# **DOI:** https://doi.org/10.47391/JPMA.612

2

1

- 3 Progressive resistance training improving gait performance and
- 4 mobility in acute and chronic stroke patients

5

- 6 Qurat ul Ain<sup>1</sup>, Muhammad Imran<sup>2</sup>, Ayesha Bashir<sup>3</sup>, Arshad Nawaz Malik<sup>4</sup>
- 7 1 Institute of Health and Rehabilitation Science, School of Life Science Technology, Xi'an
- 8 Jiaotong University, Xi'an, China; 2 Riphah College of Rehabilitation Sciences, Islamabad,
- 9 Pakistan; 3 Isra Institute of Rehabilitation Sciences, Islamabad, Pakistan; 4 Shifa Tameer e
- 10 Millat University, Islamabad, Pakistan
- 11 Correspondence: Qurat ul Ain. Email: qurat.iimc@gmail.com

12

13

#### Abstract

Stroke, a neurological disorder, leads to long-term disability thereby greatly 14 affecting gait and mobility. The purpose of the current study was to investigate 15 the effects of progressive resistance training in both acute and chronic stroke 16 patients. A quasi interventional study was designed and 46 stroke patients were 17 recruited through convenience sampling technique. Sample size was calculated 18 using epi-tool. Patients who had cognitive problems, balance impairments and 19 contractures were excluded from the study. The study was conducted from 20 January to June 2018, at Rafsan Rehab & Research Centre, Peshawar. 21 Progressive resistance exercises starting at 50 % of one repetition maximum 22 (RM) were performed three days/week and for a total duration of nine weeks. 23 Blind assessor measured readings at baseline and after nine weeks. Gait 24 dynamic index (GDI), Six-Meter Walk Test (SMWT) and Five Times Sit-to-25 26 Stand (FTSTS) tools were used to collect the required data. The data was analysed at baseline and after nine weeks on SPSS-20. After nine weeks of 27 28 intervention significant improvement was recorded in patients on GDI 29 (P<0.001), SMWT score (P<0.001) and FTSTS (P<0.001). Progressive

30 resistance training improves mobility limitations and gait in both acute and

31 chronic stroke patients.

32 **Key Words:** Balance, Gait, Mobility Limitation, Resistance Training, Stroke

33

34

52

53

54

55

## Introduction

Walking independently denotes a life-enriching ability in the course of one's daily life.<sup>(1)</sup> Stroke commonly affects walking ability along with other impairments in gait parameters; hence, restoring an optimal gait performance marks one of the major goals of stroke rehabilitation.<sup>(2)</sup> Kim et al in their study states that exercises that predominantly increase muscle strength of lower extremities in stroke patients have shown significant improvements in gait and stair-climbing function, particularly by enhancing force generation through

42 larger range of motion. (3)

Several factors are associated with typical gait abnormalities in individuals after 43 a stroke including decreased velocity, impaired postural and joint control, 44 asymmetry of stride length and time, lower limb muscle weakness, impaired 45 muscle tone and other related factors. Among all, muscle weakness contributes 46 greatly and is a common impairment in stroke patients leading to impaired gait 47 performance. Both the ability and quality of walk is strongly associated and 48 relies on strength of the lower extremity muscles. Optimal stroke rehabilitation 49 necessitates improving patient's gait performance and requires restoring muscle 50 strength of lower extremities. (4) 51

Numerous researchers suggest resistance training for lower limb muscles in order to improve the ability to walk in stroke patients. Wenwen H.E. in a recent randomised control trial reports resistance training to be effective in improving gait. (5) Similar results have been reported by some meta-analyses as well. (6, 7)

56 However a systemic review evaluating resistance training reported that

57 improved strength in stroke patients does not necessarily affect their ability to

58 walk.<sup>(8)</sup>

59 Functional restoration in stroke patients along with other chronic diseases can

be achieved by resistance training. Yet literature lacks evidence regarding

studies conducted in Pakistan. The current study was aimed to evaluate the

effectiveness of strength training in acute and chronic stroke patients in terms of

63 gait improvement.

