Title: Reliability of Center of Pressure Measures in Chronic Stroke Survivors: Influence of Motor and Cognitive Dual-tasking

Running Title: COP Measures Reliability in Dual Tasks

Authors: Mitra Parsa[1], Iraj Abdollahi[1,*], Hossein Negahban[2,3], Mohammad Ali Sanjari[4], Enayatollah Bakhshi[5], Haniyeh Fakur Haddadiyan[6]

1. *Neuromusculoskeletal Rehabilitation Research Center, University of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation Sciences, Tehran, Iran.*
2. *Department of Physiotherapy, School of Paramedical and Rehabilitation Sciences, Mashhad University of Medical Sciences, Mashhad, Iran.*
3. *Orthopedic Research Center, Mashhad University of Medical Sciences, Mashhad, Iran.*
4. *Department of Basic Rehabilitation Sciences, Iran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran.*
5. *Department of Biostatistics, University of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation Sciences, Tehran, Iran.*
6. *Department of Physiotherapy, Faculty of Rehabilitation, Mashhad University of Medical Sciences, Mashhad, Iran.*

***Corresponding Author**: Iraj Abdollahi, Neuromusculoskeletal Rehabilitation Research Center, University of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation Sciences, Tehran, Iran. Email: ir.abdollahi@uswr.ac.ir

To appear in: **Basic and Clinical Neuroscience**

Received date: 2024/09/20

Revised date: 2024/10/02

Accepted date: 2024/11/30

Please cite this article as:
Parsa, M., Abdollahi, I., Negahban, H., Sanjari, M.A., Bakhshi, E., Fakur Haddadiyan, H. (In Press). Reliability of Center of Pressure Measures in Chronic Stroke Survivors: Influence of Motor and Cognitive Dual-tasking. Basic and Clinical Neuroscience. Just Accepted publication Jul. 10, 2025.
Doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.32598/bcn.2025.6958.1
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.32598/bcn.2025.6958.1

Highlights:

Investigating the reliability of CoP measures during dual-task conditions in chronic post-stroke survivors showed that:

- Within-day ICCs were higher than between-day values in chronic stroke survivors.
- Mean velocity and AP direction velocity variables were the most reliable measures.
- Dual-tasking improved CoP measures reliabilities, except for the sway area.
- Semi-tandem standing reached acceptable reliability in dual-tasking.
- These findings can provide clinicians with valuable insights into detecting specific balance problems.

Plain Language Summary

This study explored how well balance measurements work in people recovering from strokes, especially when they're performing two tasks at the same time. Balance is a big issue for stroke survivors, as about half experience long-lasting physical difficulties, making them more prone to falls. In rehabilitation, reliable measures of balance are essential to track improvement and guide treatment. This study focused on assessing the reliability of "center of pressure" (CoP) measurements—essentially how people distribute their weight when standing—as a tool to evaluate balance.

Sixteen stroke survivors participated in balance tests, which involved standing still in various positions. Some tests were done while performing a single task, like standing still with eyes open, while others involved dual-tasking, such as holding an object or performing a cognitive task like the Stroop test. The CoP data was collected over two sessions, spaced 48 hours apart, to test the reliability of these measurements both within a single day and across different days.

The researchers found that dual-tasking generally improved the reliability of CoP measures, particularly in challenging standing positions like semi-tandem (one foot slightly in front of the other). However, the area covered by the body's sway was less reliable during these tasks. The most reliable measure was how quickly the center of pressure moved totally, and in the front-to-back (anterior-posterior) direction.

These findings matter because improving balance assessments can lead to better, more effective rehabilitation for stroke survivors. By identifying the most reliable ways to measure balance, therapists can better track recovery, tailor treatments to individual needs, and ultimately help reduce the risk of falls—an essential concern for people regaining independence after a stroke.

Abstract

Background: Reliable balance measures are crucial for effective stroke rehabilitation.

Purpose: This study examines the between-day and within-day reliabilities of the center of pressure (CoP) measures in chronic stroke survivors in different standing positions under the influence of motor and cognitive dual-tasking.

Methods: Sixteen people (49.31±15.5 years, five females) with chronic stroke were assessed in two sessions, 48 hours apart. Participants completed three balance control conditions: single-task, motor dual-task, and cognitive dual-task, while they performed three trials of open-eye quiet standing and semi-tandem standing. Three trials of closed-eye quiet standing were conducted in the single-task condition. A two-way random model of the Intraclass correlation coefficient ($ICC_{2,3}$), standard error of measurement (SEM), and minimal detectable change (MDC) were calculated for CoP mean velocity, anterior-posterior (AP) and medial-lateral (ML) mean velocity, the standard deviation of AP and ML velocity, and sway area.

Results: Within-day ICC values were higher than between-day values (ICC: 0.78- 0.96). Mean velocity and mean and SD of velocity in the AP direction showed the highest relative and absolute reliabilities in an open-eyes quiet standing position (ICC: 0.82- 0.92, SEM: 0.67- 1.24). Dual-tasking could increase the reliability of the CoP measures, except for the sway area (ICC: 0.53-0.93 changed to 0.84-0.96). MDCs ranged from 1.03 to 7.77 mm/s for velocity-based variables.

Conclusions: Assessing the postural control system during dual-task conditions provides more reliable CoP measures, especially in a semi-tandem standing position. These findings can provide clinicians valuable insights into detecting specific balance problems post-stroke individuals encounter.

Keywords: Reliability, Balance, CoP measures, Dual-task, Stroke

Introduction

Approximately 50% of stroke survivors experience residual physical disabilities (Corriveau, Hébert, Raîche, & Prince, 2004; Sawacha et al., 2013), leading to deficits in sensory, musculoskeletal, perceptual, and cognitive systems, affecting balance control and finally increasing the risk of falls (Corriveau et al., 2004; Jagroop, Aryan, Schinkel-Ivy, & Mansfield, 2023; Sawacha et al., 2013). Therefore, the primary goal of stroke rehabilitation is to enhance balance control, requiring reliable balance measures to guide rehabilitation and monitor progress over time (Jette, Halbert, Iverson, Miceli, & Shah, 2009; Mansfield & Inness, 2015). Clinical balance scales fail to reveal underlying dyscontrol, which could potentially increase the risk of falling as the compensatory strategies used to complete tasks remain unknown (Mansfield & Inness, 2015).

The solution could be to record center of pressure (CoP) excursion using a force platform in a laboratory setting (Jette et al., 2009; Sackley, 1991; Sawacha et al., 2013). CoP parameters can differentiate between fallers and non-fallers (Melzer, Benjuya, & Kaplanski, 2004; Melzer, Kurz, & Oddsson, 2010; Pajala et al., 2008) and are associated with clinical outcome measures in elderly and post-stroke individuals (Sawacha et al., 2013), but intrinsic variability of CoP measures influences their reliability in postural control assessments. Additionally, reliability is not a static characteristic and varies based on the population (Gasq et al., 2014; Lafond, Corriveau, Hébert, & Prince, 2004).

