

Effects of balance training with visual feedback during mechanically unperturbed standing on postural corrective responses

Dimitry G. Sayenko¹, Kei Masani¹, Albert H. Vette^{1,2}, Maria I. Alekhina³, Milos R. Popovic^{1,4}, and Kimitaka Nakazawa^{5,6}

¹ Rehabilitation Engineering Laboratory, Toronto Rehabilitation Institute, Canada

² Department of Kinesiology, University of Waterloo, Canada

³ Department of Exercise Sciences, Faculty of Physical Education and Health, Perceptual Motor Behaviour Laboratory, University of Toronto, Canada

⁴ Institute of Biomaterials and Biomedical Engineering, University of Toronto, Canada

⁵ Department of Rehabilitation for Movement Functions, Research Institute of National Rehabilitation Center for Persons with Disabilities, Japan

⁶ Department of Life Sciences, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, University of Tokyo, Japan

Corresponding author: Dimitry G. Sayenko

Rehabilitation Engineering Laboratory, Toronto Rehabilitation Institute, Lyndhurst Centre, 520 Sutherland Drive, Toronto, Ontario M4G 3V9, Canada

E-mail: dimitry.sayenko@utoronto.ca

Phone: +1-416-597-3422 ext. 6213

Fax: +1-416-425-9923

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Dr. Vladimir I. Dotsenko and Mr. Sergey S. Sliva for providing some of the utilized hardware. This study was supported by the grants and fellowship programs of the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science and the Canadian Paraplegic Association Ontario.

Abstract

Evidence of a non-specific effect of balance training on postural control mechanisms suggests that balance training during mechanically unperturbed standing may improve postural corrective responses following external perturbations. The purpose of the present study was to examine kinematics of the trunk as well as muscular activity of the lower leg and paraspinal muscles during postural responses to support-surface rotations after short-term balance training. Experiments were performed in control (n=10) and experimental (n=11) groups. The experimental group participated in the 3-day balance training program. During the training, participants stood on a force platform and were instructed to voluntarily shift their center of pressure in indicated directions as represented by a cursor on a monitor. Postural perturbation tests were executed before and after the training period: the slow and fast 10° dorsiflexions were induced at angular velocities of approximately 50° s⁻¹ and 200° s⁻¹, respectively. In the experimental group, the amplitude of the trunk displacements during slow and fast perturbations was up to 33.4 % and 26.7 % lower, respectively, following the training. The magnitude of the muscular activity was reduced in both the early and late components of the response. The kinematic parameters and muscular responses did not change in the control group. The results suggest that balance training during unperturbed standing has the potential to improve postural corrective responses to unexpected balance perturbation through (1) improved neuromuscular coordination of the involved muscles and (2) adaptive neural modifications on the spinal and cortical levels facilitated by voluntary activity.

Keywords: balance training; biofeedback; motor learning; plasticity; postural corrective responses.

1. Introduction

Recent advances in technology have resulted in the availability of visual feedback for the retraining of balance function in disabled and at-risk populations [1-5] through improvement of sensorimotor integration [6, 7]. Generally, those balance improvements were revealed in a *task-specific* manner [8, 9]. That is, balance training in mechanically unperturbed standing was shown to improve the stability of mechanically unperturbed posture [10, 11]. However, since the ability to recover balance after external perturbations may be crucial for fall prevention, it is not clear whether the unperturbed balance training would foster that ability. There is growing evidence of *non-specific* effects of balance training on postural control mechanisms [12-15]. These findings raise the question of whether balance training during unperturbed standing may improve the ability to recover balance after external perturbations.

Postural corrective responses to unexpected external perturbations [16-23] are of considerable importance in maintaining stability in the unpredictable circumstances of daily life [11, 24, 25]. Quantification of postural responses has practical implications for predicting falls [26, 27]. For instance, the magnitude of the kinematic and muscular responses, as well as the ability to scale the responses proportionally to the perturbation intensity, can be affected by specific neuromuscular impairments [23, 28] or training adaptation [29, 30]. It has been long believed that postural recovery

strategies are not associated with cortical control [18]. However, growing evidence exists that the cerebral cortex and high-level “cognitive” processing may be involved in controlling specific aspects of balance [11, 27, 31]. For example, it has been demonstrated that primarily supraspinal adaptations contribute to improved balance performance following balance training [29]. Although the earliest part of the postural response may not be due to cortical activity, studies suggest that the cerebral cortex may become involved in shaping the postural response as the response progresses [27]. Therefore, as cortical control seems to contribute to postural stabilization in general, the improvement obtained during balance training in unperturbed standing may affect the postural recovery ability against the perturbation.