64

65

70

73

79

80

82

83

60

61

#### **Methods and Results**

A quasi experimental study with a sample of 46 stroke patients of either gender was conducted to observe the effect of progressive resistance training on gait. There was only a single experimental group without randomisation and no

69 control group. The experiment was conducted at the Rafasan Rehab Centre,

Peshawar, from January to June 2018. Epi-tool was used to measure the sample

with 4.9 standard deviation, 0.95 confidence level and desired precision 1.5.<sup>(9)</sup>

Patient recruitment was based on non-probability purposive sampling technique

and inclusion criteria: 46 stroke patients with a minimum 24 score on mini

mental state examination, able to follow three step command and age above 30

years. Patients who did not meet the criterion or those who had some other

problems such as inflammatory joint problems, cognitive impairments, severe

visual impairments, trauma, contractures, fractures or unstable and uncontrolled

diabetes or hypertension were excluded. Informed consent form was signed by

all the patients. The study was approved by Riphah Ethical Committee. The

patients received intervention three days/week and for a total duration of nine

weeks with progressive increase in resistance (started at 50 % of 1 RM and

increased to 60% and 70%, respectively every three weeks). Blind assessor

measured readings at baseline and after nine weeks. Final analysis was done

using SPSS 20, for 39 participants after 7 patients dropped out.

Both the categories of stroke patients, i.e. acute and chronic, received the same 85 treatment intervention with equal intensity and repetitions. Treatment was given 86 for nine weeks (three days/week) and time for each session was 45 minutes. 87 Resistance was initiated at 50 % of 1 Repetition Maximum and was increased to 88 60% and 70% for every three weeks, respectively. Major muscle groups 89 targeted for strength training are listed in Table 1. Along with strength training 90 patients also performed squatting, walk in parallel bar and sit-to-stand activity 91 (10 repetitions, 3 sets). Assessment tools included Six-Minute Walk Test, 92 Dynamic Gait Index and Times Sit-to-Stand Test. 93 Test of Analysis were non-parametric test and were selected on the basis of test 94 of normality (ShapiroWilk test- p > 0.05). The sample included 12 (30.8 %) 95 females with a mean age of  $57.42 \pm 7.74$  years and 27 (69.2%) males with a 96 mean age of  $57.93 \pm 10.02$  years. Twenty (51.3%) participants who had stroke 97 less than three months ago were in the acute stroke category, whereas 19 98 (48.7%) were in chronic stroke category. The mean age of acute and chronic 99 stroke participants was  $57.80 \pm 9.57$  years and  $57.74 \pm 9.22$  years, respectively. 100 Significantly improved result with P value 0.001 was observed in both acute and 101 chronic stroke patients before and after the treatment, whereas there was no 102 difference in the effect of intervention among the two categories. 103 Like Gait Dynamic Index significant improvement was also measured with P 104 value 0.001 in both acute and chronic stroke patients before and after treatment 105 for Six-Minute Walk Test and five Times Sit-to-Stand Test. (Table 2) Looking at 106 the mean rank slightly greater effect was observed in 6 Six-Minute Walk Test 107

109

110

108

## **Discussion**

The current study investigates the effects of progressive resistance training in stroke patients. The sample size of this study was 39 patients. Out of the 39 patients included in the final analysis, 0-3 months passed since stroke attack in

and five Times Sit-to-Stand Test for chronic stroke patients.(Table 3)

19 patients, and in the remaining 20 patients more than 3-4 months had passed 114 since the stroke. The study showed that progressive resistance training can 115 improve gait in stroke patients after receiving nine weeks of progressive 116 resistance training. It also showed improvement in all the three outcome tools, 117 i.e. Gait Dynamic Index, Six-Minute Walk Test and Five Times Sit-to-stand 118 test. A systemic review published recently also support the use of progressive 119 resistance training for improving function, mobility and gait in stroke 120 survivors. (6) Resistance training can improve the functional limitations and 121 improves strength in both paretic and non-paretic lower limb. 122 However, a study conducted in 2008 in Sweden on progressive resistance 123 training in stroke patients reported that after 10 weeks of intervention in chronic 124 stroke patients no immediate effect was measured in gait performance, (10) 125 whereas in the current study gait performance improved in both acute as well as 126 chronic stroke patients. Another study published in 2017 also supports the 127 effectiveness of progressive resistance training in stroke patients to improve gait 128 performance. This study assessed the short-term and long-term effects of 129 resistance training in stroke patients. (11) 130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

### Conclusion

Findings of the study show that not only acute stroke survivors but also chronic stroke patients have the capacity to improve gait related functional outcomes by improving strength of the lower limbs. The effects of progressive resistance training on both acute and chronic stroke patients are equally effective. However, further studies especially randomised controlled trials should be conducted to further investigate the effects of progressive resistance training.

138 139

140 **Disclaimer:** None to declare.