To date, several studies have demonstrated acceptable CoP measures reliability in assessing balance in populations with disequilibrium problems (Mohammadi-Rad et al., 2022; Ruhe, Fejer, & Walker, 2010; Salavati et al., 2009; Terra, Da Silva, Bueno, Ferraz, & Smaili, 2020), healthy elders (Lin, Seol, Nussbaum, & Madigan, 2008; Moghadam et al., 2011; Salehi, Ebrahimi, Esteki, Maroufi, & Parnianpour, 2010), and young adults (Fullin et al., 2022; Lo et al., 2022). Few studies have reported it throughout various stages of post-stroke recovery (Bower, McGinley, Miller, & Clark, 2014; Gasq et al., 2014; Gray, Ivanova, & Garland, 2014; Martello et al., 2017). It is worth noting that only one study has specifically examined the reliability of CoP-based variables among chronic stroke survivors, in which a limited number of conventional variables were selected as a part of the main objective (Jagroop et al., 2023). However, during the chronic stage of stroke recovery, rehabilitative interventions have a significant net effect on the patient's improvement, as spontaneous brain recovery has almost plateaued. (Bernhardt et al., 2017). Accordingly, assessing the reliability of CoP measures in the chronic stage of stroke recovery could provide deeper insights into clinical decision-making and upcoming research.

Individuals have limited cognitive capacity based on the attentional capacity theory (Kahya et al., 2019), so they cannot perform two simultaneous tasks efficiently, known as the dual-task effect (Arpaia et al., 2024). Research has indicated that older adults and individuals with age-related neurodegenerative conditions experience higher costs of dual-tasking (Kahya et al., 2019). This leads to an elevated risk of falls and loss of independence (Arpaia et al., 2024; Kahya et al., 2019), particularly in post-stroke individuals compared to healthy adults (Tisserand, Armand, Allali, Schnider, & Baillieul, 2018). It is notable that dual-tasking also leads to spatiotemporal locomotor adaptations, which may help post-stroke individuals maintain their balance during dual-task conditions (Ghai, Ghai, & Effenberg, 2017; Tisserand et al., 2018). Consequently, monitoring the balance control system during dual-tasking could be beneficial for a more accurate impairment diagnosis and tracking of rehabilitation outcomes. So far, a study has examined the reliability of CoP measures during different postural stability tasks in post-stroke patients, regardless of the influence of dual-tasking on CoP measures reliability (Gray et al., 2014). Therefore, in this study, we investigated the reliability of CoP measures under various dual-task conditions.

Moreover, the reliability of CoP measures in tandem standing in post-stroke individuals has not been studied, although this narrow support-based position is commonly used to identify underlying deficiencies in the postural control system (Melzer et al., 2010), and predict the risk of falling (Pajala et al., 2008; Stel, Smit, Pluijm, & Lips, 2003). Furthermore, tandem standing is a practical position to assess the ability for uneven weight distribution in individuals with leg-related motor disorders, as more weight is placed on the rear leg (Jonsson, Seiger, & Hirschfeld, 2005). We selected semi-tandem standing for this study to ensure participant's successful performance.

Thus, the present study aimed to examine the within-day and between-day reliabilities of CoP measures in different standing positions with the influence of motor and cognitive dual-tasking in chronic stroke survivors.

Materials and Methods

Participants

The Ethics Committee of the University of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation Sciences approved this study (No: IR.USWR.REC.1398,136). All subjects signed an informed consent form before participating in the survey. Participants were sixteen people with chronic stroke (>6 months post-stroke) participated in an unpublished clinical trial (No: IRCT20220703055350N1). Common inclusion criteria were: 1) ability to stand and walk independently for one minute, 2) ability to hold semi-tandem standing independently for 30 seconds, and 3) no recent limb surgery or uncorrected visual or auditory impairments. Participants with 1) a score higher than two on the Modified Ashworth Scale in calf muscle (F. Li, Wu, & Li, 2014), 2) a score lower than 24 on the Mini-Mental State Examination-Persian version (Ansari, Naghdi, Hasson, Valizadeh, & Jalaie, 2010), 3) a standard deviation (SD) of ±1 or greater on the Line Bisection Test (hemineglect history)

(Plummer, Morris, & Dunai, 2003), 4) conditions that may affect their balance control except stroke were excluded. Age, height, weight, sex, and type of stroke were obtained from participants. They were also assessed by the Berg Balance Scale (BBS) (Salavati et al., 2012), the Mini-Balance Evaluation System Test (Mini-BEST) (Molhemi, Monjezi, Mehravar, Shaterzadeh-Yazdi, & Majdinasab, 2024), and Activities-Specific Balance Confidence (ABC) (Hassan, Zarrinkoob, Jafarzadeh, & Akbarzadeh, 2015) (Table 1). BBS is a valid and reliable 14-item balance assessment tool for stroke patients. Each item is graded on a 5-point scale, and the total score ranges from 0 to 56. The inter-rater reliability (Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC): 0.98) and the intra-rater (ICC: 0.97) were very high in post-stroke survivors. (Berg, Wood-Dauphinee, & Williams, 1995). Mini-BEST consists of 14 items that assess dynamic balance and have excellent intra-rater reliability (ICC: 0.97), and interrater reliability (ICC: 0.96) for stroke patients. Each item is graded on a 3-point scale with a score of 0 to 28. (Tsang, Liao, Chung, & Pang, 2013). ABC Scale measures the psychological impact of balance impairment and falls. It is a valid and reliable scale (Internal consistency: 0.94 and test-retest reliability ICC: 0.85), rating confidence in performing activities from 0% to 100%. The percentage for each of the 16 items is averaged (Botner, Miller, & Eng, 2005).

Procedure

CoP data were obtained using two adjacent strain gauge Kistler force platforms (model No: 9286BA, Switzerland). Assessments were carried out by the same rater in the exact location and time during two sessions, 48 hours apart, with three trials per session (Gray et al., 2014; Jagroop et al., 2023). The lighting and sound levels of the environment were controlled. Postural sway was measured in three conditions: single-task, motor dual-task, and cognitive dual-task. In the single-task condition, participants maintained an open-eye quiet standing (open-quiet), an open-eye semi-tandem standing (open-tandem), and a closed-eye quiet standing (closed-quiet). In motor and cognitive dual-task conditions, they held quiet and semi-tandem standing (motor-quiet, motor-tandem, and cognitive-quiet, cognitive-tandem, respectively). During quiet standing, they were instructed to stand comfortably barefoot, as still and quiet as possible, on two adjacent force plates with their feet shoulder-width apart, arms at their sides, and gaze at the wall 2 meters in front. Both feet were placed on the same plate, with a foot-width distance between them and the affected leg in front, during semi-tandem standing (Jonsson et al., 2005). The position of the feet remained the same throughout all assessment sessions. For motor dual-tasking, participants hold a tray containing a glass of water (Negahban, Ebrahimzadeh, & Mehravar, 2017). For cognitive dual-tasking, they conducted the congruent Stroop test, which has been previously validated and proven reliable in its Persian version (Sadri Damirchi, Akbari, Mojarad, & Behbuei, 2019). A board with forty-five words was placed two meters away from participants for the Stroop task. Words were names of four colors written in the same color ink, and were arranged in nine rows of five words. All positions were held for approximately 30 seconds. (Negahban et al., 2017), with a 30-second break between trials. A physiotherapist supervised participants during assessments for safety.

