

1 **Title:** Age-Related Modifications of Muscle Synergies during Daily-Living Tasks: A Scoping
2 Review

3 **Authors:** Cloé Dussault-Picard (1,2), Sara Havashinezhadian (3,4), Nicolas A Turpin (5), Florent
4 Moissenet (6,7), Katia Turcot (3,4), Yosra Cherni (1,2)

5 **Affiliations**

6 (1) École de kinésiologie et des sciences de l'activité physique, Université de Montréal,
7 Montréal, QC, Canada

8 (2) Centre de recherche du CHU Ste Justine, Montréal, QC, Canada

9 (3) Département de Kinésiologie, Faculté de Médecine, Université Laval, Québec, QC, Canada

10 (4) Centre Interdisciplinaire de Recherche en Réadaptation et Intégration Sociale, Québec, QC,
11 Canada

12 (5) IRISSE (EA 4075), UFR SHE, Département des sciences du sport (STAPS), Université de la
13 Réunion, France

14 (6) Kinesiology Laboratory, Geneva University Hospitals and University of Geneva, Geneva,
15 Switzerland

16 (7) Biomechanics Laboratory, Geneva University Hospitals and University of Geneva, Geneva,
17 Switzerland

18

19 **Corresponding author: Yosra Cherni**, email: yosra.cherni@umontreal.ca

20

21

1 **Abstract (249/250)**

2 **Purpose:** Aging is associated with changes in neuromuscular control that can lead to difficulties
3 in performing daily-living tasks. Based on electromyography, muscle synergy analysis provides a
4 valuable tool for assessing neuromuscular control strategies. However, the age-related changes of
5 muscle synergies during daily living tasks are scattered throughout the literature. This review
6 aimed to synthesize the existing literature on muscle synergies in elderly people during daily-
7 living tasks and examine how they differ from those exhibited by young adults.

8 **Methods:** A search was conducted across the Medline, CINHAL, and Web of Science databases.
9 Studies were included if they focused on muscle synergies in elderly people during walking, sit-
10 to-stand or stair ascent, and if muscle synergies were obtained by a matrix factorization
11 algorithm.

12 **Results:** The research strategy identified 4849 studies, of which 17 studies were included after
13 the screening process. The muscle synergies of 295 elderly people and 182 young adults were
14 reported. Results suggest that: 1) elderly people and young adults retain similar muscle synergies'
15 number, 2) elderly people have higher muscles contribution during walking, and 3) an increased
16 inter and intra-subject variability during specific tasks (i.e., walking and stair ascent,
17 respectively) was reported in elderly people compared to young adults.

18 **Conclusion:** This review provides a comprehensive understanding of age-related changes in
19 neuromuscular control during daily-living tasks. Our findings suggested that although the number
20 of synergies remains similar, metrics such as spatial and temporal structures of synergies are
21 more suitable to identify neuromuscular control deficits between young adults and elderly people.

22 **Keywords:** muscle coordination, elderly, electromyography, gait, sit-to-stand, stair ascent
23

1 **1. Introduction**

2 Aging is associated with changes in neuromuscular control (Schmitz et al., 2009), which
3 refers to the coordinated interaction between the nervous system and the muscles. These
4 alterations can have a major impact on mobility capacities (Brown and Flood, 2013). The
5 combination of motor and cognitive disorders is at the origin of an accelerated loss of
6 independence and autonomy (Bimou et al., 2021; Sobral et al., 2018). Additionally, the aging
7 process is often accompanied by degeneration of nerve and muscle tissues. As a result, the
8 performance of daily tasks (e.g., walking, sit-to-stand and stair ascent) becomes increasingly
9 challenging for elderly people (EP). Indeed, performing these tasks are considered complex
10 considering multi-level joints coordination and the need to coordinate different agonist and
11 antagonist muscles. However, daily-living tasks are necessary skills to maintain independence
12 and autonomy (Merrilees, 2014).

13 Muscle synergy analysis is recognized as a useful tool to assess neuromuscular control
14 strategies or to quantify functional deficits in pathologies (Turpin et al., 2021). A muscle synergy
15 analysis gives an insight into the temporal and spatial structure of the muscle's coordination from
16 the recorded muscle activity. So far, the most appropriate method to retrieve muscle synergies is
17 by extracting muscle activity from electromyography (EMG) signals with the non-negative
18 matrix factorization algorithm (Rabbi et al., 2020, Turpin et al., 2021). This method has been
19 commonly used for assessing muscle synergies during daily-living tasks in various populations
20 with muscle coordination impairments (Cherni et al., 2021; Turpin et al., 2021). Indeed,
21 neuromuscular control impairments during functional tasks assessed by muscle synergies may be
22 relevant to develop training modalities that are specific to the deficient synergies, especially in
23 populations that suffer from neuromuscular control degradation such as EP.

24 The literature suggests that aging impacts how spinal circuits integrate peripheral
25 afference and descending inputs, resulting in a change in final motor output (e.g., muscles
26 synergies) in EP. For example, Baggen et al., (2020), found that neuromuscular control
27 complexities and structures were affected by age during step ascent at different heights. Indeed,
28 age was correlated with higher synergy complexity, and authors reported higher synergies
29 similarity across step heights in the older compared to the young adults (YA) (Baggen et al.,

1 2020). On the other hand, Monaco et al. (Monaco et al., 2010) reported that the gross structures
2 of muscle synergies and their temporal activations were similar between YA and EP during
3 locomotion, while Kubota et al. (2021) reported a decreased synergy complexity in EP, compared
4 to YA. The contradictory results of the above studies concerning the effect of age on synergies
5 complexity show that it remains unclear whether the between-group neuromuscular differences
6 are attributed to changes in specific muscle synergies, their temporal activities, or both. Indeed,
7 the studies that have investigated the relationship between aging and changes in synergies during
8 daily living tasks are scattered, and a scoping of the literature is necessary to provide a better
9 understanding of the effect of aging on muscle synergies during common daily living tasks (i.e.,
10 walking, sit-to stand, stair ascent). This would help to guide interventions in aging populations
11 and ultimately, lighten the decline in self-mobility and autonomy.

12 This scoping review aims to give an overview of the existing studies investigating lower
13 limb muscle synergies in EP during daily living tasks such as walking, sit-to-stand task and stair
14 ascent. The primary aim is to examine how muscle synergies in EP differ from those exhibited by
15 YA during walking, stair ascent, and sit-to-stand tasks by investigating the quantification and
16 structure of synergies, and the variability of synergies between and within EP.

17 **2. Materials and Methods**

18 *2.1. Data Source and Literature Source*

19 A science librarian was consulted for the initial development of the search protocol.
20 Studies were identified by searching Medline, CINHALL and Web of Science from inception to
21 October 2022. The search strategy was based on three main concepts: “muscle synergy,” “elder,
22 and “daily living tasks”. More details concerning search strategy and the key words used are
23 reported in **Appendix** as a supplementary material. The current review follows the Systematic
24 reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) checklist (Tricco et
25 al., 2018) and was registered on the OSF platform (ID: osf.io/e3bzy).

26 *2.2. Eligibility Criteria*

27 The included studies met the following inclusion criteria: (1) performing on a group of
28 adults with a mean age of 60 years or older (as defined by the United Nations); without a history

1 of major physical or psychiatric condition likely to affect gait, and in case of a mixed population:
2 the majority of the investigated population older than 60; (2) focused on muscle synergies of the
3 lower limb during walking, sit-to-stand task or stair ascent; (3) based on non-negative matrix
4 factorization (NNMF) synergy extraction method and; (4) study published in French or English.
5 Studies were excluded if they: (1) was performed on a population other than elder; (2) focused on
6 muscle synergies of the upper limb; and (3) was not original research, such as letters to editor,
7 conference abstracts and commentaries.

8 *2.3. Studies screening*

9 Titles and abstracts of the identified studies were screened independently by two of the
10 authors (YC and SH) to identify those that potentially met inclusion criteria. A full review of
11 those studies was then performed independently by the same authors. In the case of any
12 unresolvable disagreement related to the studies eligibility, a third author (FM) performed the
13 screening to reach consensus.

14 *2.4. Methodological quality and risk of bias*

15 Two authors independently (YC and SH) rated the overall quality of each included study,
16 using the modified version of the Downs and Black checklist (Connor Gorber et al., 2007; Downs
17 and Black, 1998). Out of 27 Items, fourteen Items were identified as relevant by the authors
18 which allows to evaluate overall reporting bias (items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10), external validity
19 (items 11 and 12), internal validity bias (items 15, 16, 18, 20), internal validity confounding
20 (items 21, 22, 25), and power (item 27) of the included studies. The maximum total consists of 19
21 points per study. Each study was assigned a score of “high” ($\geq 75\%$), “moderate” (60–74%),
22 “low” ($\leq 60\%$) (Desmyttere et al., 2018). For the assessment procedures, a calibration meeting
23 was initially performed with five studies, to ensure a clear understanding of each criterion and
24 thus standardization and reliability of assessments. A second meeting was held to discuss the
25 criteria for each study included, until a consensus was reached for a score. In the case of any
26 unresolvable disagreement, a third author (FM) performed the assessment to reach consensus.

27 *2.5. Data charting process*

1 Data including study design, quality assessment, subject characteristics (age, sex), study
2 methods (number of cycles analyzed, number and name of muscles recorded, EMG pre-
3 processing methods), and synergy outcomes (muscle synergies in EP, and differences with YA),
4 was extracted by one author (CDP), and validated by a second author (YC). Descriptive and
5 numerical analyses were used to summarize the literature for each functional task (i.e., walking,
6 sit-to stand, stair ascent). The main outcome measures discussed in this review were: (1)
7 quantification of muscle synergies such as total number of synergies, the spatial (i.e., muscle
8 weighting) and temporal (i.e., relative temporal activation) structure of muscle synergies, and the
9 variability accounted for (VAF). The spatial and temporal structure of muscle synergies were
10 reported as mentioned in the original article by the authors or extracted from the article graphics.
11 The spatial and temporal structure of muscle synergies were reported as mentioned in the original
12 article by the authors or extracted from the article graphics. If extracted from graphics, muscles
13 with the highest weight and the most significant timing were reported to define the spatial and
14 temporal structure, respectively. The VAF was defined by the uncentered Pearson correlation
15 coefficient between weight \times coefficient, and the EMG amplitude time series (Torres-Oviedo et
16 al., 2006). Effect sizes were reported for each significant synergy difference between group (EP
17 vs YA). If the original study does not provide the effect size, it was calculated from mean and
18 standard deviation data. The authors were contacted if mean and standard deviation were not
19 available. Cohen's d effect size (d) or Glass's delta effect size (Δ) was calculated if the study
20 used parametric tests or non-parametric, respectively (Cohen, 1977; Ialongo, 2016). The findings
21 related to the study aims and the implication for future research were then discussed.