Based on these considerations, we suggest that postural corrective responses can be improved after balance training during mechanically unperturbed standing. The purpose of the present study was to examine trunk kinematics as well as muscular activity of the lower leg and paraspinal muscles during postural responses to support-surface rotations of different velocities after short-term balance training. In particular, we hypothesized that a reduced magnitude of trunk deflection following the perturbations of different velocities, as well as the increased ability to scale responses, will reveal an improvement of stability, whereas changes in early and late components of the muscular response will indicate spinal and supraspinal adaptation due to the training.

2. Methods

2.1. Participants

Experiments were conducted in 21 male and female volunteers (mean \pm SD: age 26.5 ± 3.6 yrs, height 169.2 ± 10.9 cm, body mass 64.7 ± 8.8 kg). Of the 21 participants, 10 (7 males, 3 females; age 27.4 ± 4.0 yrs; height 169.4 ± 10.1 cm; body mass 65.6 ± 9.4 kg) were randomly assigned to the control group and the other 11 (7 males, 4 females; age 26.5 ± 3.6 yrs; height 169.1 ± 11.9 cm; body mass 64.7 ± 8.8 kg) to the experimental group. Each participant gave written informed consent to the experimental procedure, which was approved by the local ethics committee in accordance with the declaration of Helsinki on the use of human subjects in experiments.

2.2. Experimental setup and procedure

Postural responses to external perturbations have been tested on the first (first measurement) and on the fifth (second measurement) days of the study. Between these tests, the experimental group performed the balance training, whereas the control group was instructed to maintain a regular level of daily activity.

During the test, the participants stood in an upright position with their feet lightly strapped across the instep to the foot plates. Postural perturbations were evoked by rotating the foot plates in the dorsiflexion

direction by a custom-made servo-controlled torque motor. The axis of rotation of the ankle joint was aligned with the axis of rotation of the foot plate. The perturbations were applied at angular velocities of approximately $50^{\circ} \text{ s}^{-1}$ and $200^{\circ} \text{ s}^{-1}$, which resulted in joint rotations of 10° dorsiflexion. The time between two successive perturbations was randomized between eight and twelve seconds.

The participants were asked to maintain their normal standing posture, with straight knees and arms hanging comfortably at their sides. The position of their hip (at the level of the greater trochanter) was then reset to zero on an oscilloscope to establish a reference value for each participant's preferred stance position (see below). After each perturbation, the participants received feedback on their standing posture by visualizing this position on the oscilloscope placed at eye level, approximately 1.5 meters in front of the participant. The participants were instructed to keep the same position during the test.

2.3. Data collection

All biomechanical (kinematics and foot plate rotation) and electromyographic (EMG) recordings were initiated 200 ms prior to the onset of the perturbation and had a sampling duration of 5 s.

The anterior-posterior displacements of points corresponding to the location of the cervical vertebra 7 (C7) and the greater trochanter (HIP) were measured by two charge-coupled laser displacement sensors (LK-2500, Keyence, Japan). During the experimental trials, the laser beams were aimed at the plastic plates (corresponding to the C7 and HIP), and the distance between the plate and the laser sensor was measured. Surface EMG signals from the right soleus muscle (SOL), the medial head of the gastrocnemius muscle (GM), the tibialis anterior muscle (TA), and the lumbar paraspinal (erector spinae) muscles (ES) at the level of the iliac crest were recorded via bipolar surface Ag-AgCl electrodes with a diameter of 7 mm (Vitrode F, Nihon Kohden, Japan). The electrodes were applied at an inter-electrode distance of 20 mm after cleansing of the skin. For the reference electrode, a belt-type surface Ag-AgCl electrode with a width of 20 mm (45400, Shimizu Electronic Ind., Niigata, Japan) was wrapped around the right shin at the tibial tuberosity level. The EMG signals were amplified with a gain of 1k and band-pass filtered (15 Hz to 3 kHz) with a bioamplifier (AB-651J, Nihon Kohden, Tokyo, Japan). Both the biomechanical data and EMG were sampled at a rate of 5 kHz.