Data Processing

Force platform data were sampled at 100 Hz with a low-pass filter at 10 Hz. A MATLAB routine computed CoP measures for combining both plates (net-CoP). The mean and SD of net-CoP velocity along anterior-posterior (AP) (Vap and SD.Vap) and medial-lateral (ML) directions (Vml and SD.Vml), mean velocity (Vmean), and sway area (Area) were chosen as their relevance in hemiplegic stroke patients was demonstrated (Gasq et al., 2014), and previously recommended

(Palmieri, Ingersoll, Stone, & Krause, 2002). CoP velocity reflects the efficiency of the postural control system in counteracting postural sway via neuromuscular activity. SD of velocity is the variability index of CoP velocity (Paillard & Noé, 2015). The lower the velocity and SD, the better the balance control. The sway area quantifies 95% of the ellipse formed by CoP excursion, representing the overall performance of the postural control system. Smaller sway area indicates better balance control performance (Paillard & Noé, 2015).

Statistical Analysis

Data analysis was conducted using SPSS version 21. A two-way random model of the intraclass correlation coefficient ($ICC_{2,3}$) with a corresponding 95% confidence interval (CI) was used to estimate relative reliability. Three assessment trials in a single session were used to examine within-day reliability. The average of three trials in two separate sessions was implemented for between-day reliability. Munro's classification for reliability coefficients used to represent the degree of reliability: 0.00–0.25 – little, if any correlation; 0.26–0.49 – low correlation; 0.50–0.69 – moderate correlation; 0.70–0.89 – high correlation and 0.90–1.00 – very high correlation (Domholdt, 2005). Absolute reliability was determined using the standard error of measurement (SEM). SEM ($SD \times \sqrt{1 - ICC}$) indicates how much a change in measurement score is due to random error (Atkinson & Nevill, 1998). The minimal detectable change (MDC $=1.96\times\sqrt{2}\times SEM$) was also calculated, representing a clinically significant change between two measurement scores not due to random error (Atkinson & Nevill, 1998). The statistical significance level was $\alpha=0.05$.

Results

Demographic characteristics of participants are presented in Table 1.

***Table 1**: Demographic and clinical characteristics of the participants (n:16)*

Variable	*Mean / count*	*SD*	*Minimum*	*Maximum*
Age (years)	49.31	15.50	27	76
Height (cm)	166.33	11.93	147	187
Weight (kg)	69.27	13.06	52	86
Sex	Male:11 Female:5			
Stroke type	Ischemic:8 Hemorragic:5 Unknown:3			
Hemiparetic side	Right:6 Left:10			
BBS (score out of 56)	51.81	4.51	42	56
Mini-BEST (score out of 28)	20.43	5.42	12	27
ABC (score out of 100)	70.96	19.28	23.43	70.96

SD: standard deviation, BBS: Berg Balance Scale, Mini-BEST: Mini-Balance Evaluation System Test, ABC: Activities- Specific Balance Confidence.

Table 2 represents the mean and SD for COP measures under different test conditions.

__Table 2__: Test-Retest means and SDs of the CoP measures in all conditions

CoP measure	**Single-task**			**Motor dual-task**			**Cognitive dual-task**		
	Test position	Test mean (SD)	Retest mean (SD)	Test position	Test mean (SD)	Retest mean (SD)	Test position	Test mean (SD)	Retest mean (SD)
Vml	Open-Quiet	9.78 (2.62)	9.42 (1.56)	Motor-Quiet	9.95 (3.31)	9.51 (2.25)	Cognitive-Quiet	10.47 (2.21)	10.23 (1.67)
(mm/s)	Closed-Quiet	10.69 (2.77)	10.81 (2.47)	Motor-Tandem	14.87 (4.24)	14.00 (4.40)	Cognitive-Tandem	16.12 (4.30)	16.36 (3.53)
	Open-Tandem	15.05 (4.50)	15.14 (3.03)						
SD.Vml	Open-Quiet	12.41 (3.51)	11.92 (2.00)	Motor-Quiet	12.65 (4.60)	12.10 (3.06)	Cognitive-Quiet	13.33 (2.92)	12.94 (2.12)
(mm/s)	Closed-Quiet	13.60 (3.48)	13.80 (3.24)	Motor-Tandem	18.82 (5.38)	18.43 (5.83)	Cognitive-Tandem	21.23 (5.41)	21.29 (4.73)
	Open-Tandem	19.61 (5.92)	19.20 (3.86)						
Vap	Open-Quiet	12.23 (2.33)	12.60 (2.11)	Motor-Quiet	12.55 (3.36)	12.48 (3.22)	Cognitive-Quiet	13.58 (2.25)	14.02 (2.09)
(mm/s)	Closed-Quiet	16.47 (4.16)	17.39 (4.54)	Motor-Tandem	14.53 (4.37)	13.97 (4.49)	Cognitive-Tandem	16.45 (4.88)	17.11 (5.80)
	Open-Tandem	14.81 (3.77)	14.98 (3.23)						
SD.Vap	Open-Quiet	15.65 (3.09)	16.09 (2.75)	Motor-Quiet	16.03 (4.65)	15.92 (4.26)	Cognitive-Quiet	17.34 (3.08)	18.08 (2.69)
(mm/s)	Closed-Quiet	21.43 (5.52)	22.68 (6.01)	Motor-Tandem	18.84 (5.93)	17.99 (5.80)	Cognitive-Tandem	21.58 (5.71)	22.29 (7.88)
	Open-Tandem	19.30 (5.00)	19.00 (4.68)						
Vmean	Open-Quiet	17.34 (3.66)	17.38 (2.61)	Motor-Quiet	17.74 (5.12)	17.36 (4.15)	Cognitive-Quiet	19.00 (3.26)	19.16 (2.44)
(mm/s)	Closed-Quiet	21.56 (5.20)	22.43 (5.28)	Motor-Tandem	22.86 (6.54)	21.71 (6.58)	Cognitive-Tandem	25.75 (6.33)	26.07 (6.82)
	Open-Tandem	23.26 (6.12)	22.91 (4.71)						
Area	Open-Quiet	550.63 (700.24)	415.83 (433.50)	Motor-Quiet	623.04 (811.53)	512.60 (502.157)	Cognitive-Quiet	526.71 (404.46)	436.19 (181.27)
(mm^2)	Closed-Quiet	640.82 (746.46)	757.01 (840.56)	Motor-Tandem	879.94 (708.19)	765.38 (471.91)	Cognitive-Tandem	769.63 (537.86)	805.33 (549.10)
	Open-Tandem	897.88 (838.02)	807.28 (499.67)						

SD: standard deviation, CoP: center of pressure, V: velocity, ml: medial-lateral, ap: anterior-posterior, Open-Quiet: open-eyes quiet standing, Closed-Quiet: closed-eyes quiet standing, Open-Tandem: open-eyes semi-tandem standing, Motor-Quiet: Motor dual-task Quiet standing, Motor-Tandem: Motor dual-task semi-Tandem standing, Cognitive-Quiet: Cognitive dual-task quiet standing, Cognitive-Tandem: Cognitive dual-task semi-Tandem standing, Vmean: mean velocity, Area: sway area

Within-day Reliability

Table 3 presents within-day reliabilities. Generally, within-day ICCs were higher than between-day ICCs.