22 **3. Results**

23 *3.1. Search results*

24 The initial search led to 8 963 studies. After removing duplicates, study titles and
25 abstracts were screened by two reviewers to assess the eligibility of 4 849 studies. Then, 280
26 studies were determined by consensus and qualified for the full-text reading stage. This last stage
27 resulted in the identification of 17 studies as eligible in this review. The flowchart of the selection
28 process is charted in **Figure 1**.




Figure 1. The scoping review flow diagram.

3.2. Risk of Bias

The median score of the modified Quality Index for the included studies was 72% (range from 44 to 89%) indicating a high quality (Table 1). The majority of studies were of high (Alizadehsaravi et al., 2022; Baggen et al., 2020; Clark et al., 2010; da Silva Costa et al., 2020; Santuz et al., 2022; Sawers et al., 2017; Sawers and Bhatt, 2018) or moderate quality (Allen et al., 2019; Allen and Franz, 2018; Collimore et al., 2021; Guo et al., 2022; Hanawa et al., 2017; Kubota et al., 2021; Toda et al., 2016; Yang et al., 2019), and, two were of low methodological quality (An et al., 2013; Yang et al., 2017). The score for reporting elements was high, while external validity elements were rated lower in the studies. Four studies out of seventeen (Alizadehsaravi et al., 2022; da Silva Costa et al., 2020; Sawers et al., 2017; Sawers and Bhatt, 2018) detailed the source of patient populations.

Table 1. Methodological quality assessment scores of included studies using the modified version of Downs and Black checklist.

| Studies | Reporting | | | | | | | | External validity | | Internal validity (bias) | | | | Internal validity (confounding) | | | Power | Score | Quality |
|------------------------------|-----------|---|---|---|----------------|---|---|----|-------------------|----|--------------------------|----|----|----|---------------------------------|----|----|-------|-------|----------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 ^a | 6 | 7 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 15 | 16 | 18 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 25 | 27 | (%) | |
| Alizadehsaravi et al. (2022) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | UD | 1 | 1 | 89 | High |
| Allen and Franz (2018) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | UD | UD | 1 | 0 | 67 | Moderate |
| Allen et al. (2019) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | UD | 1 | 0 | 72 | Moderate |
| An et al. (2013) | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | UD | UD | 0 | 0 | 44 | Low |
| Baggen et al. (2020) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | UD | 1 | 0 | 78 | High |
| Clark et al. (2010) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | UD | 1 | 1 | 78 | High |
| Collimore et al. (2021) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | UD | 1 | UD | 72 | Moderate |
| da Silva Costa et al. (2020) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | UD | 1 | 1 | 89 | High |
| Guo et al. (2022) | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | UD | 1 | 0 | 67 | Moderate |
| Hanawa et al. (2017) | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | UD | 1 | 0 | 61 | Moderate |
| Kubota et al. (2021) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | UD | 1 | 0 | 67 | Moderate |
| Santuz et al. (2022) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | UD | 1 | 1 | 89 | High |
| Sawers et al. (2017) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | UD | 1 | UD | 78 | High |
| Sawers and Bhatt (2018) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | UD | 1 | UD | 78 | High |
| Toda et al. (2016) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | UD | 1 | 1 | 72 | Moderate |
| Yang et al. (2017) | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | UD | UD | 1 | 0 | 50 | Low |
| Yang et al. (2019) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | UD | 1 | UD | 72 | Moderate |

Note. 1 = Yes; 2 = No; UD = Unable to Determine; ^aThe score for item 5 is 0: No, 1: partially, and 2: Yes, similar to Down & Black checklist.

1 3.3. *Studies characteristics*

2 **Table 2** shows the population and methodology characteristics of the 17 studies included
3 in this review. All studies were published between 2009–2022. Eleven of them (65%) used an
4 observational cross-sectional study design (Allen and Franz, 2018; An et al., 2013; Baggen et al.,
5 2020; Collimore et al., 2021; Da Silva Costa et al., 2020; Guo et al., 2022; Hanawa et al., 2017;
6 Kubota et al., 2021; Santuz et al., 2022; Toda et al., 2016; Yang et al., 2017), and six studies
7 (35%) focused on EP only (Alizadehsaravi et al., 2022; Allen et al., 2019; Clark et al., 2010;
8 Sawers et al., 2017; Sawers and Bhatt, 2018; Yang et al., 2019). A total of 295 EP and 182 YA
9 were included. The sample size ranged from 3 to 140 participants (group mean \pm SD = EP: $17.2 \pm$
10 15.6 ; YA: 16.6 ± 18.6), and group age mean was 70.4 and 25.4 years old for the EP and YA
11 adults, respectively). Eleven studies (65%) focused on muscle synergies during walking
12 (Alizadehsaravi et al., 2022; Allen et al., 2019; Allen and Franz, 2018; Clark et al., 2010;
13 Collimore et al., 2021; Guo et al., 2022; Kubota et al., 2021; Santuz et al., 2022; Sawers et al.,
14 2017; Sawers and Bhatt, 2018; Toda et al., 2016), four studies (23%) on sit-to-stand task (An et
15 al., 2013; Hanawa et al., 2017; Yang et al., 2019, 2017), one (6%) on balanced walking (Da Silva
16 Costa et al., 2020) and one (6%) on stair ascent (Baggen et al., 2020). All studies were recording
17 muscles using surface EMG. Overall, 5 to 16 muscles were included per leg, or leg and trunk.
18 Seven studies (An et al., 2013; Baggen et al., 2020; Da Silva Costa et al., 2020; Guo et al., 2022;
19 Kubota et al., 2021; Yang et al., 2019, 2017) on seventeen (41%) focused either on leg and trunk
20 muscles. The reported muscles for the leg muscle activities were: adductor magnus (ADD),
21 biceps femoris (BF), biceps femoris long head (BFL), biceps femoris short head (BFS),
22 gastrocnemius (GAS), gastrocnemius lateralis (GL), gastrocnemius medialis (GM), gluteus
23 maximus (GMax), gluteus medius (GMed), gluteus minimus (GMin), hamstrings (H), iliopsoas
24 (IL), medial hamstrings (MH), peroneus longus (PL), rectus abdominis (RA), rectus femoris
25 (RF), semitendinosus (ST), soleus (SOL), tensor fasciae latae (TFL), tibialis anterior (TA), vastus
26 muscles (VAS), vastus lateralis (VL), and vastus medialis (VM). Among the seventeen included
27 studies, the most common muscles recorded for the anterior part of the leg were: TA ($n = 17$;
28 100%), RF ($n = 14$; 82%), and VL ($n = 15$; 88%) (**Figure 2**). The most common muscles
29 recorded for the posterior part of the leg were: SOL ($n = 15$; 88%), GM ($n = 12$; 71%), GMax
30 ($n = 11$; 65%), and GMed ($n = 11$; 65%). The reported muscles for the trunk muscle activities

1 were: erector spinae (ES), external obliques (EOB), latissimus dorsi (LD), paravertebral muscle
2 (PVM), and rectus abdominis (RA). The raw EMG data was most commonly processed using the
3 following steps: high-pass filtered, rectified, low-pass filtered, amplitude scaled, and time-
4 normalized (see **Table 2** for more details). The majority of studies (n = 11; 65%) normalized the
5 EMG envelopes by the maximum value (Alizadehsaravi et al., 2022; Allen et al., 2019; Allen and
6 Franz, 2018; Baggen et al., 2020; Clark et al., 2010; da Silva Costa et al., 2020; Kubota et al.,
7 2021; Santuz et al., 2022; Sawers et al., 2017; Sawers and Bhatt, 2018; Yang et al., 2019).
8 However, few studies (n = 4; 23%) did not report any data normalization to extract muscles
9 synergies (An et al., 2013; Guo et al., 2022; Toda et al., 2016; Yang et al., 2017).