2.4. Balance training

The training in the experimental group was performed with the force plate analysis system “Stabilan-01” (Rhythm, Russia). During the training,

participants stood on the force plate and were instructed to look at the monitor that was placed at eye level approximately 1.5 meters in front of the force plate. The center of pressure (COP) position signal was utilized as a visual input to game-based exercises.

During the first day of the experiment, the participants of both groups were requested to attend a familiarization session after the first measurement. During this 10 to 15 minute session, a single trial of each game-based exercise was introduced to the participants. Then, the training was performed in the experimental group during three successive days. On the fifth day, the participants of both groups attended the final 7 to 10 minute session, and performed a single trial (“exam”) of each game-based exercise trying to reach the maximal score for the entire training program. After this exam, the second measurement was performed.

2.5. Training protocols

Details of the training intervention have been reported elsewhere [2, 12]. In brief, during the balance training, two types of supervised learning conditions were implemented in random order. For the first type, a given stereotyped pattern of movement had to be generated, requiring a high precision of movement performance. For the second type, the participants applied a general strategy of voluntary postural control that included

attention, decision-making, and performance of the task with different movement patterns. The duration of each exercise varied from 1 to 2 minutes. In order to motivate participants to improve their performance, a score representing different exercise parameters was displayed. The participants were instructed to maximize their score during each exercise. Once a consistent score in each exercise was attained by the participants, the difficulty level of the exercise was increased. During each 60 minute training session, usually five rounds of each exercise were presented to the participant.

2.6. Data processing

Participants were familiarized with the perturbation test for each perturbation velocity to reduce the effects of adaptation [19, 23]. For each angular velocity, twelve perturbations were used for the analysis. The peak-to-peak amplitude of the posterior displacement of the C7 and HIP points following the perturbation was normalized with respect to the mean HIP displacement during the first measurement. The EMG time series were full-wave rectified and ensemble averaged. Muscle activity was quantified by calculating the average EMG signal amplitude across each of the following six epochs prior to and following the onset of the foot plates rotation: -100 to 0 ms (background activity), 30-80 ms (short latency stretch response (SLSR)), 80-120 ms (medium latency stretch response (MLSR)), 120-220

ms (primary balance correcting response (PBSR)), 240-350 ms (secondary balance correcting response (SBSR)), and 350-700 ms (stabilizing phase (SP)). These time periods are consistent with previous works [19, 22]. The response amplitude was reported as a ratio with respect to the background level of activity preceding the perturbation (100 ms) [3].

The dependent variables were submitted to 2 (groups: control, experimental) by 2 (measurements: first, second) by 2 (perturbation velocities: slow, fast) mixed analysis of variance (ANOVA). In this factorial design group was used as a between-subject factor, whereas both perturbation velocity and measurement were within-subject factors. It should be noted that we chose to use this factorial arrangement for each dependent variable. EMG data were analyzed for each epoch independently. A simple t-test comparisons were made to decompose significant effects ($\alpha = 0.05$). The results for the pooled data are presented as mean values and standard errors of the mean (SEM).

3. Results

Figure 1 demonstrates the muscular responses with kinematics of the trunk following fast ($200^{\circ} \text{ s}^{-1}$) support-surface rotations during the first and second measurements in one participant from the control group (Fig. 1A) and one from the experimental group (Fig. 1B). There was no difference in the level of background muscle activity in the control and experimental groups during the first and second measurements. It can be seen that the rotation of the foot plates caused SLSR and MLSR in SOL and GM during the first 120 ms, followed by PBSR and SBSR (from 120 to 350 ms), and SP (during the last 350 ms) in TA and ES. The perturbation caused backward deflection of the trunk as shown in the C7 and HIP trajectories. In the control group, the kinematics and muscle activities did not change much (Fig. 1A). In the experimental group, the amplitudes of the C7 and HIP displacements and the magnitude of the muscle activity were reduced following the training (Fig. 1B).

Figure 2 demonstrates little changes in the trajectory of the C7 and HIP displacements in the control group between the first and second measurements (Fig. 2A). In the experimental group, the amplitudes of the C7 and HIP displacements were clearly decreased after the balance training (Fig. 2B).

The results for both C7 and HIP displacements revealed main effects for the velocity ($F_{2, 20} = 27.4, p < 0.001$; $F_{2, 20} = 35.8, p < 0.001$), and

training by group interaction ($F_{4, 20} = 7.3, p < 0.01$; $F_{4, 20} = 8.5, p < 0.01$).