***Table 3**: Within-day Intraclass correlation coefficients, SEM, and MDC of the CoP measures in all conditions.*

CoP measure		***Single-task***				***Motor dual-task***				***Cognitive dual-task***		
	Test position	ICC (95% CI)	SEM	MDC	Test position	ICC (95% CI)	SEM	MDC	Test position	ICC (95% CI)	SEM	MDC
Vml	Open-Quiet	**0.93** (0.85-0.98)	0.41	1.14	Motor-Quiet	**0.89** (0.76-0.96)	0.75	2.07	Cognitive-Quiet	**0.95** (0.88-0.98)	0.37	1.03
(mm/s)	Closed-Quiet	**0.91** (0.79-0.97)	0.74	2.05	Motor-Tandem	**0.93** (0.84-0.97)	1.16	3.22	Cognitive-Tandem	**0.85** (0.66-0.94)	1.37	3.79
	Open-Tandem	**0.78** (0.50-0.92)	1.42	3.94								
SD.Vml	Open-Quiet	**0.93** (0.85-0.97)	0.53	1.47	Motor-Quiet	**0.86** (0.68-0.95)	1.14	3.17	Cognitive-Quiet	**0.94** (0.86-0.98)	0.52	1.44
(mm/s)	Closed-Quiet	**0.91** (0.79-0.96)	0.97	2.69	Motor-Tandem	**0.94** (0.84-0.98)	1.43	3.96	Cognitive-Tandem	**0.84** (0.64-0.94)	1.89	5.24
	Open-Tandem	**0.79** (0.52-0.92)	1.77	4.90								
Vap	Open-Quiet	**0.90** (0.77-0.96)	0.67	1.84	Motor-Quiet	**0.96** (0.90-0.98)	0.64	1.78	Cognitive-Quiet	**0.90** (0.77-0.96)	0.66	1.83
(mm/s)	Closed-Quiet	**0.90** (0.77-0.96)	1.43	3.98	Motor-Tandem	**0.94** (0.86-0.98)	1.10	3.05	Cognitive-Tandem	**0.98** (0.95-0.99)	0.82	2.27
	Open-Tandem	**0.83** (0.62-0.94)	1.33	3.69								
SD.Vap	Open-Quiet	**0.90** (0.76-0.96)	0.87	2.41	Motor-Quiet	**0.95** (0.88-0.98)	0.95	2.64	Cognitive-Quiet	**0.90** (0.75-0.96)	0.89	2.48
(mm/s)	Closed-Quiet	**0.88** (0.72-0.95)	2.08	5.77	Motor-Tandem	**0.95** (0.88-0.98)	1.30	3.59	Cognitive-Tandem	**0.96** (0.91-0.99)	1.58	4.37
	Open-Tandem	**0.86** (0.68-0.95)	1.75	4.85								
Vmean	Open-Quiet	**0.92** (0.82-0.97)	0.74	2.04	Motor-Quiet	**0.94** (0.86-0.98)	1.02	2.82	Cognitive-Quiet	**0.93** (0.84-0.97)	0.64	1.79
(mm/s)	Closed-Quiet	**0.90** (0.78-0.96)	1.67	4.63	Motor-Tandem	**0.95** (0.88-0.98)	1.47	4.08	Cognitive-Tandem	**0.95** (0.89-0.98)	1.52	4.22
	Open-Tandem	**0.85** (0.65-094)	1.82	5.05								
Area	Open-Quiet	**0.95** (0.89-0.98)	96.93	268.60	Motor-Quiet	**0.90** (0.77-0.96)	158.80	440.03	Cognitive-Quiet	0.60 (0.12-0.84)	114.64	317.68
(mm^2)	Closed-Quiet	**0.93** (0.84-0.97)	222.39	616.25	Motor-Tandem	**0.82** (0.59-0.93)	200.21	554.79	Cognitive-Tandem	**0.86** (0.68-0.95)	205.45	569.31
	Open-Tandem	**0.84** (0.63-0.94)	199.88	553.87								

SEM: standard error of measurement, MDC: minimal detectable change, CoP: center of pressure, ICC: Intraclass correlation coefficients, CI: confidence interval, V: velocity, ml: medial-lateral, ap: anterior-posterior, Open-Quiet: open-eyes quiet standing, Closed-Quiet: closed-eyes quiet standing, Open-Tandem: open-eyes semi-tandem standing, Motor-Quiet: Motor dual-task Quiet standing, Motor-Tandem: Motor dual-task semi-Tandem standing, Cognitive- Quiet: Cognitive dual-task quiet standing, Cognitive-Tandem: Cognitive dual-task semi-Tandem standing, Vmean: mean velocity, Area: sway area. Values with ICC greater than 0.70 were highlighted in bold.

- *Single-task Condition*

ICCs ranged from 0.78 to 0.95, with high to very high reliability for all CoP measures. Lower relative and absolute reliabilities were seen in open-tandem than in open-quiet and closed-quiet positions. Reliabilities of the CoP measures were lower in the closed-quiet than in the open-quiet position, especially in terms of SEMs (0.74-222.39 versus 0.41-96.93, respectively). Sagittal plane measurements (Vap & SD. Vap) had higher reliabilities than the frontal plane (Vml & SD.Vml) in semi-tandem standing (Table 3).

- *Motor Dual-task Condition*

ICCs ranged from 0.82 to 0.95. All CoP measures had high to very high reliability. Performing a secondary motor task improved the reliabilities of CoP measures in a motor-tandem position (ICC: 0.86-0.95 and SEM: 1.16-1.47) compared to the open-tandem position (ICC: 0.78-0.86 and SEM: 1.42-1.82), except for Area (Table 3).

- *Cognitive Dual-task Conditions*

ICCs ranged from 0.60 to 0.96. All CoP measures had high to very high reliability, except for the sway area in the cognitive-quiet position. Cognitive dual-tasking improved reliabilities of CoP measures in a cognitive-tandem position (ICC: 0.84-0.98 and SEM: 0.82-1.89) compared to the open-tandem position (ICC: 0.78-0.86 and SEM: 1.33-1.82), except for Area (Table 3).

MDCs ranged from 1.03 mm/s for Vml (cognitive-quiet) to 5.77 mm/s for SD. Vap (closed-quiet), and from 268.60 mm^2 (open-quiet) to 616.25 mm^2 (closed-quiet) for Area (Table 3).

Please insert Table 3 near here.

Between-day Reliability

Table 4 presents between-day reliabilities.

- *Single-task Condition*

ICCs ranged from 0.53 to 0.96, with moderate to very high reliability for all CoP measures. The open-tandem position showed lower relative and absolute reliabilities than open-quiet and closed-quiet positions (Table 4). The absolute reliability of CoP measures in a closed-quiet position was almost lower than in an open-quiet position (SEM: 0.99- 156.01 versus 0.91- 159.17, respectively). Sagittal plane variables had higher reliabilities than the frontal plane variables in open-quiet and open-tandem positions.