Table 2. Summary of the included studies


| Studies | Population characteristics | | | | | Studies methods | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|---------|--|---|--|--|
| | N | Age | Sex | Task | Condition(s) | Number of cycles/trials | Muscles recorded | EMG pre-processing method |
| Alizadehsaravi et al. (2022) | EP: 22 | EP: 72.6 | EP: 11M/11F | Walking | 1. Fixed (0.97 m/s) Treadmill | Minimum 50 | D side: TA, VL, GL, SOL, PL, RF, BF, GMed ND side: RF, BF, GMed | High-pass filtered (50 Hz), notch filtered (50 Hz and signal harmonics), Hilbert transformed, rectified, low-pass filtered (20 Hz). EMG normalized by maximum value during task. |
| Allen and Franz (2018) | EP: 11 YA: 12 | EP: 75.1 YA: 24.8 | EP: 5M/6F YA: 6M/6F | Walking | 1. Self-selected speed (EP: 0.60 - 1.57 m/s; YA: 1.29 m/s) Overground | Minimum 42 | TA, GM, SOL, PL, VL, MH, GMed | High-pass filtered (35 Hz), demeaned, rectified, low-pass filtered (10 Hz). EMG normalized to the maximum observed in each muscle during task. |
| Allen et al. (2019) | EP: 6 | EP: 62.0 | EP: 3M/5F | Walking | 1. Self-selected speed (1.36 m/s) Overground | 3 x 7.6-m trial | GMax, GMed, TFL, ADD, BFL, RF, VL, GM, GL, SOL, PL, TA | High-pass filtered (35 Hz), demeaned, rectified, low-pass filtered (40 Hz). EMG normalized to the maximum activation observed during walking at self-selected speed |
| Clark et al. (2010) | EP: 20 | EP: 65.5 | EP: 4M/16F | Walking | 1. Comfortable speed 2. Fastest speed 3. Six speeds (0.3 - 1.8 m/s) Treadmill | 1. 3 x 30-s trial 2. 2 x 30-s trial 3. 6 x 30-s trial | TA, SOL, GM, VM, RF, MH, BF, GMed | High pass filtered (40 Hz), demeaned, rectified, smoothed (4 Hz). EMG normalized to maximum value from self-selected walking and resampled at each 1% of the gait cycle. |
| Collimore et al. (2021) | EP: 18 YA: 18 | EP: 72 YA: 27 | EP: 5M/13F YA: 7M/11F | Walking | 1. Fixed (EP: 1.1 m/s; YA: 1.2 m/s) Treadmill | 30 | VM, RF, VL, TFL, SOL, GM, PL, TA, BF, MH, GMax, GMed | High-pass filtered (40 Hz), demeaned, rectified, low-pass filtered (4Hz), resampled (1000 Hz). No EMG normalization. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------|---|--------------------------|---|--|
| Guo et al. (2022) | EP: 11 YA: 11 | EP: 67.2 YA: 23.4 | EP: 4M/7F YA: 4M/7F | Walking | 1. Slow speed 2. Normal speed 3. Fast speed Overground | EP: 19 ± 3 YA: 11 ± 3 | TA, GM, GL, SOL, VL, VM, RF, H, ADD, TFL, GMax, ES, EOB, LD | Noise removed from powerline interference, high-pass filtered (40 Hz), rectification, low-pass filtered (40 Hz), integrated (20-ms intervals). Normalization not described. |
| Santuz et al. (2022) | EP: 70 YA: 70 | EP-M:73.3; EP-F: 71.4 YA-M: 28.3; YA-F: 25.5 | EP: 35M/35F YA: 35M/35F | Walking | 1. Self-selected speed (EP: 1.0 - 1.4 m/s; YA: 1.1 - 1.5 m/s) Overground | 30 | GMed, GMax, TFL, RF, VM, VL, ST, BFL, TA, PL, GM, GL, SOL | High-pass filtered (50 Hz), full-wave rectified, low-pass filtered (20 Hz). EMG normalized to the maximum of each trial. |
| Kubota et al. (2021) | EP: 10 YA: 11 | EP: 70.0 YA: 20.5 | EP: 8M/2F YA: 11M/0F | Walking | 1. Fixed (0.83 m/s) Treadmill | 10 | PVM, OPVM, GMax, GMed, TFL, ADD, RF, VM, VL, ST, BF, PL, TA, GM, GL, SOL | Band-pass filtered (20– 450 Hz), demeaned, rectified, smoothed (4 Hz). Normalized by the peak value (over all maximum) |
| Toda et al. (2016) | EP: 20 YA: 20 | EP-M: 68.4 EP-F: 69.1 YA-M: 21.7 YA-F: 24.1 | EP: 10M/10F YA: 10M/10F | Walking | 1. Self-selected speed (EP: 0.89 - 1.42 m/s; YA: 1.00 - 1.56 m/s) Overground | Not mentioned | GMax, GMed, GMin, IL, RF, VAS, H, GAS, SOL, TA | Not mentioned |
| Sawers et al. (2017) | EP-Fall: 15 EP-Recovery: 13 | EP-Fall: 71 EP-Recovery: 72 | EP-Fall: 2M/13F EP-Recovery: 8M/5F | Walking | 1. Self-selected speed (EP-Fall: 0.55 - 1.23 m/s; EP-Recovery: 0.74 - 1.26 m/s) Overground | 18-24 | TA, GM, VL, BFL | Band-pass filtered (10–200 Hz), rectified, low pass filtered (50 Hz). EMG normalized to the maximum activation during nonslip walking trials. |
| Sawers and Bhatt (2018) | EP-Fall: 12 EP-Recovery: 13 | EP-Fall: 73 EP-Recovery: 74 | EP-Fall: 2M/10F EP-Recovery: 7M/6F | Walking | 1. Self-selected speed (EP-Fall: 0.80 - 1.46 m/s; EP-Recovery: 0.69 - 1.35 m/s) Overground | 18-24 | TA, GM, VL, BFL | Band-pass filtered (10–200 Hz), rectified, low pass filtered (50 Hz). EMG normalized to the maximum activation during nonslip walking trials. |
| da Silva Costa et al. (2020) | EP: 14 YA: 17 | EP: 69.0 YA: 24.0 | EP: 3M/11F YA: 11M/6F | Balanced walking | 1. Along a 2-cm wide tape 2. On a 6-cm wide | 20 x 4-m trial | TA, PL, GM, SOL, VM, VL, BFL, ST, GMed, | High-pass filtered (35 Hz), demeaned, rectified, low- pass filtered (40 Hz). EMG |


| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------|--|----------|--|---|
| | | | | | aluminium beam | | RF, ADD, EOB, ES | normalized to maximum activation observed during the line walking trials. |
| Baggen et al. (2020) | EP: 11 YA: 10 | EP: 67.0 YA: 22.5 | EP: 0M/11F YA: 0M/10F | Step ascent | 1. Forward step (10, 20, 30 cm) | 9 | TA, GL, SOL, VL, RF, BF, ST, GMax, GMed, ES | High-pass filtered (20 Hz), rectified, smoothed (0.1s moving window). EMG normalized to the respective maximum obtained over all trials. |
| An et al. (2013) | EP: 7 YA: 3 | EP: 67.1 YA: 24.0 | Not mentioned | Sit-to-stand | 1. Stand up in a way they found comfortable | 12 to 20 | RF, TA, VL, SOL, GAS, BF, GMax, LD | High-pass filtered (10 Hz), notch filtered (50-60 Hz), centered, rectified, smoothed. Normalization not described. |
| Hanawa et al. (2017) | EP: 3 YA: 4 | EP: 72.0 YA: 22.5 | EP: 3M YA: 4M | Sit-to-stand | 1. Natural speed 2. As fast as possible | 10 | TA, SOL, GM, VL, RF, ST, GMax | Band-pass filtered (20–500 Hz), demeaned, rectified, smoothed (10 Hz). EMG normalized to maximum EMG activity for a given muscle across all trials. |
| Yang et al. (2017) | EP: 5 YA: 6 | EP: 66.8 YA: 25.0 | Not mentioned | Sit-to-stand | 1. Chair height adjusted to the lower leg height | 15 | TA, GAS, SOL, RF, VL, BFL, BFS, GMax, RA, ES | Not mentioned |
| Yang et al. (2019) | EP: 12 | EP: 64.2 | EP: 10M/2F | Sit-to-stand | 1. Chair height adjusted to the lower leg height | 10 | TA, GL, GM, PL, SOL, RF, VL, VM, BF, SM, Gmax, Gmed, RA, EOB, ES | Band-pass filtered (40-400 Hz), rectified, low-pass filtered (4 Hz). EMG normalized to maximum value during the task. |

Abbreviations: adductor magnus (ADD), biceps femoris (BF), biceps femoris long head (BFL), biceps femoris short head (BFS), dominant (D), elderly people (EP); erector spinae (ES), external obliques (EOB), female (F), gastrocnemius (GAS), gastrocnemius lateralis (GL), gastrocnemius medialis (GM), gluteus maximus (GMax), gluteus medius (GMed), gluteus minimus (GMin), hamstrings (H), iliopsoas (IL), latissimus dorsi (LD), male (M), medial hamstrings (MH), non-dominant (ND), non-negative matrix factorization (NNMF), opposite (opp), opposite paravertebral muscle (OPVM), paravertebral muscle (PVM), peroneus longus (PL), rectus abdominis (RA), rectus femoris (RF), semitendinosus (ST), soleus (SOL), tensor fasciae latae (TFL), tibialis anterior (TA), vastii muscles (VAS), vastus lateralis (VL), vastus medialis (VM), young adults (YA).

1



2



3

4 **Figure 2.** Names of the included muscles and related occurrence (% of the included studies).

1

2 3.4. Walking tasks

3 A range of 4 to 8 synergies that account for more than 80% of the variance have been
4 reported by eleven studies that have focused on normal walking task (see **Table 3**). Although the
5 majority of studies (64%) (Alizadehsaravi et al., 2022; Allen et al., 2019; Allen and Franz, 2018;
6 Clark et al., 2010; Kubota et al., 2021; Santuz et al., 2022; Toda et al., 2016) reported 4 to 5
7 synergies during overground or treadmill walking at different speed (speed range [max, min]:
8 [0.30 m/s, 1.57 m/s]), one study (Collimore et al., 2021) reported only 3 synergies during
9 treadmill walking at monitored speed (speed: 1.1 m/s), two studies (Sawers et al., 2017; Sawers
10 and Bhatt, 2018) mentioned the presence of 6 synergies during overground walking (speed range
11 [max, min]: [0.55 m/s, 1.26 m/s]), and one study (Guo et al., 2022) extracted 8 synergies during
12 overground walking at different self-selected speeds (i.e., slow, normal, fast). Four of the eleven
13 studies carried out their experiment on a treadmill, either imposing a walking speed
14 (Alizadehsaravi et al., 2022; Collimore et al., 2021; Kubota et al., 2021), or at a self-selected
15 speed and imposed speed (Clark et al., 2010), while seven of them conducted their experiment
16 overground, at a self-selected (Allen et al., 2019; Allen and Franz, 2018; Guo et al., 2022; Santuz
17 et al., 2022; Sawers et al., 2017; Sawers and Bhatt, 2018; Toda et al., 2016). All studies assessed
18 at least the activity of 1 muscle from each sagittal lower limb muscle groups (i.e., hip
19 flexor/extensor, knee flexor/extensor, and ankle plantar flexor/dorsiflexor), and one study (Guo
20 et al., 2022) supplemented this with the assessment of trunk flexor/extensor, and another (Kubota
21 et al., 2021) with the measurement of paravertebral muscles activity.

22 When comparing EP vs YA using a Dynamic Motor Control (DMC) index to identify
23 individuals with neuromuscular complexity impairment during walking, Collimore et al. (2021)
24 observed group difference in the number of impaired individuals. Indeed, The authors reported
25 that 11.1% of YA (18–35 years old), 38.5% of young EP (65–74 years old) and 80% of older EP
26 (75+ years old) presented impaired neuromuscular control (Collimore et al., 2021). Allen and
27 Franz (2018) found that fall history, but not age, was associated with reduced number of
28 synergies (difference: 0.90 synergy, $d = 1.630$), and greater VAF-1 (difference: +19.58 %, $d =$
29 2.097) (see **Table 4**). In opposition, Kubota et al. (2021) reported a reduced number of synergies

1 for the EP group (difference: -0.87 synergy, $d = 1.774$). However, Allen and Franz (2018)
2 highlighted that age was related to a greater synergy timing variability independent of falling
3 history (EP-fallers difference: +1.21, $d = 1.046$, and EP-non fallers difference: +1.32, $d = 1.396$),
4 which is in line with the results of Guo et al. (2022), who reported greater inter and intra-subject
5 timing activation variability for most synergies at normal and slow speed. Overall, EP and YA
6 synergies appear to differ temporally, as shown by the greater duration of activation reported by
7 Santuz et al. (2022) for all four extracted synergies ($\beta = 7.510$ to 12.390), and the earlier shift in
8 the activity timing of 3 of the 4 extracted synergies ($\beta = -7.240$ to 17.140). Also, our findings
9 indicate a tendency towards a greater muscular contribution in EP for specific synergy when
10 walking at normal speed. Indeed, Kubota et al. (2021) reported greater contribution of the ST
11 (difference: +0.19, $d = 0.732$) and BF (difference: +0.30, $d = 0.978$) in the synergy 1 (i.e.,
12 synergy involved in loading response), Guo et al., (2022) observed a greater contribution of the
13 ADD in the synergy 4 (i.e., synergy involved in early stance and late swing), and Toda et al.
14 (2016) reported a greater contribution of the TA (difference: N/A, male: $d = 0.526$; female: $d =$
15 0.696) in the synergy 1 (i.e., synergy involved in early stance), the GMax (difference: N/A, male:
16 $d = 0.936$; female: $d = 0.564$) and RF (difference: N/A, male: $d = 0.021$; female: $d = 1.102$) in the
17 synergy 2 (i.e., synergy involved in late stance), the TA (difference: N/A, male: $d = 0.261$;
18 female: $d = 0.294$) in the synergy 4 (i.e., synergy involved in late swing), and the GAS
19 (difference: N/A, male: $d = 0.936$; female: $d = 0.958$) in the synergy 5 (i.e., synergy involved in
20 early stance). Guo et al. (2022), who also compared differences between walking speeds, reported
21 greater contribution of the TA and lower contribution of the TFL in the synergy 3 (i.e., synergy
22 that contributes to loading response and leg stabilisation before the foot contact) only at fast
23 speed, and greater contribution of the EOB in the synergy 9 only at slow speed.