The responses were larger during fast perturbations as compared to slow perturbations for both kinematic parameters ($p < 0.05$). For the interaction, there were no changes in the trajectory of both C7 and HIP displacements between the first and second measurements in the control group ($ps < 0.6$) (Fig. 3A), whereas those in the experimental group were clearly decreased after the balance training ($ps < 0.005$) (Fig. 3B).

The analysis of the muscular responses revealed significant effects for the perturbation velocity in the SOL and GM SLSR, TA PBSR and SBSR, and ES PBSR, SBSR, and SR ($ps < 0.01$). However, we failed to recognize the velocity by training interactions. The analysis revealed significant effects for training by group interaction in the SOL SLSR and MLSR ($F_{4, 20} = 13.4, p < 0.002$ and $F_{4, 20} = 13.4, p < 0.002$, respectively), as well as in the GM SLSR ($F_{4, 20} = 8.8, p < 0.009$). The two-way interactions are depicted on Fig. 4. In the TA, main effects for training by group interaction were revealed in the PBSR, SBSR, and SP ($F_{4, 20} = 8.7, p < 0.01$, $F_{4, 20} = 6.1, p < 0.03$, and $F_{4, 20} = 8.9, p < 0.009$, respectively). In the ES muscle, main effects for training by group interaction were revealed in the SLSR, PBSR and SBSR ($F_{4, 20} = 9.8, p < 0.007$, $F_{4, 20} = 10.5, p < 0.006$, and $F_{4, 20} = 4.6, p < 0.05$, respectively). For training by group interactions described above, only the experimental group showed significant reduction of muscular response amplitude following the training ($ps < 0.05$).

4. Discussion

In the present study, we demonstrated that the amplitude of the posterior deflection of the trunk following perturbations was significantly reduced after the training. The findings support our hypothesis that the postural corrective response to external perturbation can be improved following balance training during mechanically unperturbed standing. The results contradict the principle of task-specificity of training [8, 9], but agrees with recent results on the non-specific effects of balance training [12-15].

We suggested that the pattern of the muscular responses during perturbations of different velocity might be changed (optimized) after the training, indicating the increased ability to scale the responses proportionally to the perturbation intensity. However, we failed to reveal this effect. At the same time, we found that the muscular activity of the lower leg and paraspinal muscles decreased after training in the experimental group. In conjunction with the reduced amplitude of the posterior body deflection, these results concur with previous findings demonstrating that more efficient and effective postural strategies are associated with reduced muscle activation [23]. Changes revealed in early and late components of the muscle response can indicate spinal [29, 32, 33] and cortical [27, 29, 30] adaptations induced by balance training. In the context of spinal adaptation, it has been shown that, during challenging

balance tasks, coactivation of respective muscles is accompanied by acute inhibition in spinal reflex circuits without reduction in background muscle activity [29, 32, 33]. Additionally, it has been suggested that during acquisition of a novel visuo-motor skill, gating of additional sensory feedback may facilitate the direct cortical control of muscle activity [34]. The purpose of gating sensory input to spinal motoneurons (i.e. depression of the motoneuronal excitability) during skill acquisition may indicate that optimization of the task requires that visual and sensory feedback are closely integrated at a cortical level, and thus, reflects that descending systems maintain a tight control of spinal circuits [34, 35]. As for the cortical adaptation, it has been shown that changes in the late EMG components may reflect a simplification (automatization) of motor response [23, 29]. We therefore suggest that self-initiated motions during balance training in unperturbed standing could result in non-specific neural modifications on both the spinal and cortical levels that result in reduction of the muscle response magnitude against external perturbations. Other potential non-specific mechanisms can be attributed to changes in attention, balance confidence and/or reduced anxiety after the training. It is unclear, however, whether these effects can be developed after a 3-day training period in healthy individuals. It is also arguable whether the short-term intervention can result in long-term improvements attributable to learning or whether the current effects occurred due to acute adaptation. Self-report and

behavioral measures as well as a retention period followed by another post-test might help elucidate the contribution of central adaptation mechanisms in future studies.

5. Conclusion

Balance training during mechanically unperturbed standing resulted in a decreased amplitude of trunk deflection and reduced muscular activity during postural responses to external perturbation. These results suggest that a 3-day balance training in unperturbed standing can improve postural corrective responses to unexpected balance perturbation in healthy individuals. Possible mechanisms include improved neuromuscular coordination of the postural muscles and adaptive neural modifications on the spinal and cortical levels. Further research is required to determine whether the revealed effects will occur in individuals with impaired mobility, and whether respective outcomes support the merit of mechanically unperturbed balance training in reducing fall risk.