- *Motor Dual-task Condition*

ICCs ranged from 0.83 to 0.94, with high to very high reliability for all CoP measures. Reliabilities were higher in the motor-quiet position than in the motor-tandem position (ICC: 0.90-0.93 and SEM: 0.74-210.61 versus ICC: 0.87-0.92 and SEM: 1.43-245.32, respectively). Again, performing a secondary motor task improved the relative and absolute reliabilities of CoP measures compared to the single-task condition except for Area (Table 4).

- *Cognitive Dual-task Condition*

ICCs ranged from 0.66 to 0.96, with high to very high reliability for all CoP measures, except for the Area in the cognitive-quiet position. Cognitive dual-tasking improved the relative and absolute reliabilities of CoP measures compared to the single-task condition except for Area (Table 4).

MDCs ranged from 1.37 mm/s for Vml (cognitive-quiet) to 7.77 mm/s for SD. Vml (open-tandem) and from 409.06 mm^2 (cognitive-tandem) to 635.06 mm^2(motor-tandem) for Area (Table 4).

***Table 4**: Between-day Intraclass correlation coefficients, SEM, and MDC of the CoP measures in all conditions.*

CoP measure		***Single-task***				***Motor dual-task***				***Cognitive dual-task***		
	Test position	ICC (95% CI)	SEM	MDC	Test position	ICC (95% CI)	SEM	MDC	Test position	ICC (95% CI)	SEM	MDC
Vml	Open-Quiet	**0.78** (0.38-0.92)	0.91	2.53	Motor-Quiet	**0.93** (0.81-0.98)	0.72	2.01	Cognitive-Quiet	**0.93** (0.78-0.98)	0.49	1.37
(mm/s)	Closed-Quiet	**0.82** (0.49-0.94)	0.99	2.75	Motor-Tandem	**0.89** (0.69-0.96)	1.36	3.78	Cognitive-Tandem	**0.89** (0.69-0.96)	1.24	3.43
	Open-Tandem	0.65 (-0.51-0.88)	1.94	5.38								
SD.Vml	Open-Quiet	**0.77** (0.34-0.92)	1.23	3.41	Motor-Quiet	**0.93** (0.82-0.98)	1.00	2.78	Cognitive-Quiet	**0.90** (0.72-0.96)	0.77	2.13
(mm/s)	Closed-Quiet	**0.83** (0.51-0.94)	1.28	3.54	Motor-Tandem	**0.92** (0.78-0.97)	1.53	4.23	Cognitive-Tandem	**0.93** (0.79-0.97)	1.30	3.59
	Open-Tandem	0.53 (-0.42-0.84)	2.80	7.77								
Vap	Open-Quiet	**0.83** (0.53-0.94)	0.84	2.34	Motor-Quiet	**0.93** (0.80-0.98)	0.84	2.33	Cognitive-Quiet	**0.90** (0.72-0.97)	0.65	1.80
(mm/s)	Closed-Quiet	**0.90** (0.77-0.96)	1.91	5.31	Motor-Tandem	**0.87** (0.63-0.95)	1.50	4.16	Cognitive-Tandem	**0.89** (0.68-0.96)	1.68	4.67
	Open-Tandem	**0.83** (0.62-0.94)	1.33	3.70								
SD.Vap	Open-Quiet	**0.84** (0.54-0.94)	1.08	3.00	Motor-Quiet	**0.92** (0.78-0.97)	1.21	3.36	Cognitive-Quiet	**0.86** (0.61-0.95)	1.02	2.82
(mm/s)	Closed-Quiet	**0.78** (0.37-0.92)	2.45	6.78	Motor-Tandem	**0.87** (0.63-0.95)	1.98	5.49	Cognitive-Tandem	**0.96** (0.91-0.99)	2.25	6.23
	Open-Tandem	**0.81** (0.45-0.93)	1.93	5.35								
Vmean	Open-Quiet	**0.82** (0.48-0.94)	1.24	3.43	Motor-Quiet	**0.94** (0.82-0.98)	1.11	3.07	Cognitive-Quiet	**0.88** (0.67-0.96)	0.98	2.72
(mm/s)	Closed-Quiet	**0.78** (0.38-0.92)	2.22	6.16	Motor-Tandem	**0.88** (0.68-0.96)	2.15	5.97	Cognitive-Tandem	**0.91** (0.75-0.97)	1.89	5.24
	Open-Tandem	**0.66** (0.00-0.88)	2.74	7.59								
Area	Open-Quiet	**0.92** (0.76-0.97)	159.17	441.07	Motor-Quiet	**0.90** (0.71-0.96)	203.22	563.11	Cognitive-Quiet	0.66 (0.05-0.88)	157.94	437.66
(mm^2)	Closed-Quiet	**0.96** (0.88-0.98)	156.01	432.30	Motor-Tandem	**0.83** (0.52-0.94)	229.18	635.06	Cognitive-Tandem	**0.92** (0.77-0.97)	147.62	409.06
	Open-Tandem	**0.89** (0.69-0.96)	217.04	601.42								

SEM: standard error of measurement, MDC: minimal detectable change, CoP: center of pressure, ICC: Intraclass correlation coefficients, CI: confidence interval, V: velocity, ml: medial-lateral, ap: anterior-posterior, Open-Quiet: open-eyes quiet standing, Closed-Quiet: closed-eyes quiet standing, Open-Tandem: open-eyes semi-tandem standing, Motor-Quiet: Motor dual-task Quiet standing, Motor-Tandem: Motor dual-task semi-Tandem standing, Cognitive- Quiet: Cognitive dual-task quiet standing, Cognitive-Tandem: Cognitive dual-task semi-Tandem standing, Vmean: mean velocity, Area: sway area. Values with ICC greater than 0.70 were highlighted in bold.

Discussion

This study aimed to determine the within-day and between-day reliability of COP measures in different standing positions while imposing a motor or cognitive dual-tasking on the postural control system. Nearly high to very high reliabilities were found for CoP measures. The mean velocity and mean and SD of velocity in the AP direction showed the highest relative and absolute reliabilities.

Results on mean velocity in the quiet standing mirror prior results on healthy elders (Kwon, Eom, & Kim, 2022; Moghadam et al., 2011; Ruhe et al., 2010), elderly fallers (Swanenburg, de Bruin, Favero, Uebelhart, & Mulder, 2008), and post-stroke individuals (Gasq et al., 2014; Gray et al., 2014). Mean velocity is more reliable than displacement or sway area, as it is not solely dependent on the CoP position (Gray et al., 2014; Ruhe et al., 2010), and commonly preferred since it can minimize the extreme effects of peak values (Jagroop et al., 2023). Our findings, especially in dual-task conditions, also confirmed its high reliability.