24 As for balanced walking, Da Silva Costa et al. (2020) investigated two complex walking
25 tasks: tape and beam walking. Six and seven synergies, that accounted for more than 90% of the
26 variance, have been extracted for the tape and beam walking conditions, respectively. Compared
27 to YA, the authors reported higher muscle coactivation (i.e., number of significantly active
28 muscles) within each muscle synergy (difference: +1.20 muscles, $d = 0.630$), greater muscle
29 contribution (i.e., sum of the contributions of significantly active muscle) within a muscle

- 1 synergy (difference: +0.50, $d = 0.660$), and greater VAF-1 (difference: +5.3 %, $d = 0.840$) in EP,
- 2 regardless the condition (Da Silva Costa et al., 2020).

Table 3. Muscle synergies during normal and balanced walking in elderly people

| Normal walking | | | | |
|------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| Studies | VAF (%) | Number of synergies | Major involved muscles | Predominant temporal occurrence |
| Alizadehsaravi et al. (2022) | 87 ± 2 | 1 | Dominant leg: SOL, GL | Stance phase |
| | | 2 | Dominant leg: VL, RF | Weight acceptance |
| | | 3 | Non Dominant leg: GMed, RF | Stance phase |
| | | 4 | Dominant leg: BF | Prior heel strike |
| | | 5 | Non Dominant leg: BF | Prior heel strike |
| Allen et al. (2018) | >90 | 1 | GM, SOL, PL | Late stance |
| | | 2 | MH | Early stance |
| | | 3 | TA, VL | Swing phase |
| | | 4 | Med, VL | Early stance |
| Allen et al. (2019) | >90 | 1 | BF, RF, VL, PL, TA | Not mentioned |
| | | 2 | GM, GL, SOL, PL | |
| | | 3 | ADD | |
| | | 4 | GMed | |
| Clark et al. (2010) | 85-98 | 1 | GMed, VM, RF | Weight acceptance |
| | | 2 | SOL, GM | Late stance |
| | | 3 | TA, RF | Early stance & early swing |
| | | 4 | MH, BF | Late swing & early stance |
| Collimore et al. (2021) | >90 | 1 | Not mentioned | Not mentioned |
| | | 2 | | |
| | | 3 | | |

| | | | | |
|---|------|---|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Guo et al. (2022) | >80 | 1 | TA | Early stance & swing phase |
| | | 2 | GM, GL, SOL | Late stance |
| | | 3 | VL, VM, RF | Early stance & late swing |
| | | 4 | H, ADD | Early stance & late swing |
| | | 5 | TFL | Whole gait cycle |
| | | 6 | GMax | Early stance & late swing |
| | | 7 | EOB | Whole gait cycle |
| | | 8 | ES, LD | Late stance |
| <i>An additional synergy involving RF is identified at fast speed compared to normal and slow speed</i> | | | | |
| Kubota et al. (2021) | ≥90% | 1 | GMax, GMed, TFL, RF, VM, VL, OPVM | Early stance |
| | | 2 | GMed, TFL, OPVM, GM, GL, SOL, PL | Late stance |
| | | 3 | ADD, PVM, TA, ST, BF | Early swing |
| | | 4 | PVM, TA, ST, BF | Late swing |
| Santuz et al. (2022) | >80 | 1 | GMed, GMax, TFL, RF, VM, VL | Weight acceptance |
| | | 2 | PL, GM, GL, SOL | Propulsion |
| | | 3 | TA | Early swing |
| | | 4 | SR, BF | Late swing |
| Sawers et al. (2017) | >90 | 1 | TA, BFL, VL | Stance phase & late swing |
| | | 2 | TA | Stance phase |
| | | 3 | GM, oppBFL | Stance phase |
| | | 4 | TA, GM VL, BFL | Swing phase |
| | | 5 | GM, oppBFL | Whole gait cycle |
| | | 6 | BFL | Whole gait cycle |
| Sawers and Bhatt | >90 | 1 | TA, VL | Early stance & swing |

| | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----|-------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| (2018) | | 2 | oppTA, oppVL | Late stance & early swing |
| | | 3 | GM, BFL | Late stance |
| | | 4 | oppGM, oppBFL | Early stance & late swing |
| | | 5 | VL, BFL | Early stance |
| | | 6 | oppVL, oppBFL | Late stance & early swing |
| | | <hr/> | | |
| Toda et al. (2016) | >90 | 1 | GMed, GMin, VAS | Early stance |
| | | 2 | GAS, SOL | Late stance |
| | | 3 | IL, RF | Stance phase |
| | | 4 | GMax, H | Late swing |
| | | 5 | TA | Early stance |
| <hr/> | | | | |
| Balanced walking | | | | |
| <hr/> | | | | |
| Da Silva Costa et al. (2020) (Tape) | >90 | 1 | VL, RF, GM | Stance phase |
| | | 2 | PL, GM | Stance phase |
| | | 3 | PL, EOB | Whole gait cycle |
| | | 4 | BFL, ST | Late swing & early stance |
| | | 5 | ES | Early stance & late stance |
| | | 6 | TA, VM, SOL, ADD | Mid-swing |
| <hr/> | | | | |
| da Silva Costa et al. (2020) (Beam) | >90 | 1 | VL, RF | Stance phase |
| | | 2 | PL | Stance phase |
| | | 3 | RF, GM, SOL, GMed, EOB | Constant on all gait cycle |
| | | 4 | BFL, ST, ADD | Late swing & early stance |
| | | 5 | ES, EOB | Early stance & late stance |
| | | 6 | SOL | Mid-swing |
| | | 7 | TA, VM | Mid-stance & mid-swing |

NOTE. The number of synergies in elderly people (EP) and highest weighting muscles within the synergy are reported. The variability accounted for (VAF) is presented for all synergies or segregate by unique synergy, if available. Temporal component is represented by the predominant temporal occurrence (i.e., when the synergy activation is predominant compared to the rest of the movement). **Abbreviations:** adductor magnus (ADD), biceps femoris (BF), biceps femoris long head (BFL), biceps femoris short head (BFS), erector spinae (ES), external obliques (EOB), gastrocnemius (GAS), gastrocnemius lateralis (GL), gastrocnemius medialis (GM), gluteus maximus (GMax), gluteus medius (GMed), gluteus minimus (GMin), hamstrings (H), iliopsoas (IL), latissimus dorsi (LD), medial hamstrings (MH), opposite (opp), opposite paravertebral muscle (OPVM), paravertebral muscle (PVM), peroneus longus (PL), rectus femoris (RF), semitendinosus (ST), soleus (SOL), tensor fasciae latae (TFL), tibialis anterior (TA), vastii muscles (VAS), vastus lateralis (VL), vastus medialis (VM). * An additional synergy involving RF is identified at fast speed compared to normal and slow spee

Table 4. Significant differences in synergy characteristic between elderly people and young adults during normal and balanced walking

| | | VAF | | Muscle contribution | | Number of synergies | | Timing activation | | Other indexes | |
|--------------------|-------------------------|--|--|---|---------------------------------|----------------------|-------|--|---|---|--------------------|
| | | Difference in older | ES | Difference in older | ES | Difference in older | ES | Difference in older | ES | Difference in older | ES |
| Normal walking | Allen et al. (2018) | ↑ VAF-1 only in EP-fallers | 2.097 | | | ↓ only in EP-fallers | 1.630 | ↑ TAV - EP-fallers ↑ TAV - EP-non fallers | 1.046 1.396 | | |
| | Collimore et al. (2021) | | | | | | | | | ↓ DMC index | 0.919 ^A |
| | Guo et al. (2022) | | | ↑ TA - S3 at fast speed ↓ TFL - S3 at fast speed ↓ TA - S4 at fast speed ↑ EOB - S4 at fast speed ↑ ADD - S4 at normal speed ↑ EOB - S9 at slow speed ↓ S6 amplitude in early swing at all speed ↑ S1 amplitude in late stance at fast speed | • • • • • • • | | | ↑ inter-subject TAV - S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, S8 at normal & slow speed ↑ intra-subject TAV - S6 at fast speed ↑ intra-subject TAV - S2, S4 at normal speed ↑ intra-subject TAV - S1 at slow speed ↓ intra-subject TAV - S7, S8 at normal & slow speed | • • • • • | | |
| | Kubota et al. (2021) | ↑ VAF - S1 ↑ VAF - S2 ↑ VAF - S3 ↑ VAF - S4 | 1.851 1.922 2.273 2.473 | ↑ ST - S1 ↑ BF - S1 | 0.732 0.978 | ↓ | 1.774 | | | | |
| | Santuz et al. (2022) | | | | | | | ↑ time of activation - S1 ↑ time of activation - S2 ↑ time of activation - S3 ↑ time of activation - S4 Earlier shifting - S2 Earlier shifting - S3 Earlier shifting - S4 | 7.510 ^δ 6.530 ^δ 12.750 ^δ 12.390 ^δ -7.240 ^δ -15.480 ^δ -17.140 ^δ | ↑ reduction of local complexity - F vs. M ↑ reduction of global complexity - F vs. M | 0.04 0.04 |
| Toda et al. (2016) | | | ↓ SOL in F - S1 ↑ TA - S1 ↑ TA - S2 ↑ GMax - S2 ↑ RF - S2 ↓ IL - S3 ↑ GAS in F - S3 ↑ TA - S4 ↑ GAS - S5 | 1.405 M: 0.526; F: 0.696 M: 1.039; F: 0.878 M: 0.936; F: 0.564 M: 0.021; F: 1.102 M: 0.714; F: 0.436 1.064 M: 0.261; F: 0.294 M: 0.936; F: 0.958 | | | | | | | |
| Balanced walking | Costa et al. (2020) | ↑ VAF-1 | 0.840 | | | | | | | ↑ Wmus ↑ Wsum | 0.630 0.660 |

NOTE. Lower-limb muscle synergies difference in elderly people (EP) compared to young adults (YA) are presented. Synergy (S) numbers are based on Table 3. If available (• if not), effect size (ES) are reported as Cohen's d, or Glass's delta (Δ) or edges (δ). **Abbreviations:** increased/higher (\uparrow), decreased/lower (\downarrow), adductor magnus (ADD), bicep femoris (BF), dynamic motor control index (DMC), external obliques (EOB), females (F), gastrocnemius (GAS), gluteus maximus (GMax), iliopsoas (L), males (M), soleus (SOL), temporal activation variability (TAV), tibialis anterior (TA), variance accounted for (VAF), VAF the first muscle synergy (VAF-1), number of significantly active muscles/muscle synergy (Wmus), sum of the contribution of active muscles within a muscle synergy (Wsum).

