Salbach NM, Mayo NE, Wood-Dauphinee S, Hanley JA, Richards CL, Côté R. A
  task-orientated intervention enhances walking distance and speed in the first year post
- stroke: a randomized controlled trial. Clin Rehabil. 2004;18(5):509-19.
- 64. Sullivan KJ, Knowlton BJ, Dobkin BH. Step training with body weight support: effect of treadmill speed and practice paradigms on poststroke locomotor recovery. Archives
- of physical medicine and rehabilitation. 2002;83(5):683-91.
- 65. Bowden MG, Behrman AL, Neptune RR, Gregory CM, Kautz SA. Locomotor
   rehabilitation of individuals with chronic stroke: difference between responders and
   nonresponders. Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation. 2013;94(5):856-62.
- 66. Burke E, Dobkin BH, Noser EA, Enney LA, Cramer SC. Predictors and biomarkers
  of treatment gains in a clinical stroke trial targeting the lower extremity. Stroke.
  2014;45(8):2379-84.
- 1000 67. Dobkin BH, Nadeau SE, Behrman AL, Wu SS, Rose DK, Bowden M, et al.
- Prediction of responders for outcome measures of locomotor Experience Applied PostStroke trial. J Rehabil Res Dev. 2014;51(1):39-50.
- 1003 68. Freyssin C, Verkindt C, Prieur F, Benaich P, Maunier S, Blanc P. Cardiac
- rehabilitation in chronic heart failure: effect of an 8-week, high-intensity interval training

- versus continuous training. Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation.2012;93(8):1359-64.
- 1007 69. Fu TC, Wang CH, Lin PS, Hsu CC, Cherng WJ, Huang SC, et al. Aerobic interval 1008 training improves oxygen uptake efficiency by enhancing cerebral and muscular
- hemodynamics in patients with heart failure. Int J Cardiol. 2013;167(1):41-50.
- 1010 70. Guiraud T, Nigam A, Gremeaux V, Meyer P, Juneau M, Bosquet L. High-intensity 1011 interval training in cardiac rehabilitation. Sports Med. 2012;42(7):587-605.
- 1012 71. Moholdt T, Aamot IL, Granoien I, Gjerde L, Myklebust G, Walderhaug L, et al.
- Aerobic interval training increases peak oxygen uptake more than usual care exercise training in myocardial infarction patients: a randomized controlled study. Clin Rehabil. 2012;26(1):33-44.
- 1016 72. Moholdt TT, Amundsen BH, Rustad LA, Wahba A, Lovo KT, Gullikstad LR, et al. 1017 Aerobic interval training versus continuous moderate exercise after coronary artery
- bypass surgery: a randomized study of cardiovascular effects and quality of life. Am Heart J. 2009;158(6):1031-7.
- 73. Rognmo O, Hetland E, Helgerud J, Hoff J, Slordahl SA. High intensity aerobic
  interval exercise is superior to moderate intensity exercise for increasing aerobic
  capacity in patients with coronary artery disease. Eur J Cardiovasc Prev Rehabil.
  2004;11(3):216-22.
- 1024 74. Wisloff U, Stoylen A, Loennechen JP, Bruvold M, Rognmo O, Haram PM, et al.
  1025 Superior cardiovascular effect of aerobic interval training versus moderate continuous
  1026 training in heart failure patients: a randomized study. Circulation. 2007;115(24):3086-94.
- 1027 75. Common terminology criteria for adverse events (CTCAE) version 4.0. National1028 Cancer Institute. 2009.
- 76. Burgomaster KA, Hughes SC, Heigenhauser GJ, Bradwell SN, Gibala MJ. Six
  sessions of sprint interval training increases muscle oxidative potential and cycle
  endurance capacity in humans. J Appl Physiol (1985). 2005;98(6):1985-90.
- 1032 77. Gibala MJ, Little JP, van Essen M, Wilkin GP, Burgomaster KA, Safdar A, et al.
  1033 Short-term sprint interval versus traditional endurance training: similar initial adaptations
  1034 in human skeletal muscle and exercise performance. J Physiol. 2006;575(Pt 3):901-11.
- 78. Hood MS, Little JP, Tarnopolsky MA, Myslik F, Gibala MJ. Low-volume interval
  training improves muscle oxidative capacity in sedentary adults. Medicine and science
  in sports and exercise. 2011;43(10):1849-56.
- 79. Bartlett JD, Hwa Joo C, Jeong TS, Louhelainen J, Cochran AJ, Gibala MJ, et al.
  Matched work high-intensity interval and continuous running induce similar increases in
  PGC-1alpha mRNA, AMPK, p38, and p53 phosphorylation in human skeletal muscle. J
  Appl Physiol (1985). 2012;112(7):1135-43.
- 1042 80. Burgomaster KA, Howarth KR, Phillips SM, Rakobowchuk M, Macdonald MJ,
- 1043 McGee SL, et al. Similar metabolic adaptations during exercise after low volume sprint
- interval and traditional endurance training in humans. J Physiol. 2008;586(1):151-60.

1045 81. Rakobowchuk M, Tanguay S, Burgomaster KA, Howarth KR, Gibala MJ, MacDonald
1046 MJ. Sprint interval and traditional endurance training induce similar improvements in
1047 peripheral arterial stiffness and flow-mediated dilation in healthy humans. Am J Physiol
1048 Regul Integr Comp Physiol. 2008;295(1):R236-42.

- 1054 Figure 1. Study Schedule and Participant Flow Diagram
- 1055 HIT- high-intensity interval training, MAT- moderate-intensity aerobic training