Additionally, the mean and SD of velocity in the AP direction were more reliable than the ML direction in semi-tandem standing. Frontal plane variables are likely less reliable due to stroke survivors' varying ability to control balance in the ML direction. It is possible that asymmetry in weight bearing, along with difficulty in shifting weight to the affected limb (Gray et al., 2014), resulted in inconsistent measures of CoP in the ML direction across sessions This inconsistency led to reduced reliability in the variables related to the frontal plane, which is noticeable in the semi-tandem standing position. However, there have been no studies on the reliability of tandem standing in post-stroke individuals. Swanenburg et al (2008) reported that when stance width increases, a disproportionate decrease occurs in the angular motion of ankles and feet (Swanenburg et al., 2008). In semi-tandem standing, the base of support increases in the anterior-posterior direction, affecting force level variability similar to a broader stance in a side-by-side position.(Jonsson et al., 2005). This, in turn, may improve the reliability of sagittal plane variables. Further research could reveal the exact rationale for this finding.

Compared to quiet standing positions, CoP measures in the semi-tandem standing had lower relative and absolute reliability during single-tasking; however, implementing a dual-task assessment enhanced reliability except for the sway area (Tables 3 and 4). It is believed that dual-tasking can improve performance by directing attention toward an external source of attention. This leads to automatic motor function, allowing for more effective performance by shifting motor control from higher cognitive to basic noncognitive centers (Ghai et al., 2017). Automating postural control may decrease performance variability and increase the reliability of the measurements. However, further investigations are needed to prove this opinion. Terra et al (2020) found that reliability decreased in the cognitive dual-task compared to single-task condition when evaluating patients with Parkinson's disease (Terra et al., 2020). Disagreement is possibly due to significant methodological differences. They studied patients with Parkinson’s disease, aged 71±7.8 years, and used simple mathematical operations as a secondary task and participants stood with their back foot's big toe 5 centimeters behind the front foot's heel. (Terra et al., 2020). However, based on our study, assessing balance under dual-task conditions provides more reliable CoP measures for diagnosing balance impairments and tracking therapeutic outcomes in chronic post-stroke individuals.

Closing eyes had no significant effect on CoP parameters’ reliability in our study, which aligns with the findings of other studies on post-stroke patients (Gasq et al., 2014) and elders (Z. Li, Liang, Wang, Sheng, & Ma, 2016; Lo et al., 2022; Moghadam et al., 2011; Salehi et al., 2010).

However, future studies may reveal the exact effect of closing eyes on the reliability of CoP measures when assessing balance in stroke survivors.

Previous research has reported lower reliability for the CoP sway area in stroke patients (Aryan, Inness, Patterson, Mochizuki, & Mansfield, 2023; Gasq et al., 2014; Gray et al., 2014), which contradicts our findings. The lack of research on the sway area of CoP in chronic post-stroke individuals makes it challenging to identify the discrepancy root. However, the broad age range of our participants (27 to 76 years) can obscure the test-retest inconsistency; as pointed out by Ruhe et al. (2010) (Ruhe et al., 2010), differences in trial duration and foot position may have contributed to inconsistent results. As we found, some studies have shown that sway area is a reliable CoP measure in older adults (18-20, 35, 36) and adults with Parkinson's disease (Terra et al., 2020). This could be attributed to some similarities between participants of previous studies and recent populations.

Within-day Reliability

Higher within-day ICCs were found than between-day ICCs, consistent with studies on young and old individuals (Benvenuti et al., 1999; Lin et al., 2008; Ruhe et al., 2010). Gray and colleagues (2014) concluded that averaging ten internal perturbation trials in post-stroke patients improved between-day reliability compared to within-day reliability of CoP measures (Gray et al., 2014). However, this population has achieved high within-day reliability in fewer trials (Gray et al., 2014; Jagroop et al., 2023). Fatigue may cause decreased reliability in pathologically affected or elderly individuals during extra trials.(Gray et al., 2014; Ruhe et al., 2010)

According to the results, measurements in quiet standing showed high absolute reliability in all three conditions. Jagroop et al. (2023) found lower absolute reliability than our findings in quiet standing in chronic stroke individuals. However, they measured the RMS of CoP velocity. SEM was 4.9 mm for the RMS of Vml and 3.7 mm for the RMS of Vap (Jagroop et al., 2023). Their participants were older (mean age: 64±9.5 years), and they conducted two assessment trials despite identifying that three trials would result in an ICC higher than 0.9 (Jagroop et al., 2023).

In quiet standing, MDCs were lower than in previous results (Aryan et al., 2023). Aryan et al. (2023) investigated the within-session reliability of CoP measures in subacute post-stroke individuals. They reported higher SEMs, and consequently higher MDCs, for Vap and Vml in quiet standing than we found (SEM: 2.83, MDC: 7.84 versus SEM:0.67, MDC:1.84 for Vap, and SEM: 1.59, MDC:4.41 versus SEM:0.41, MDC:1,14 for Vml) (Aryan et al., 2023). It was suggested that balance measures may be less stable among people in early stroke recovery stages (Jagroop et al., 2023), resulting in higher MDCs in their study.

Between-day Reliability

Most measures of CoP had high to very high between-day reliability (Table 4). Correspondingly, dual-tasking could increase the reliability of measurements in quiet standing except for the CoP sway area. Gray et al. (2014) found similar results for the load drop task during quiet standing (ICC: 0.78-0.89) than primary quiet standing (ICC: 0.52-0.98) (Gray et al., 2014). Swanenburg et al. (2008) examined the reliability of CoP measures in fallers and non-fallers under single and dual-task conditions. They reported no significant differences in reliability between test conditions (Swanenburg et al., 2008). However, the mean velocity ICC increased from 0.70 to 0.94 in the fallers performing a secondary cognitive task. Interestingly, they also revealed a decrease in sway area reliability in fallers due to cognitive dual-tasking (ICC 0.69 changed to 0.57), like a study on healthy elders (Moghadam et al., 2011) and our findings. Further investigation is necessary to determine the cause of reduced sway area reliability during dual-task assessment.

It is important to note that the study results may not apply to people other than those with hemiplegic stroke or at different stages of recovery. Additionally, our sample size was limited, which could influence the generalizability of the results, as it may not encompass heterogeneous postural control mechanisms among chronic stroke survivors.

In summary, CoP measures in various positions and conditions are reliable enough to assess balance in chronic stroke survivors. Measuring CoP excursion during dual-task conditions is a more reliable method while evaluating the postural control system, especially in semi-tandem standing. Improving balance assessments by using more reliable measures during dual-tasking can help us understand balance impairments and lead to better rehabilitation interventions.

Acknowledgment

The authors would like to thank Mr. Mohammad Parsa and Dr. Payam Sasan Nezhad for contributing to patient selection and the staff of the Rehabilitation section of the Ghaem Hospital. The experiment was conducted in the Biomechanics Laboratory, Rehabilitation Research Center, Ghaem Hospital, Mashhad University of Medical Sciences.

Conflict of Interests

None of the authors have any financial or other interests related to the manuscript to declare.

Funding

This study did not receive funding from any public, commercial, or non-profit organization.