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.06.16.23291230>; this version posted June 18, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under aCC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

1 3.5. Stair ascent

2 The only study that focused on stair ascent reported 4 synergies (Baggen et al., 2020), that
3 accounted for 90.5%, 89.8% and 91.8% of variance in young women, and 88.5%, 87.3% and
4 87.4% in older women for step heights of 10, 20 and 30 cm, respectively (see **Table 5**). The
5 number of synergies was similar between step heights, and the muscle composition of Synergy 1
6 (i.e., synergy involved in the pull-up part of the movement), appeared to be the most variable
7 across step heights.

8 The results showed that the VAF obtained when extracting 4 synergies was lower (i.e.,
9 indicating higher synergy complexity) when step height was increased, and that EP had lower
10 VAF than YA, across all step heights (difference (10 cm): +1.92 %, $d = 0.092$; difference (20
11 cm): +2.53 %, $d = 0.101$; difference (30 cm): +2.88 %, $d = 0.163$). For all step heights, muscle
12 weighting analysis showed that the RF contribution in EP is greater in the synergy 4, which is
13 involved in the second half of foot clearance and pull-up phases (difference (10 cm): +0.21, $d =$
14 1.360; difference (20 cm): +0.13, $d = 1.644$; difference (30 cm): +0.20, $d = 1.387$), and lower in
15 the synergy 2, that is contributing during the beginning of foot clearance and the end of pull-up
16 phases (difference (10 cm): +0.26, $d = 1.435$; difference (20 cm): +0.23, $d = 1.322$; difference (30
17 cm): +0.36, $d = 2.400$), compared to YA. Overall, the muscle contribution differences between
18 EP and YA appears highly variable across step heights (see **Table 5**). Regarding temporal
19 activation patterns, higher between-subjects variability of temporal activation was shown for all
20 step heights in the synergy 2 (difference (10 cm): +5.58, $d = 1.636$; difference (20 cm): +9.97, d
21 = 1.556; difference (30 cm): +8.04, $d = 2.125$), and the synergy 4, (difference (10 cm): +6.50, $d =$
22 1.908; difference (20 cm): +5.36, $d = 1.460$; difference (30 cm): +9.37, $d = 1.625$) in EP,
23 compared to YA. The same tendency was noticed, solely for 20 and 30 cm step heights, in the
24 synergy 3, that is contributing during the end of foot clearance and the pull-up phase (difference
25 (20 cm): +9.76, $d = 1.381$; difference (30 cm): +10.64, $d = 1.295$).

Table 5. Muscle synergies in elderly people during stair ascent and differences with young adults.

| Baggen et al. (2020) | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|--|
| 10 cm | | | | 20 cm | | | | 30 cm | | | |
| Synergy | VAF (%) | Major involved muscles | Predominant temporal occurrence | Synergy | VAF (%) | Major involved muscles | Predominant temporal occurrence | Synergy | VAF (%) | Major involved muscles | Predominant temporal occurrence |
| 1 | | GL, RF, GMed | Pull-up | 1 | | GL, SOL | Pull-up | 1 | | GL, RF, GMax, GMed | Pull-up |
| 2 | | RF, BF, ST, | First half of FC & pull-up | 2 | | VL, RF, BF, ST, | First half of FC & end of pull-up | 2 | | VL, BF, ST | First half of FC & end of pull-up |
| 3 | 88.5 | TA, SOL, ES | End of FC & beginning of pull-up | 3 | 87.3 | TA, ES | Foot clearance & Pull-up | 3 | 87.4 | TA, SOL, ES | End of FC & pull-up |
| 4 | | TA, SOL, RF | Middle of FC & pull-up | 4 | | TA, SOL | Second half of FC & pull-up | 4 | | TA, ST | Second half of FC & pull-up |
| Difference in older | | | ES | Difference in older | | | ES | Difference in older | | | ES |
| VAF | | ↓ VAF | 0.092 | VAF | | ↓ VAF | 0.101 | VAF | | ↓ VAF | 0.163 |
| Muscle contribution | ↓ VL - S1 | 1.140 | ↑ GL - S1 | 2.740 | ↑ RF - S1 | 2.785 | | | | | |
| | ↑ RF - S1 | 1.537 | ↓ VL - S2 | 1.029 | ↑ BF - S1 | 1.467 | | | | | |
| | ↓ Gmed - S1 | 1.154 | ↓ RF - S2 | 1.322 | ↓ RF - S2 | 2.400 | | | | | |
| | ↓ RF - S2 | 1.435 | ↑ ST - S2 | 1.631 | ↑ SOL - S3 | 1.397 | | | | | |
| | ↓ ES - S2 | 1.580 | ↓ GL - S3 | 3.667 | ↓ ES - S3 | 1.231 | | | | | |
| | ↑ SOL - S4 | 1.037 | ↓ SOL - S3 | 1.506 | ↑ RF - S4 | 1.387 | | | | | |
| | ↑ RF - S4 | 1.360 | ↑ RF - S4 | 1.644 | ↑ ST - S4 | 1.159 | | | | | |
| Timing activation | | ↑ BSV of temporal activations - S2 | 1.636 | ↓ GMed - S4 | 1.302 | ↓ Gmed - S4 | 1.031 | ↑ BSV of temporal activations - S2 | 2.125 | ↑ BSV of temporal activations - S2 | 1.295 |
| Timing activation | | ↑ BSV of temporal activations - S4 | 1.908 | ↑ BSV of temporal activations - S2 | 1.556 | ↑ BSV of temporal activations - S3 | 1.381 | ↑ BSV of temporal activations - S3 | 1.295 | ↑ BSV of temporal activations - S4 | 1.625 |
| Timing activation | | ↑ BSV of temporal activations - S4 | 1.908 | ↑ BSV of temporal activations - S4 | 1.460 | ↑ BSV of temporal activations - S4 | 1.460 | ↑ BSV of temporal activations - S4 | 1.460 | ↑ BSV of temporal activations - S4 | 1.460 |

NOTE. Upper part: The number of synergies in elderly people (EP) and highest weighting muscles within the synergy are reported. The variability accounted for (VAF) is presented for all synergies. Temporal component is represented by the predominant temporal occurrence. Lower part: Lower-limb muscle synergies difference in EP compared to young adults (YA) are presented. Synergy (S) numbers are based on the upper part. Effect size (ES) are reported Cohen's d. **Abbreviations:** increased/higher (↑), decreased/lower (↓), biceps femoris (BF), between-subject variability (BSV) erector spinae (ES), gastrocnemius lateralis (GL), gluteus maximus (GMax), gluteus medius (GMed), rectus femoris (RF), semitendinosus (ST), soleus (SOL), tibialis anterior (TA), vastus lateralis (VL), foot clearance (FC).

1 3.6. *Sit-to-stand task*

2 Three studies (An et al., 2013; Hanawa et al., 2017; Yang et al., 2017), among the four
3 that focused on sit-to-stand task (An et al., 2013; Hanawa et al., 2017; Yang et al., 2019, 2017),
4 describe the temporal occurrence of muscle synergies according to the phasic description of
5 Schenkman et al. (1990): **Phase 1** (i.e., flexion momentum phase) begins with the first shoulder
6 movement in the horizontal direction; **Phase 2** (i.e., momentum transfer phase) begins at contact
7 loss with the stool; **Phase 3** (i.e., vertical extension phase) begins when the shank segment tilted
8 forward to the maximum; **Phase 4** (i.e., stabilization phase) begins when the vertical shoulder
9 position achieved its maximum height. A range of 3 to 4 muscle synergies that account for 88%
10 of the variance have been reported by the four studies that have focused on sit-to-stand task (see
11 **Table 6**).

12 Overall, the results suggest similar muscle synergies underlying the sit-to-stand task
13 between EP and YA groups. Still, An et al. (2013) observed that 5 of 7 EP had no synergy for
14 flexing their ankle and bending their trunk (i.e., during phase 1 and 2). Also, Yang et al. (2019)
15 reported difference in the temporal (i.e., delayed peak time), and spatial (i.e., decreased gradient
16 steepness after peak value) structure of one synergy in EP, compared to YA. Furthermore,
17 Hanawa et al. (2017) investigated muscle synergies during sit-to-stand task at different speeds.
18 Three synergies, with similar spatial structure, were observed in both EP and YA groups,
19 regardless the speed. Conversely, the change in movement speed affected the temporal structure
20 of synergies (i.e., prolonged activation for one synergy), but no effect of age was observed.

Table 6. Muscle synergies in elderly people during sit-to-stand task and differences with young adults.

| Studies | VAF (%) | Number of synergies | Major involved muscles | Predominant temporal occurrence | Difference in older | ES |
|----------------------|---------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--------|
| An et al. (2013) | Not mentioned | 1 | GAS, RF, GMax | Phase 1 & 2 | 5/7 participants have no synergy at all for flexing their ankle and bending trunk - S1 | • |
| | | 2 | TA, VL, BF | Phase 3 | | |
| | | 3 | SOL, GAS, BF, GMax | Phase 3 & 4 | | |
| Hanawa et al. (2017) | >90 | 1 | TA, RF, VL | Phase 2 | No information | |
| | | 2 | VL, RF, ST, GM | Phase 3 | | |
| | | 3 | SOL, GM | Phase 4 | | |
| Yang et al. (2017) | 88 ± 3 | 1 | RA | Phase 1 | No information | |
| | | 2 | TA, VL, RF | End phase 1 & phase 2 | | |
| | | 3 | ES, VL, BFL, BFS | Phase 2 & phase 3 | | |
| | | 4 | GAS, SOL, GMax | Phase 3 & phase 4 | | |
| Yang et al. (2019) | 88.7 | 1 | RA, EOB | Phase 1 | Peak time comes after - S2 ↓ gradient steepness after the peak value of S2 | • • |
| | | 2 | TA, RF, VM, VL | Phase 2 | | |
| | | 3 | ES, BF, ST, GMax, GMed | Phase 3 & 4 | | |
| | | 4 | GL, GM, PL, SOL | Phase 3 and 4 | | |

NOTE. On the left side: The number of synergies in elderly people (EP) and highest weighting muscles within the synergy are reported. The variability accounted for (VAF) is presented for all synergies. Temporal component is represented by the predominant temporal occurrence. Phase 1 begins with the first shoulder movement in the horizontal direction; Phase 2 begins at contact loss with the stool; Phase 3 begins when the shank segment tilted forward to the maximum; Phase 4 begins when the vertical shoulder position achieved its maximum height (Schenkman et al., 1990). On the right side: Lower-limb muscle synergies difference in EP compared to young adults (YA) are presented. Synergy (S) numbers are based on the left side. Effect size (ES) were not available (•). **Abbreviations:** increased/higher (↑), decreased/lower (↓), biceps femoris (BF), biceps femoris long head (BFL), biceps femoris short head (BFS), external obliques (EOB), erector spinae (ES), gastrocnemii (GAS), gluteus maximus (GMax), gluteus medius (GMed), gastrocnemius medialis (GM), gastrocnemius lateralis (GL), latissimus dorsi (LD), peroneus longus (PL), rectus femoris (RF), semitendinosus (ST), soleus (SOL), tibialis anterior (TA), vastus lateralis (VL).