141 **Conflict of Interest:** None to declare.

**Funding Sources:** None to declare.

## References

- 144 1. Davies PM. Steps to follow: the comprehensive treatment of patients with
- hemiplegia: Springer Science & Business Media; 2000.
- 2. Katz-Leurer M, Carmeli E, Shochina M. The effect of early aerobic
- training on independence six months post stroke. Clinical rehabilitation,
- 148 2003;17:735-41.
- 3. Kim CM, Eng JJ. The relationship of lower-extremity muscle torque to
- locomotor performance in people with stroke. Physical therapy. 2003;83:49-57.
- 151 4. Park B-S, Kim J-H, Kim M-Y, Lee L-K, Yang S-M, Jeon H-J, et al.
- Effect of a muscle strengthening exercise programme for pelvic control on gait
- function of stroke patients. Journal of physical therapy science. 2015;27:641-4.
- 5. Wenwen H, Yan L, Xudong G, Hui L, Jianming F, Lao F, et al. The
- effect of Thera-Band resistance strength training on motor function of lower
- limbs and gait after stroke. Chinese Journal of Physical Medicine and
- 157 Rehabilitation. 2018;40:106-9.
- 158 6. Pontes SS, de Carvalho ALR, Almeida KdO, Neves MP, Ribeiro
- Schindler IFS, Alves IGN, et al. Effects of isokinetic muscle strengthening on
- muscle strength, mobility, and gait in post-stroke patients: a systematic review
- and meta-analysis. Clinical rehabilitation. 2019;33:381-94.
- 162 7. Mehta S. Pereira S, Viana R, Mays R, McIntyre A, Janzen S, et al.
- 163 Resistance training for gait speed and total distance walked during the chronic
- stage of stroke: a meta-analysis. Topics in stroke rehabilitation. 2012;19:471-8.
- 8. Gopaul U, Van Vliet P. Progressive resistance training improves muscle
- strength of paretic lower limb in chronic stroke patients: a systematic review.
- 167 Physiotherapy. 2015;101:e465-e6.
- 9. Ouellette MM, LeBrasseur NK, Bean JF, Phillips E, Stein J, Frontera
- WR, et al. High-intensity resistance training improves muscle strength, self-
- 170 reported function, and disability in long-term stroke survivors. Stroke.
- 171 2004;35:1404-9.

10. Flansbjer U-B, Miller M, Downham D, Lexell J. Progressive resistance 172 training after stroke: effects on muscle strength, muscle tone, gait performance 173 and perceived participation. Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine. 2008;40:42-8. 174 11. Vahlberg B, Cederholm T, Lindmark B, Zetterberg L, Hellstrom K. 175 Short-term and long-term effects of a progressive resistance and balance 176 exercise programme in individuals with chronic stroke: a randomised controlled 177 trial. Disabil Rehabil. 2017;39:1615-22. doi 10.080/09638288.2016.1206631. 178 Epub 2016 Jul 14. 179 180

181 -----

182 183

**Table 1: Intervention / Progressive Resistance Strength Training** 

184

| Muscle Groups                              | Concentric, Eccentric and Isometric Exercises |
|--|---|
| Flexors, Extensors &<br>Abductors (Hip)    | 3 Sets of 10 Repetitions                      |
| Flexors & Extensors<br>(Knee)              | 3 Sets of 10 Repetitions                      |
| Planter Flexors & Dorsi<br>Flexors (Ankle) | 3 Sets of 10 Repetitions                      |