Authors' contributions

Conceptualization, Mitra Parsa, Mohammad Ali Sanjari, Hossein Negahban, and Iraj Abdollahi; Methodology, MP, MAS, HN, and IA; Software, MAS; Formal Analysis, Enayatollah Bakhshi; Investigation, MP and MAS; Resources, MP; Data Curation, Haniyeh Fakur Hadadian, MP and MAS; Writing – Original Draft, MP; Writing – Review & Editing, MP, MAS, and HN; Resources, MP; Supervision, MAS, HN, IA, and EB.

References:

Ansari, N. N., Naghdi, S., Hasson, S., Valizadeh, L., & Jalaie, S. (2010). Validation of a Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE) for the Persian population: a pilot study. *Appl Neuropsychol, 17*(3), 190-195. doi:10.1080/09084282.2010.499773

Arpaia, Pasquale, Cuocolo, Renato, Fullin, Allegra, Gargiulo, Ludovica, Mancino, Francesca, Moccaldi, Nicola, . . . De Blasiis, Paolo. (2024). Executive Functions Assessment Based on Wireless EEG and 3D Gait Analysis During Dual-Task: A Feasibility Study. *IEEE Journal of Translational Engineering in Health and Medicine*.

Aryan, Raabeae, Inness, Elizabeth, Patterson, Kara K, Mochizuki, George, & Mansfield, Avril. (2023). Reliability of force plate-based measures of standing balance in the sub-acute stage of post-stroke recovery. *Heliyon, 9*(10).

Atkinson, G., & Nevill, A. M. (1998). Statistical methods for assessing measurement error (reliability) in variables relevant to sports medicine. *Sports Med, 26*(4), 217-238. doi:10.2165/00007256-199826040-00002

Benvenuti, F., Mecacci, R., Gineprari, I., Bandinelli, S., Benvenuti, E., Ferrucci, L., . . . Stanhope, S. J. (1999). Kinematic characteristics of standing disequilibrium: reliability and validity of a posturographic protocol. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil, 80*(3), 278-287. doi:10.1016/s0003-9993(99)90138-7

Berg, K., Wood-Dauphinee, S., & Williams, J. I. (1995). The Balance Scale: reliability assessment with elderly residents and patients with an acute stroke. *Scand J Rehabil Med, 27*(1), 27-36.

Bernhardt, Julie, Hayward, Kathryn S, Kwakkel, Gert, Ward, Nick S, Wolf, Steven L, Borschmann, Karen, . . . Corbett, Dale. (2017). Agreed definitions and a shared vision for new standards in stroke recovery research: the stroke recovery and rehabilitation roundtable taskforce. *International Journal of Stroke, 12*(5), 444-450.

Botner, E. M., Miller, W. C., & Eng, J. J. (2005). Measurement properties of the Activities-specific Balance Confidence Scale among individuals with stroke. *Disabil Rehabil, 27*(4), 156-163. doi:10.1080/09638280400008982

Bower, Kelly J, McGinley, Jennifer L, Miller, Kimberly J, & Clark, Ross A. (2014). Instrumented static and dynamic balance assessment after stroke using Wii Balance Boards: Reliability and association with clinical tests. *PLoS one, 9*(12), e115282.

Corriveau, Hélene, Hébert, Réjean, Raîche, Michel, & Prince, François. (2004). Evaluation of postural stability in the elderly with stroke. *Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation, 85*(7), 1095-1101.

Domholdt, Elizabeth. (2005). Rehabilitation research: principles and applications. *(No Title)*.

Fullin, Allegra, Caravaggi, Paolo, Picerno, Pietro, Mosca, Massimiliano, Caravelli, Silvio, De Luca, Antonio, . . . De Blasiis, Paolo. (2022). Variability of postural stability and plantar pressure parameters in healthy subjects evaluated by a novel pressure plate. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 19*(5), 2913.

Gasq, David, Labrunée, Marc, Amarantini, David, Dupui, Philippe, Montoya, Richard, & Marque, Philippe. (2014). Between-day reliability of centre of pressure measures for balance assessment in hemiplegic stroke patients. *Journal of neuroengineering and rehabilitation, 11*(1), 1-10.

Ghai, Shashank, Ghai, Ishan, & Effenberg, Alfred O. (2017). Effects of dual tasks and dual-task training on postural stability: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clinical interventions in aging*, 557-577.

Gray, Vicki L, Ivanova, Tanya D, & Garland, S Jayne. (2014). Reliability of center of pressure measures within and between sessions in individuals post-stroke and healthy controls. *Gait & posture, 40*(1), 198-203.

Hassan, Hoory, Zarrinkoob, Homa, Jafarzadeh, Sadegh, & Akbarzadeh, Baghban Alireza. (2015). Psychometric evaluation of persian version of activities-specific balance confidence scale for elderly Persians.

Jagroop, David, Aryan, Raabeae, Schinkel-Ivy, Alison, & Mansfield, Avril. (2023). Reliability of unconventional centre of pressure measures of quiet standing balance in people with chronic stroke. *Gait & posture, 102*, 159-163.

Jette, Diane U, Halbert, James, Iverson, Courtney, Miceli, Erin, & Shah, Palak. (2009). Use of standardized outcome measures in physical therapist practice: perceptions and applications. *Physical therapy, 89*(2), 125-135.

Jonsson, Erika, Seiger, Åke, & Hirschfeld, Helga. (2005). Postural steadiness and weight distribution during tandem stance in healthy young and elderly adults. *Clinical Biomechanics, 20*(2), 202-208.

Kahya, Melike, Moon, Sanghee, Ranchet, Maud, Vukas, Rachel R, Lyons, Kelly E, Pahwa, Rajesh, . . . Devos, Hannes. (2019). Brain activity during dual task gait and balance in aging and age-related neurodegenerative conditions: a systematic review. *Experimental gerontology, 128*, 110756.

Kwon, Yu-Ri, Eom, Gwang-Moon, & Kim, Ji-Won. (2022). TEST–RETEST reliability of postural sway measures during static standing balance performance in healthy elderly adults. *Journal of Mechanics in Medicine and Biology, 22*(08), 2240034.

Lafond, D., Corriveau, H., Hébert, R., & Prince, F. (2004). Intrasession reliability of center of pressure measures of postural steadiness in healthy elderly people. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil, 85*(6), 896-901. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2003.08.089

Li, F, Wu, Y, & Li, X. (2014). Test-retest reliability and inter-rater reliability of the Modified Tardieu Scale and the Modified Ashworth Scale in hemiplegic patients with stroke. *Eur J Phys Rehabil Med, 50*(1), 9-15.

Li, Zhen, Liang, Yan-Yi, Wang, Lei, Sheng, Jing, & Ma, Shao-Jun. (2016). Reliability and validity of center of pressure measures for balance assessment in older adults. *Journal of physical therapy science, 28*(4), 1364-1367.

Lin, Dingding, Seol, Hyang, Nussbaum, Maury A, & Madigan, Michael L. (2008). Reliability of COP-based postural sway measures and age-related differences. *Gait & posture, 28*(2), 337-342.

Lo, Pei-Yi, Su, Bo-Lin, You, Yu-Lin, Yen, Chen-Wen, Wang, Shih-Ting, & Guo, Lan-Yuen. (2022). Measuring the Reliability of Postural Sway Measurements for a Static Standing Task: The Effect of Age. *Frontiers in Physiology, 13*, 850707.