1 **4. Discussion**

2 The goal of this scoping review was to summarize the existing literature investigating
3 muscle synergies in EP during daily living tasks which are critical to maintaining their
4 autonomy. We highlighted how muscle synergies in EP differ from those exhibited by YA. The
5 main findings were: 1) EP retain in general similar muscle synergies number compared to YA
6 although increased VAF could be observed in EP compared to YA during normal and balanced
7 walking; 2) Generally, higher muscles contribution was reported in EP during normal and
8 balanced walking tasks; and 3) in terms of synergies temporal structure, EP had an increased
9 inter-subject variability during stair ascent, and an increased intra and inter-subject variability
10 during normal walking, compared to YA.

11 *4.1. Walking tasks*

12 Despite no independent effect of age on motor module complexity in terms of number of
13 synergies, some studies reported an age-related decrease in neuromuscular complexity (i.e.,
14 higher VAF-1) and efficiency (i.e., higher muscle coactivity) during normal walking (Allen et
15 al., 2019; Da Silva Costa et al., 2020) and balanced walking (Da Silva Costa et al., 2020). The
16 VAF-1 appears to be a more sensitive measure of changes in the complexity of neuromuscular
17 control that accompanies cortical modifications related to aging (Douaud et al., 2014). Moreover,
18 the results suggests that age increases the variability of module recruitment timing during
19 walking (Allen et al., 2019; Guo et al., 2022), which can be associated with an altered
20 neuromuscular control at the highest levels of control (e.g., cortical). The VAF-1 is obviously
21 dependent on the number of synergies recruited during the task but probably also on the
22 distribution variance and timing across the synergies from cycle-to-cycle/step-to-step. To assess
23 these changes, that we suppose occur with age, it is likely that other synergies metrics (i.e.,
24 temporal and spatiotemporal synergy models) might provide additional information, and perhaps
25 reveals more subtle differences. Moreover, the DMC index has been shown to be a relevant
26 predictor related to aging, in contrast to the number of synergies (Collimore et al., 2021). Indeed,
27 within EP group differences (young-EP vs older-EP) has been reported, suggesting that the use
28 of two age groups (EP vs YA) as a differentiating factor can be overly crude.

1 Da Silva Costa et al. (2020) have shown that EP have increased muscle coactivation and
2 contribution within synergies, which supports the increased biomechanical control demand
3 required in EP, compared to YA. Greater antagonistic activation is a well-known adaptation
4 when the task requires a more precise control such as walking on slippery surfaces (Chambers
5 and Cham, 2007) or descending slopes (Lay et al., 2007), and it increases dramatically with age
6 (Ortega and Farley, 2015). This control strategy appears intuitive, as neural delays are thought to
7 be too long to allow feedback mechanisms to sufficiently respond to instabilities during tasks,
8 but the effect of antagonist co-activation on control remains to be fully elucidated (Latash, 2018).
9 Indeed, Da Silva Costa et al. (2020) have shown that task complexity, such as greater balance
10 challenges during gait (i.e., beam vs tape walking), results in an increased muscle coactivation
11 (i.e., within a synergy), and an increased number of muscle synergies, which reflect the greater
12 complexity of neuromuscular activation patterns when the task is more complex. Thus,
13 increasing the difficulty of functional task may potentially distinguished neuromuscular control
14 deficit that are not present when the task difficulty is low (Da Silva Costa et al., 2020). Allen and
15 Franz (2018), who assessed the effect of balanced perturbations during gait in EP with and
16 without history of fall, suggested that fall history was an important contributor of motor module
17 complexity. Indeed, their results indicate that fall history has a larger effect on motor module
18 recruitment than age itself, which suggest fall experience has perceptual and
19 biomechanical/physiological consequences on control of posture, and this likely explains the
20 abnormal responses to balance perturbations and the associated greater risk of fall in EP with fall
21 history observed elsewhere (Tinetti et al., 1988).

22 The methodological choices (i.e., environmental setting) may explain differences in EP
23 and YA that are not supported by all studies that focussed on gait. For instance, the reduced
24 number of synergies in EP vs. YA reported by Kubota et al. (2021) is not supported by Allen
25 and Franz (2018) and the discrepancy could be the results of the walking environment (treadmill
26 vs. overground), walking speed (fixed vs. self-selected), or fall history. Indeed, walking on a
27 treadmill at a fixed speed imposes a cadenced pattern of joint motion, which may standardize the
28 condition for the assessment of the true differences between EP and YA, despite the effect of fast
29 speed variation that can occur during overground walking. Indeed, it could be argued that the
30 walking environment may affects the number of synergies; Guo et al. (2022) identified an

1 additional synergy at fast speed, compared to normal and slow speed during overground walking,
2 while Clark et al. (2010) did not support this result with their experimentation on a treadmill.
3 Overall, results suggest that differences in synergy outcomes are mainly observed when the
4 conditions are the most challenging, and less observed in basic standardized conditions.

5 *4.2. Stair ascent*

6 During stair ascent task, Baggen et al., (2020) reported a decreased VAF-1 was observed
7 in older women, and when step height was increased, suggesting a higher synergy complexity.
8 According to the current literature, population with impaired mobility, such as cerebral palsy
9 (Steele et al., 2015) and Parkinson's disease (Rodriguez et al., 2013), have a reduced
10 neuromuscular complexity, which limits their ability to perform complex locomotor task such as
11 walking up-stairs. Thus, a greater synergy complexity in EP, compared to YA during stair ascent
12 is not expected. However, the author proposes that the increased complexity of synergies arises
13 from the greater challenge of stepping up stairs in EP, which requires the adoption of different
14 control strategies to compensate for their reduced functional capacity (Baggen et al., 2020).

15 *4.3. Sit-to-stand task*

16 The ability to rise from seated position is critical for EP to maintain their independence
17 and functional fitness (Van Lummel et al., 2015; Yee et al., 2021). In the absence of any fall
18 history, Hanawa et al. (2017) reported common muscle synergies during sit-to-stand task in both
19 YA (n = 4) and EP (n = 3). In the other hand, compared to YA, An et al. (2013) observed less
20 activated synergies, and no synergy involved in ankle flexion and trunk bending (i.e., to raise the
21 hip from the seat) in 5/7 EP. These results may be related to the low muscle strength of EP
22 individuals, knowing that this latter is one of the most important factors to succeed in getting up
23 from a chair (Alexander et al., 1997; Van Lummel et al., 2015). In a similar context, Van
24 Lummel et al. (2015), showed that EP with low grip strength used a different strategy to rise
25 from a seated position than EP with higher grip strength, which is characterized by greater trunk
26 flexion and more dynamic trunk use during the extension phase. Indeed, peripheral muscle
27 weakness of EP may be compensated by using their trunk, exhibiting increased sway due to the
28 high inertia of the trunk, which is challenging to halt without control and may contribute to fall

1 risk. However, the small sample size of studies investigating muscle synergies underlying the sit-
2 to-stand task in EP (i.e., 3 to 12 participants) limits the results' generalizability.

3 *4.4. Clinical implications*

4 To the best of our knowledge, this is the first review investigating the neuromuscular
5 control as assessed by muscle synergies in EP during three common tasks: walking, sit-to-stand
6 and stair ascent. These tasks require precise and dynamic coordination of several muscles of the
7 lower limb and trunk. Muscle synergy analysis can provide a more generalizable assessment of
8 motor function by identifying whether common neuromuscular control mechanisms are altered
9 when performing multiple motor tasks. This scoping review highlighted the presence of common
10 muscles synergies between different daily living tasks, particularly during the early stance phase
11 of walking and the second phase of sit-to-stand task. Indeed, the concomitant activation of the
12 TA with one or many quadriceps' muscles (i.e., RF, VL, VM), and/or with one or many muscles
13 of the posterior thigh (i.e., ST, BF) has been reported during early stance phase (i.e., heel strike,
14 loading response/weight acceptance) by most of studies that focused on gait (Allen et al., 2019;
15 Allen and Franz, 2018; Clark et al., 2010; Guo et al., 2022; Sawers et al., 2017; Sawers and
16 Bhatt, 2018; Toda et al., 2016). Similar synergies have been observed in all studies that focused
17 on sit-to-stand task during the second phase of the movement (Hanawa et al., 2017; Yang et al.,
18 2019, 2017), or during the third phase (An et al., 2013). The presence of similar synergies
19 represents a significant advantage for therapeutic managements in EP. Indeed, these results
20 suggest the possibility to improve the neuromuscular control of problematic gait phases (e.g.,
21 during the stance phase when dynamic stability is challenged) through the practice of functional
22 tasks that represent a lower risk of falls (e.g., chair rising with handhold).

23 *4.5. Recommendations for future studies*

24
25 In order that future studies may contribute to establishing a better theoretical framework
26 concerning muscle synergies during daily living tasks in EP, authors should consider the
27 following elements. First, the names of the muscles should be specifically defined. Some studies
28 included in this scoping review (An et al., 2013; Guo et al., 2022; Toda et al., 2016; Yang et al.,
29 2017) mentioned muscles group (e.g., GAS or H) without specifying which muscles were
30 included in these groups, thereby limiting the results' comparison with other studies. Indeed,

1 although muscles within the same muscles group (e.g., H) work synergistically during the
2 movement (e.g., walking), the contribution of each muscle (e.g., BF, ST, SM) may vary
3 depending on the specific demands of the gait phase.