185 186

407

## Table 2: Across & between groups Analysis for Gait Dynamic Index

| 190 | Across Group Analysis for Gait Dynamic Index (GDI) |              |                 |                 |                   |           |
|-----|--|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|-----------|
|     |  |              | Stroke          | III Dynamic mu  | Chronic Stroke    |           |
|     | Group  | Mean ± SD    | Mean Rank       | Mean ± SD       | Mean Rank         | P - Value |
|     | Baseline   | 6.66 ± 2.35  | 13.44           | 9.00 ± 2.09     | 23.56             | <0.004    |
|     | Post Intervention                                  | 18.27 ± 2.05 | 15              | 19.7 ± 1.96     | 22                | <0.043    |
|     |  | Within Group | Analysis for Ga | ait Dynamic Ind | ex (GDI)          | • C       |
|     |  | Baseline     |                 | F               | Post Intervention |           |
|     | Group  | Mean ± SD    | Mean ± SD       | Mean Rank       | P-va              | alue      |
|     | Baseline   | 6.66 ± 2.35  | 18.27 ± 2.05    | 9.5             | <0.               | 001       |
| 191 | Post Intervention                                  | 9.00 ± 2.09  | 19.7 ± 1.96     | 9.5             | <0.               | 001       |
| 192 |  |              |                 |                 |                   |           |
| 193 |  |              |                 |                 |                   |           |
|     |  |              |                 | X               |                   |           |
|     |  |              |                 |                 |                   |           |
|     |  |              |                 |                 |                   |           |
|     |  |              |                 | .01             |                   |           |
|     |  |              |                 |                 |                   |           |
|     |  |              |                 |                 |                   |           |
|     |  |              | Sco.            |                 |                   |           |
|     |  |              |                 |                 |                   |           |
|     |  |              |                 |                 |                   |           |
|     |  |              |                 |                 |                   |           |
|     |  | , Y          |                 |                 |                   |           |
|     |  |              |                 |                 |                   |           |
|     | SIONO  |              |                 |                 |                   |           |
|     |  |              |                 |                 |                   |           |
|     |  |              |                 |                 |                   |           |
|     |  |              |                 |                 |                   |           |
|     |  |              |                 |                 |                   |           |
| *   | <b>69</b>  |              |                 |                 |                   |           |
|     |  |              |                 |                 |                   |           |
|     |  |              |                 |                 |                   |           |
| ~40 |  |              |                 |                 |                   |           |
|     |  |              |                 |                 |                   |           |
|     |  |              |                 |                 |                   |           |
| •   |  |              |                 |                 |                   |           |
|     |  |              |                 |                 |                   |           |
|     |  |              |                 |                 |                   |           |
|     |  |              |                 |                 |                   |           |
|     |  |              |                 |                 |                   |           |

# **Table 3: Across & between groups Analysis for 6 Minute Walk Test & Five Times Sit to Stand Test**

| Across Group Analysis for 6 Minute Walk Test |                       |                  |                 |              |           |  |  |
|--|-----------------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------|-----------|--|--|
| Acute Stroke                                 |                       | Cł               | Chronic Stroke  |              |           |  |  |
| Group  | Mean ± SD             | Mean<br>Rank     | Mean ±<br>SD    | Mean<br>Rank | P - Value |  |  |
| Baseline                                     | 35.77 ± 14.52         | 9.86             | 84.16 ± 20.02   | 27.14        | <0.001    |  |  |
| Post Intervention                            | 76.50 ± 12.64         | 10.56            | 155.6 ± 50.61   | 26.44        | <0.001    |  |  |
| Within Group Analysis for 6 Minute Walk Test |                       |                  |                 |              |           |  |  |
| Baseline Post Intervention                   |                       |                  |                 | tion         |           |  |  |
| Group  | Mean ± SD             | Mean ±<br>SD     | Mean<br>Rank    | P-v          | alue      |  |  |
| Baseline                                     | 35.77 ± 14.52         | 76.5 ± 12.64     | 9.5             | <0.          | 001       |  |  |
| Post Intervention                            | 84.16 ± 20.02         | 155.6.7 ± 50.61  | 9.5             | <0.          | 001       |  |  |
| Across Gro                                   | oup Analysis for Five | e Times Si       | it to Stand     | d Test       |           |  |  |
| Acu  | te Stroke             |                  | Cł              | ronic Stro   | ke        |  |  |
| Group  | Mean ± SD             | Mean<br>Rank     | Mean ±<br>SD    | Mean<br>Rank | P - Value |  |  |
| Baseline                                     | 73.9 ± 24.85          | 23.28            | 53.55 ± 13.62   | 13.72        | <0.006    |  |  |
| Post Intervention                            | 34.96 ± 12.56         | 24               | 23.22 ±<br>7.03 | 13           | <0.002    |  |  |
| Within Gro                                   | oup Analysis for Five | e Times Si       | t to Stand      | Test         |           |  |  |
| Baseline Post Intervention                   |                       |                  |                 |              |           |  |  |
| Group  | Mean ± SD             | Mean ±<br>SD     | Mean<br>Rank    | P-v          | alue      |  |  |
| Baseline                                     | 73.9 ± 24.85          | 34.96 ±<br>12.56 | 9.5             | <0.          | 001       |  |  |
| Post Intervention                            | 53.55 ± 13.62         | 23.22 ±<br>7.03  | 9.5             | <0.001       |           |  |  |