Mansfield, Avril, & Inness, Elizabeth L. (2015). Force plate assessment of quiet standing balance control: perspectives on clinical application within stroke rehabilitation. *Rehabilitation Process and Outcome, 4*, RPO. S20363.

Martello, Suzane Ketlyn, Boumer, Tatiane Caroline, Almeida, Juliana Carla de, Correa, Katren Pedroso, Devetak, Gisele Francine, Faucz, Rodrigo, & Manffra, Elisangela Ferretti. (2017). Reliability and minimal detectable change of between-limb synchronization, weight-bearing symmetry, and amplitude of postural sway in individuals with stroke. *Research on Biomedical Engineering, 33*, 113-120.

Melzer, Itshak, Benjuya, Nissim, & Kaplanski, Jacob. (2004). Postural stability in the elderly: a comparison between fallers and non-fallers. *Age and ageing, 33*(6), 602-607.

Melzer, Itshak, Kurz, Ilan, & Oddsson, Lars IE. (2010). A retrospective analysis of balance control parameters in elderly fallers and non-fallers. *Clinical Biomechanics, 25*(10), 984-988.

Moghadam, Mojgan, Ashayeri, Hassan, Salavati, Mahyar, Sarafzadeh, Javad, Taghipoor, Keyvan Davatgaran, Saeedi, Ahmad, & Salehi, Reza. (2011). Reliability of center of pressure measures of postural stability in healthy older adults: effects of postural task difficulty and cognitive load. *Gait & posture, 33*(4), 651-655.

Mohammadi-Rad, Shahrzad, Bandpei, Mohammad Ali Mohseni, Salavati, Mahyar, Talebian, Saeed, Keyhani, Sohrab, & Shanbehzadeh, Sanaz. (2022). Reliability of Center of Pressure measures of Postural Stability in Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstructed Athletes: Effect of Vibration and Cognitive Load. *Archives of Bone and Joint Surgery, 10*(2), 171.

Molhemi, Farshad, Monjezi, Saeideh, Mehravar, Mohammad, Shaterzadeh-Yazdi, Mohammad-Jafar, & Majdinasab, Nastaran. (2024). Validity, reliability, and responsiveness of Persian version of mini-balance evaluation system test among ambulatory people with multiple sclerosis. *Physiotherapy Theory and Practice, 40*(3), 565-575.

Negahban, H., Ebrahimzadeh, M., & Mehravar, M. (2017). The effects of cognitive versus motor demands on postural performance and weight bearing asymmetry in patients with stroke. *Neurosci Lett, 659*, 75-79. doi:10.1016/j.neulet.2017.08.070

Paillard, Thierry, & Noé, Frédéric. (2015). Techniques and methods for testing the postural function in healthy and pathological subjects. *BioMed research international, 2015*.

Pajala, Satu, Era, Pertti, Koskenvuo, Markku, Kaprio, Jaakko, Törmäkangas, Timo, & Rantanen, Taina. (2008). Force platform balance measures as predictors of indoor and outdoor falls in community-dwelling women aged 63–76 years. *The Journals of Gerontology Series A: Biological Sciences and Medical Sciences, 63*(2), 171-178.

Palmieri, Riann M, Ingersoll, Christopher D, Stone, Marcus B, & Krause, B Andrew. (2002). Center-of-pressure parameters used in the assessment of postural control. *Journal of sport rehabilitation, 11*(1), 51-66.

Plummer, Prudence, Morris, Meg E, & Dunai, Judith. (2003). Assessment of unilateral neglect. *Physical therapy, 83*(8), 732-740.

Ruhe, Alexander, Fejer, René, & Walker, Bruce. (2010). The test–retest reliability of centre of pressure measures in bipedal static task conditions–a systematic review of the literature. *Gait & posture, 32*(4), 436-445.

Sackley, Catherine M. (1991). Falls, sway, and symmetry of weight-bearing after stroke. *International disability studies, 13*(1), 1-4.

Sadri Damirchi, Esmaeil, Akbari, Taghi, Mojarad, Arezoo, & Behbuei, Sanaz. (2019). The role of stroop performance in predicting sleep quality and quality of life in the elderly. *Iranian Journal of Ageing, 13*(5), 564-575.

Salavati, Mahyar, Hadian, Mohammad Reza, Mazaheri, Masood, Negahban, Hossein, Ebrahimi, Ismaeil, Talebian, Saeed, . . . Parnianpour, Mohamad. (2009). Test–retest reliabty of center of pressure measures of postural stability during quiet standing in a group with musculoskeletal disorders consisting of low back pain, anterior cruciate ligament injury and functional ankle instability. *Gait & posture, 29*(3), 460-464.

Salavati, Mahyar, Negahban, Hossein, Mazaheri, Masood, Soleimanifar, Manijeh, Hadadi, Mohammad, Sefiddashti, Leyla, . . . Feizi, Awat. (2012). The Persian version of the berg balance scale: Inter and intra-rater reliability and construct validity in elderly adults. *Disability and rehabilitation, 34*(20), 1695-1698.

Salehi, Reza, Ebrahimi, Takamjani Ismaeil, Esteki, Ali, Maroufi, Nader, & Parnianpour, Mohammad. (2010). Test-retest reliability and minimal detectable change for center of pressure measures of postural stability in elderly subjects.

Sawacha, Zimi, Carraro, Elena, Contessa, Paola, Guiotto, Annamaria, Masiero, Stefano, & Cobelli, Claudio. (2013). Relationship between clinical and instrumental balance assessments in chronic post-stroke hemiparesis subjects. *Journal of neuroengineering and rehabilitation, 10*(1), 1-7.

Stel, Vianda S, Smit, Jan H, Pluijm, Saskia MF, & Lips, Paul. (2003). Balance and mobility performance as treatable risk factors for recurrent falling in older persons. *Journal of clinical epidemiology, 56*(7), 659-668.

Swanenburg, Jaap, de Bruin, Eling D, Favero, Kathrin, Uebelhart, Daniel, & Mulder, Theo. (2008). The reliability of postural balance measures in single and dual tasking in elderly fallers and non-fallers. *BMC musculoskeletal disorders, 9*, 1-10.

Terra, Marcelle Brandão, Da Silva, Rubens A, Bueno, Maria EB, Ferraz, Henrique Ballalai, & Smaili, Suhaila M. (2020). Center of pressure-based balance evaluation in individuals with Parkinson's disease: a reliability study. *Physiotherapy Theory and Practice, 36*(7), 826-833.

Tisserand, R., Armand, S., Allali, G., Schnider, A., & Baillieul, S. (2018). Cognitive-motor dual-task interference modulates mediolateral dynamic stability during gait in post-stroke individuals. *Hum Mov Sci, 58*, 175-184. doi:10.1016/j.humov.2018.01.012

Tsang, C. S., Liao, L. R., Chung, R. C., & Pang, M. Y. (2013). Psychometric properties of the Mini-Balance Evaluation Systems Test (Mini-BESTest) in community-dwelling individuals with chronic stroke. *Phys Ther, 93*(8), 1102-1115. doi:10.2522/ptj.20120454