4 Second, the number and the choice of the muscles included in the analysis should be
5 chosen carefully. Indeed, Steele et al (Steele et al., 2015) have shown that the structure of
6 synergies is dependent of the number and the muscles choice in the analysis. They have reported
7 that the VAF is over-estimated when fewer muscles are included in the analysis (Steele et al.,
8 2015). In line with this latter and the results of this scoping, we recommend to 1) record the
9 muscle activity of as many muscles as possible that are involved in the task (i.e., muscles
10 recognized as reliable through surface EMG recording), and to 2) select the largest muscles (i.e.,
11 determined by maximum isometric force (Maughan et al., 1983)) if the number of muscles that
12 can be recorded is limited (Steele et al., 2015).

13 Third, attention should be given to minimizing noise when recording EMG signals.
14 Indeed, Steele et al. (2015) have shown that noise affects the synergy analysis outcomes when a
15 small number of muscles are recorded. However, when the analysis includes more than 15
16 muscles, they reported that a signal that is at least 10 times stronger than the noise has minimal
17 effect on muscle combinations (Steele et al., 2015). Noise can be limited, for instance, by a good
18 skin preparation (i.e., shaving, sandpapering and cleaning of the skin), by choosing the best
19 location and orientation of the sensor on the muscle (i.e., region away from the innervation zone
20 and the end zone of the muscle), and by good fixation of the sensor (i.e., with elastic band or
21 tape) (Hermens et al., 2000).

22 Fourth, there is no one-size-fits-all method for signal processing, but authors should be
23 aware of the effect of the signal preprocessing on synergies estimation. For instance, Guo et al.,
24 (2022), who used an unconventional signal processing technique (i.e., a quasi-raw pattern/lightly
25 filtered, and cluster synergies), found a total of 8 synergies, which is largely above the number of
26 synergies conventionally reported (i.e., $n = 4$ to 5) by previous studies focusing on walking task
27 (Alizadehsaravi et al., 2022b; Allen et al., 2019b; Allen and Franz, 2018b; Clark et al., 2010b;
28 Kubota et al., 2021; Santuz et al., 2022b; Toda et al., 2016b).

1 Finally, the VAF-1, the number of synergies or the DMC are interesting, but too gross
2 and indiscriminating. An analysis of the synergy's spatial and temporal structure is warranted to
3 detect neuromuscular control deficits. A conventional EMG analysis can provide an overview of
4 the spinal cord's output, and the synergy analysis allows identifying its structuring. The
5 following three approaches, that are not well reported in the current literature, would be
6 interesting to consider: 1) assessing neuromuscular robustness over time throughout a task, by
7 calculating the variability using the cross-VAF (Ghislieri et al., 2023; Gizzi et al., 2015). This
8 would make it possible to describe how an epoch containing N gait cycles can be reconstructed
9 by a muscle synergy model calculated from a different epoch of N gait cycles. 2) Using the intra-
10 subject approach, and 3) an inter-subject/repertory approach, which both allow a better
11 synthetization of results across subjects or condition (Cheung et al., 2020; Funato et al., 2022;
12 Guo et al., 2022a). The intra-subject approach is promising, but the inter-subject comparison is
13 questionable in the absence of adequate EMG signals normalization, since synergies may differ
14 because of the normalization technique used or the different muscle activation level.

15 4.6. *Limitations*

16 Regarding the review itself, few limitations must be acknowledged. A limitation concerns
17 the restrictions on the language, and the type of publication. Indeed, we have chosen to include
18 only English and French publications to ensure that we fully comprehend the content of the
19 articles and accurately extract relevant information. Regarding the qualities of included studies,
20 several studies included a limited number of participants, without performing prospective sample
21 size calculations. Therefore, some of them may not have the power to detect changes in muscle
22 synergies. Also, two of the four studies that focused on sit-to-stand task have a low
23 methodological quality assessment score, which constrained the quality of our results concerning
24 this latter. However, the majority of the included studies have a large sample size and a
25 moderate to high methodological quality assessment score. Finally, the metrics used to describe
26 synergies are numerous (e.g., VAF, VAF-1, DMC, TAV), and these methodological
27 discrepancies limit the information synthetization across studies.

28 **5. Conclusion**

1 The identification and analysis of muscle synergies provide insights into the coordination
2 and functional implications of muscle activation patterns during common daily activity. This
3 approach was prioritized in this review to understand age-related changes in neuromuscular
4 control when performing daily living tasks such as walking, sit-to-stand and stair ascent. Our
5 findings suggested that although the number of synergies remains similar between YA and EP,
6 other metrics such as DMC, VAF, and spatial and temporal structures of synergies enable the
7 identification of decline in neuromuscular control in EP.

8 **Authors' contributions**

9 **YC** developed the search strategy and methodology for this review, which have been validated
10 by a science librarian. **YC** and **SH** screened the search hits for eligibility and rated the quality of
11 the included studies. **CDP** and **YC** extracted and synthesized the relevant data. **CDP** wrote the
12 first draft of the manuscript. **YC**, **NT**, **KT** and **FM** performed a major revision of the manuscript.
13 All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

14 **Acknowledgments**

15 C.D.P. is scholar from Fonds de recherche du Québec—Santé (FRQS). The authors thank
16 Martine Gagnon (a science librarian at Laval University) for her guidance and advice during the
17 implementation of the research strategy.

18 **Conflicts of Interest**

19 The authors declare that they have no competing interests and there are no competing financial
20 interests to declare in relation to this manuscript.

21

1 REFERENCES

- 2 Alexander, N.B., Schultz, A.B., Ashton-Miller, J.A., Gross, M.M., Giordani, B., 1997. Muscle
3 strength and rising from a chair in older adults. *Muscle Nerve* 20, 56–59.
4 [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-4598\(1997\)5](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-4598(1997)5)
- 5 Alizadehsaravi, L., Bruijn, S.M., Muijres, W., Koster, R.A.J., Dieën, J.H. van, 2022.
6 Improvement in gait stability in older adults after ten sessions of standing balance
7 training. *PLOS ONE* 17, e0242115. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0242115>
- 8 Allen, J.L., Franz, J.R., 2018. The motor repertoire of older adult fallers may constrain their
9 response to balance perturbations. *J. Neurophysiol.* 120, 2368–2378.
10 <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00302.2018>
- 11 Allen, J.L., Kesar, T.M., Ting, L.H., 2019. Motor module generalization across balance and
12 walking is impaired after stroke. *J. Neurophysiol.* 122, 277–289.
13 <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00561.2018>
- 14 An, Q., Ikemoto, Y., Asama, H., 2013. Muscle Synergy Analysis Between Young and Elderly
15 People in Standing-Up Motion. *J. Robot. Mechatron.* 25, 1038–1049.
16 <https://doi.org/10.20965/jrm.2013.p1038>
- 17 Baggen, R.J., van Dieën, J.H., Van Roie, E., Verschueren, S.M., Giarmatzis, G., Delecluse, C.,
18 Dominici, N., 2020. Age-Related Differences in Muscle Synergy Organization during
19 Step Ascent at Different Heights and Directions. *Appl. Sci.* 10, 1987.
20 <https://doi.org/10.3390/app10061987>
- 21 Bimou, C., Harel, M., Laubarie-Mouret, C., Cardinaud, N., Charenton-Blavignac, M., Toumi, N.,
22 Trimouillas, J., Gayot, C., Boyer, S., Hebert, R., Dantoine, T., Tchalla, A., 2021. Patterns
23 and predictive factors of loss of the independence trajectory among community-dwelling
24 older adults. *BMC Geriatr.* 21, 142. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-021-02063-7>
- 25 Brown, C.J., Flood, K.L., 2013. Mobility limitation in the older patient: a clinical review. *JAMA*
26 310, 1168–1177. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2013.276566>
- 27 Chambers, A.J., Cham, R., 2007. Slip-related muscle activation patterns in the stance leg during
28 walking. *Gait Posture* 25, 565–572. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2006.06.007>
- 29 Cherni, Y., Hajizadeh, M., Dal Maso, F., Turpin, N.A., 2021. Effects of body weight support and
30 guidance force settings on muscle synergy during Lokomat walking. *Eur. J. Appl.*
31 *Physiol.* <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00421-021-04762-w>
- 32 Cheung, V.C.K., Cheung, B.M.F., Zhang, J.H., Chan, Z.Y.S., Ha, S.C.W., Chen, C.-Y., Cheung,
33 R.T.H., 2020. Plasticity of muscle synergies through fractionation and merging during
34 development and training of human runners. *Nat. Commun.* 11, 4356.
35 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-18210-4>
- 36 Clark, D.J., Ting, L.H., Zajac, F.E., Neptune, R.R., Kautz, S.A., 2010. Merging of healthy motor
37 modules predicts reduced locomotor performance and muscle coordination complexity
38 post-stroke. *J. Neurophysiol.* 103, 844–857. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00825.2009>

- 1 Cohen, J., 1977. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. Elsevier.
2 <https://doi.org/10.1016/C2013-0-10517-X>
- 3 Collimore, A.N., Aiello, A.J., Pohlig, R.T., Awad, L.N., 2021. The Dynamic Motor Control
4 Index as a Marker of Age-Related Neuromuscular Impairment. *Front. Aging Neurosci.*
5 13.
- 6 Connor Gorber, S., Tremblay, M., Moher, D., Gorber, B., 2007. A comparison of direct vs. self-
7 report measures for assessing height, weight and body mass index: a systematic review.
8 *Obes. Rev. Off. J. Int. Assoc. Study Obes.* 8, 307–326. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-789X.2007.00347.x)
9 [789X.2007.00347.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-789X.2007.00347.x)
- 10 Da Silva Costa, A.A., Moraes, R., Hortobágyi, T., Sawers, A., 2020. Older adults reduce the
11 complexity and efficiency of neuromuscular control to preserve walking balance. *Exp.*
12 *Gerontol.* 140, 111050. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exger.2020.111050>
- 13 Desmyttere, G., Hajizadeh, M., Bleau, J., Begon, M., 2018. Effect of foot orthosis design on
14 lower limb joint kinematics and kinetics during walking in flexible pes planovalgus: A
15 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin. Biomech.* 59, 117–129.
16 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2018.09.018>
- 17 Douaud, G., Groves, A.R., Tamnes, C.K., Westlye, L.T., Duff, E.P., Engvig, A., Walhovd, K.B.,
18 James, A., Gass, A., Monsch, A.U., Matthews, P.M., Fjell, A.M., Smith, S.M., Johansen-
19 Berg, H., 2014. A common brain network links development, aging, and vulnerability to
20 disease. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 111, 17648–17653.
21 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1410378111>
- 22 Downs, S.H., Black, N., 1998. The feasibility of creating a checklist for the assessment of the
23 methodological quality both of randomised and non-randomised studies of health care
24 interventions. *J. Epidemiol. Community Health* 52, 377–384.
25 <https://doi.org/10.1136/jech.52.6.377>
- 26 Funato, T., Hattori, N., Yozu, A., An, Q., Oya, T., Shirafuji, S., Jino, A., Miura, K., Martino, G.,
27 Berger, D., Miyai, I., Ota, J., Ivanenko, Y., d’Avella, A., Seki, K., 2022. Muscle synergy
28 analysis yields an efficient and physiologically relevant method of assessing stroke. *Brain*
29 *Commun.* 4, fcac200. <https://doi.org/10.1093/braincomms/fcac200>
- 30 Ghislieri, M., Lanotte, M., Knaflitz, M., Rizzi, L., Agostini, V., 2023. Muscle synergies in
31 Parkinson’s disease before and after the deep brain stimulation of the bilateral
32 subthalamic nucleus. *Sci. Rep.* 13, 6997. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-34151-6>
- 33 Gizzi, L., Muceli, S., Petzke, F., Falla, D., 2015. Experimental Muscle Pain Impairs the
34 Synergistic Modular Control of Neck Muscles. *PLOS ONE* 10, e0137844.
35 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0137844>
- 36 Guo, X., He, B., Lau, K.Y.S., Chan, P.P.K., Liu, R., Xie, J.J., Ha, S.C.W., Chen, C.-Y., Cheing,
37 G.L.Y., Cheung, R.T.H., Chan, R.H.M., Cheung, V.C.K., 2022. Age-Related
38 Modifications of Muscle Synergies and Their Temporal Activations for Overground
39 Walking. *IEEE Trans. Neural Syst. Rehabil. Eng. Publ. IEEE Eng. Med. Biol. Soc.* 30,
40 2700–2709. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TNSRE.2022.3206887>