Conflict of interest statement

None of the authors have any financial and personal relationships with other people or organizations that could inappropriately influence the work. The study supporters did not have any involvement in the study design, in the

collection, analysis and interpretation of data, in the writing of the manuscript, and in the decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

References

1. Barclay-Goddard R, Stevenson T, Poluha W, Moffatt ME, Taback SP. Force platform feedback for standing balance training after stroke. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2004(4):CD004129
2. Ioffe ME, Ustinova KI, Chernikova LA, Kulikov MA. Supervised learning of postural tasks in patients with poststroke hemiparesis, Parkinson's disease or cerebellar ataxia. *Exp Brain Res* 2006;168(3):384-94
3. Woollacott M, Shumway-Cook A, Hutchinson S, Ciol M, Price R, Kartin D. Effect of balance training on muscle activity used in recovery of stability in children with cerebral palsy: a pilot study. *Dev Med Child Neurol* 2005;47(7):455-61
4. Sihvonen S, Sipila S, Taskinen S, Era P. Fall incidence in frail older women after individualized visual feedback-based balance training. *Gerontology* 2004;50(6):411-6
5. Sihvonen SE, Sipila S, Era PA. Changes in postural balance in frail elderly women during a 4-week visual feedback training: a randomized controlled trial. *Gerontology* 2004;50(2):87-95
6. Nichols DS. Balance retraining after stroke using force platform biofeedback. *Phys Ther* 1997;77(5):553-8
7. Oie KS, Kiemel T, Jeka JJ. Multisensory fusion: simultaneous re-weighting of vision and touch for the control of human posture. *Brain Res Cogn Brain Res* 2002;14(1):164-76
8. Richards CL, Malouin F, Bravo G, Dumas F, Wood-Dauphinee S. The role of technology in task-oriented training in persons with subacute stroke: a randomized controlled trial. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair* 2004;18(4):199-211
9. Kwakkel G. Impact of intensity of practice after stroke: issues for consideration. *Disabil Rehabil* 2006;28(13-14):823-30

10. Oddsson LIE, Boissy P, Melzer I. How to improve gait and balance function in elderly individuals - compliance with principles of training. *Eur Rev Aging Phys Act* 2007;4:15-23
11. Maki BE, McIlroy WE. Cognitive demands and cortical control of human balance-recovery reactions. *J Neural Transm* 2007;114(10):1279-96
12. Sayenko DG, Alekhina MI, Masani K, Vette AH, Obata H, Popovic MR, et al. Positive effect of balance training with visual feedback on standing balance abilities in people with incomplete spinal cord injury. *Spinal Cord* 2010
13. Yavuzer G, Eser F, Karakus D, Karaoglan B, Stam HJ. The effects of balance training on gait late after stroke: a randomized controlled trial. *Clin Rehabil* 2006;20(11):960-9
14. Wernig A, Nanassy A, Muller S. Maintenance of locomotor abilities following Laufband (treadmill) therapy in para- and tetraplegic persons: follow-up studies. *Spinal Cord* 1998;36(11):744-9
15. Harkema SJ. Neural plasticity after human spinal cord injury: application of locomotor training to the rehabilitation of walking. *Neuroscientist* 2001;7(5):455-68
16. Nashner LM. Adapting reflexes controlling the human posture. *Exp Brain Res* 1976;26(1):59-72
17. Diener HC, Bootz F, Dichgans J, Bruzek W. Variability of postural "reflexes" in humans. *Exp Brain Res* 1983;52(3):423-8
18. Dietz V. Human neuronal control of automatic functional movements: interaction between central programs and afferent input. *Physiol Rev* 1992;72(1):33-69
19. Carpenter MG, Allum JH, Honegger F. Directional sensitivity of stretch reflexes and balance corrections for normal subjects in the roll and pitch planes. *Exp Brain Res* 1999;129(1):93-113