- 1 Hanawa, H., Kubota, K., Kokubun, T., Marumo, T., Hoshi, F., Kobayashi, A., Kanemura, N.,
2 2017. Muscle synergies underlying sit-to-stand tasks in elderly people and their
3 relationship with kinetic characteristics. *J. Electromyogr. Kinesiol. Off. J. Int. Soc.*
4 *Electrophysiol. Kinesiol.* 37, 15–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jelekin.2017.08.004>
- 5 Hermens, H.J., Freriks, B., Disselhorst-Klug, C., Rau, G., 2000. Development of
6 recommendations for SEMG sensors and sensor placement procedures. *J. Electromyogr.*
7 *Kinesiol.* 10, 361–374. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1050-6411\(00\)00027-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1050-6411(00)00027-4)
- 8 Ialongo, C., 2016. Understanding the effect size and its measures. *Biochem. Medica* 150–163.
9 <https://doi.org/10.11613/BM.2016.015>
- 10 Kubota, K., Hanawa, H., Yokoyama, M., Kita, S., Hirata, K., Fujino, T., Kokubun, T., Ishibashi,
11 T., Kanemura, N., 2021. Usefulness of Muscle Synergy Analysis in Individuals With
12 Knee Osteoarthritis During Gait. *IEEE Trans. Neural Syst. Rehabil. Eng. Publ. IEEE*
13 *Eng. Med. Biol. Soc.* 29, 239–248. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TNSRE.2020.3043831>
- 14 Latash, M.L., 2018. Muscle coactivation: definitions, mechanisms, and functions. *J.*
15 *Neurophysiol.* 120, 88–104. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00084.2018>
- 16 Lay, A.N., Hass, C.J., Richard Nichols, T., Gregor, R.J., 2007. The effects of sloped surfaces on
17 locomotion: An electromyographic analysis. *J. Biomech.* 40, 1276–1285.
18 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2006.05.023>
- 19 Maughan, R.J., Watson, J.S., Weir, J., 1983. Strength and cross-sectional area of human skeletal
20 muscle. *J. Physiol.* 338, 37–49. <https://doi.org/10.1113/jphysiol.1983.sp014658>
- 21 Merrilees, J., 2014. Activities of Daily Living, in: Aminoff, M.J., Daroff, R.B. (Eds.),
22 *Encyclopedia of the Neurological Sciences (Second Edition)*. Academic Press, Oxford,
23 pp. 47–48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-385157-4.00464-4>
- 24 Monaco, V., Ghionzoli, A., Micera, S., 2010. Age-related modifications of muscle synergies and
25 spinal cord activity during locomotion. *J. Neurophysiol.* 104, 2092–2102.
26 <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00525.2009>
- 27 Ortega, J.D., Farley, C.T., 2015. Effects of aging on mechanical efficiency and muscle activation
28 during level and uphill walking. *J. Electromyogr. Kinesiol.* 25, 193–198.
29 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jelekin.2014.09.003>
- 30 Rabbi, M.F., Pizzolato, C., Lloyd, D.G., Carty, C.P., Devaprakash, D., Diamond, L.E., 2020.
31 Non-negative matrix factorisation is the most appropriate method for extraction of
32 muscle synergies in walking and running. *Sci. Rep.* 10, 8266.
33 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-65257-w>
- 34 Rodriguez, K.L., Roemmich, R.T., Cam, B., Fregly, B.J., Hass, C.J., 2013. Persons with
35 Parkinson’s disease exhibit decreased neuromuscular complexity during gait. *Clin.*
36 *Neurophysiol.* 124, 1390–1397. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2013.02.006>
- 37 Santuz, A., Janshen, L., Brüll, L., Munoz-Martel, V., Taborri, J., Rossi, S., Arampatzis, A., 2022.
38 Sex-specific tuning of modular muscle activation patterns for locomotion in young and
39 older adults. *PloS One* 17, e0269417. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0269417>

- 1 Sawers, A., Bhatt, T., 2018. Neuromuscular determinants of slip-induced falls and recoveries in
2 older adults. *J. Neurophysiol.* 120, 1534–1546. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00286.2018>
- 3 Sawers, A., Pai, Y.-C. (Clive), Bhatt, T., Ting, L.H., 2017. Neuromuscular responses differ
4 between slip-induced falls and recoveries in older adults. *J. Neurophysiol.* 117, 509–522.
5 <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00699.2016>
- 6 Schenkman, M., Berger, R.A., Riley, P.O., Mann, R.W., Hodge, W.A., 1990. Whole-Body
7 Movements During Rising to Standing from Sitting. *Phys. Ther.* 70, 638–648.
8 <https://doi.org/10.1093/ptj/70.10.638>
- 9 Schmitz, A., Silder, A., Heiderscheid, B., Mahoney, J., Thelen, D.G., 2009. Differences in lower-
10 extremity muscular activation during walking between healthy older and young adults. *J.*
11 *Electromyogr. Kinesiol. Off. J. Int. Soc. Electrophysiol. Kinesiol.* 19, 1085–1091.
12 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jelekin.2008.10.008>
- 13 Sobral, A.I.G. da P., de Araújo, C.M.T., Sobral, M.F.F., 2018. Mild cognitive impairment in the
14 elderly Relationship between communication and functional capacity. *Dement.*
15 *Neuropsychol.* 12, 165–172. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1980-57642018dn12-020009>
- 16 Steele, K.M., Rozumalski, A., Schwartz, M.H., 2015. Muscle synergies and complexity of
17 neuromuscular control during gait in cerebral palsy. *Dev. Med. Child Neurol.* 57, 1176–
18 1182. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dmcn.12826>
- 19 Tinetti, M.E., Speechley, M., Ginter, S.F., 1988. Risk Factors for Falls among Elderly Persons
20 Living in the Community. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 319, 1701–1707.
21 <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJM198812293192604>
- 22 Toda, H., Nagano, A., Luo, Z., 2016. Age-related differences in muscle control of the lower
23 extremity for support and propulsion during walking. *J. Phys. Ther. Sci.* 28, 794–801.
24 <https://doi.org/10.1589/jpts.28.794>
- 25 Torres-Oviedo, G., Macpherson, J.M., Ting, L.H., 2006. Muscle Synergy Organization Is Robust
26 Across a Variety of Postural Perturbations. *J. Neurophysiol.* 96, 1530–1546.
27 <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00810.2005>
- 28 Tricco, A.C., Lillie, E., Zarin, W., O'Brien, K.K., Colquhoun, H., Levac, D., Moher, D., Peters,
29 M.D.J., Horsley, T., Weeks, L., Hempel, S., Akl, E.A., Chang, C., McGowan, J., Stewart,
30 L., Hartling, L., Aldcroft, A., Wilson, M.G., Garritty, C., Lewin, S., Godfrey, C.M.,
31 Macdonald, M.T., Langlois, E.V., Soares-Weiser, K., Moriarty, J., Clifford, T., Tunçalp,
32 Ö., Straus, S.E., 2018. PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR):
33 Checklist and Explanation. *Ann. Intern. Med.* 169, 467–473.
34 <https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-0850>
- 35 Turpin, N.A., Uriac, S., Dalleau, G., 2021. How to improve the muscle synergy analysis
36 methodology? *Eur. J. Appl. Physiol.* 121, 1009–1025. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00421-021-04604-9>
- 38 Van Lummel, R.C., Walgaard, S., Pijnappels, M., Elders, P.J.M., Garcia-Aymerich, J., Van
39 Dieën, J.H., Beek, P.J., 2015. Physical Performance and Physical Activity in Older

1 Adults: Associated but Separate Domains of Physical Function in Old Age. PLOS ONE
2 10, e0144048. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0144048>

3 Yang, N., An, Q., Kogami, H., Yamakawa, H., Tamura, Y., Takahashi, K., Kinomoto, M.,
4 Yamasaki, H., Itkonen, M., Shibata-Alnajjar, F., Shimoda, S., Hattori, N., Fujii, T.,
5 Otomune, H., Miyai, I., Yamashita, A., Asama, H., 2019. Temporal Features of Muscle
6 Synergies in Sit-to-Stand Motion Reflect the Motor Impairment of Post-Stroke Patients.
7 IEEE Trans. Neural Syst. Rehabil. Eng. Publ. IEEE Eng. Med. Biol. Soc. 27, 2118–2127.
8 <https://doi.org/10.1109/TNSRE.2019.2939193>

9 Yang, N., An, Q., Yamakawa, H., Tamura, Y., Yamashita, A., Takahashi, K., Kinomoto, M.,
10 Yamasaki, H., Itkonen, M., Alnajjar, F.S., Shimoda, S., Asama, H., Hattori, N., Miyai, I.,
11 2017. Clarification of muscle synergy structure during standing-up motion of healthy
12 young, elderly and post-stroke patients. IEEE Int. Conf. Rehabil. Robot. Proc. 2017, 19–
13 24. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICORR.2017.8009215>

14 Yee, X.S., Ng, Y.S., Allen, J.C., Latib, A., Tay, E.L., Abu Bakar, H.M., Ho, C.Y.J., Koh,
15 W.C.C., Kwek, H.H.T., Tay, L., 2021. Performance on sit-to-stand tests in relation to
16 measures of functional fitness and sarcopenia diagnosis in community-dwelling older
17 adults. Eur. Rev. Aging Phys. Act. 18, 1. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s11556-020-00255-5>

18
19
20
21