20. Maki BE. Biomechanical approach to quantifying anticipatory postural adjustments in the elderly. *Med Biol Eng Comput* 1993;31(4):355-62
21. Maki BE, Holliday PJ, Topper AK. A prospective study of postural balance and risk of falling in an ambulatory and independent elderly population. *J Gerontol* 1994;49(2):M72-84
22. Gage WH, Frank JS, Prentice SD, Stevenson P. Organization of postural responses following a rotational support surface perturbation, after TKA: sagittal plane rotations. *Gait Posture* 2007;25(1):112-20
23. Horak FB, Henry SM, Shumway-Cook A. Postural perturbations: new insights for treatment of balance disorders. *Phys Ther* 1997;77(5):517-33
24. Masud T, Morris RO. Epidemiology of falls. *Age Ageing* 2001;30 Suppl 4:3-7
25. Maki BE, McIlroy WE, Fernie GR. Change-in-support reactions for balance recovery. *IEEE Eng Med Biol Mag* 2003;22(2):20-6
26. Horak FB. Postural orientation and equilibrium: what do we need to know about neural control of balance to prevent falls? *Age Ageing* 2006;35 Suppl 2:ii7-ii11
27. Jacobs JV, Horak FB. Cortical control of postural responses. *J Neural Transm* 2007;114(10):1339-48
28. Diener HC, Horak FB, Nashner LM. Influence of stimulus parameters on human postural responses. *J Neurophysiol* 1988;59(6):1888-905
29. Taube W, Gruber M, Beck S, Faist M, Gollhofer A, Schubert M. Cortical and spinal adaptations induced by balance training: correlation between stance stability and corticospinal activation. *Acta Physiol (Oxf)* 2007;189(4):347-58

30. Taube W, Schubert M, Gruber M, Beck S, Faist M, Gollhofer A. Direct corticospinal pathways contribute to neuromuscular control of perturbed stance. *J Appl Physiol* 2006;101(2):420-9
31. McIlroy WE, Norrie RG, Brooke JD, Bishop DC, Nelson AJ, Maki BE. Temporal properties of attention sharing consequent to disturbed balance. *Neuroreport* 1999;10(14):2895-9
32. Gruber M, Taube W, Gollhofer A, Beck S, Amtage F, Schubert M. Training-specific adaptations of H- and stretch reflexes in human soleus muscle. *J Mot Behav* 2007;39(1):68-78
33. Koceja DM, Trimble MH, Earles DR. Inhibition of the soleus H-reflex in standing man. *Brain Res* 1993;629(1):155-8
34. Perez MA, Lungholt BK, Nielsen JB. Presynaptic control of group Ia afferents in relation to acquisition of a visuo-motor skill in healthy humans. *J Physiol* 2005;568(Pt 1):343-54
35. Perez MA, Lundbye-Jensen J, Nielsen JB. Changes in corticospinal drive to spinal motoneurons following visuo-motor skill learning in humans. *J Physiol* 2006;573(Pt 3):843-55

Figure Captions

Fig. 1. Muscular responses and kinematic parameters (the average of 12 trials) following fast ($200^{\circ} \text{ s}^{-1}$) support-surface rotations during the first (gray lines) and second (black lines) measurements in one participant from the control (A) and one participant from the experimental group (B). SOL – soleus muscle; GM – gastrocnemius muscle; TA – tibialis anterior; ES – erector spinae; C7 – point corresponding to the level of cervical vertebra 7; HIP – point corresponding to the level of the greater trochanter; FP – foot plate. 1 – background muscle activity, 2 – short latency stretch response, 3 – medium latency stretch response, 4 – primary balance correcting response, 5 – secondary balance correcting response, and 6 – stabilizing phase.

Fig. 2. Sample population mean profiles of the C7 and HIP displacements in the control (A) and experimental (B) groups during the first (thick gray lines) and second (thick black lines) measurements of postural responses to external perturbations. The data are presented as percentages of the mean values of HIP displacement during the first measurement. Thin lines and shaded areas indicate standard errors of the mean (SEM).

Fig. 3. The pooled data of the peak amplitude of C7 and HIP displacements in the control (A) and experimental (B) groups during the first (gray columns) and second (black columns) measurements (mean \pm SEM). Asterisks indicate the differences between the values during the first and second measurements in the experimental group.

Fig. 4. The pooled data of the amplitude of the muscular responses following slow ($50^{\circ} \text{ s}^{-1}$) (A) and fast ($200^{\circ} \text{ s}^{-1}$) (B) postural perturbations for the control and experimental groups during the first and second measurements. The amplitude is presented as a ratio with respect to the background level of activity before the perturbation (mean \pm SEM). Crosses indicate statistically significant differences between the control and experimental groups during the second measurement. Asterisks indicate the differences between the values during the first and second measurements in the experimental group as identified with the post-hoc test.