

18 **ABSTRACT**

19 Postural instability is a common observation after concussions, with balance assessments
20 playing a crucial role in clinical evaluations. Widely used post-concussion balance tests focus
21 primarily on static and dynamic balance, excluding the critical aspect of reactive balance. This
22 study investigated the acute and longitudinal effects of concussion on reactive balance in
23 collegiate athletes. The assessments were conducted at pre-season baseline and 4 post-
24 concussion timepoints: acute, pre-return-to-play, post-return-to-play, and six months post-
25 concussion. The instrumented-modified Push and Release test measured reactive balance.
26 Longitudinal effects of concussions on time to stability and step latency metrics were investigated
27 applying Generalized Estimating Equations. Acutely after concussion, athletes demonstrated
28 impaired reactive balance, indicated by longer times to stability, in dual-task conditions ($p= 0.004$).
29 These acute impairments were transient and recovered over time. Exploratory analyses revealed
30 that athletes who sustained their first lifetime concussion exhibited both acute ($p = 0.037$) and
31 longitudinal ($p = 0.004$ at post-return-to-play) impairments in single- and dual-task compared to
32 controls with no lifetime concussion. This comprehensive evaluation provides insights into the
33 multifaceted nature of post-concussion impairments and emphasizes the importance of
34 considering cognitive demand and history of concussions in assessing athletes' balance.

35

36 **KEY TERMS:**

37 Concussion, Reactive balance, Wearable sensors, Inertial sensors

38

39 **INTRODUCTION**

40 Postural instability is frequently observed after concussion¹, highlighting the pivotal role of
41 balance tests in clinical evaluations for this condition. Nevertheless, widely employed post-
42 concussion balance assessments, such as the Balance Error Scoring System (BESS) and timed
43 tandem gait (TTG), provide a limited perspective on balance². A comprehensive understanding of
44 balance includes several factors that influence individuals' ability to stand, move, react, and
45 engage with their surroundings^{3,4}. These factors manifest within three primary domains of balance
46 activities: static balance, dynamic balance, and reactive balance⁵. In concussion evaluations, the
47 BESS test specifically targets static balance, defined as the ability to maintain equilibrium and
48 control the center of mass in relation to a fixed base of support⁶. The TTG test assesses dynamic
49 balance, described as the capacity to maintain equilibrium during motion or voluntary transitional
50 movements⁷. Notably, the evaluation of reactive balance, which encompassing movements and
51 postural responses to unpredictable disturbances for the restoration of equilibrium and stability⁸,
52 is absent from post-concussion assessment. Given the importance of reactive balance for
53 adapting to complex environments⁹ and its association with prospective musculoskeletal injuries
54 in elite athletes¹⁰, there is a pressing need for further understanding the immediate and long-term
55 impacts of concussions on reactive balance.

56 Reactive balance relies on interactions among spinal circuits, the brainstem, and the
57 cerebral cortex¹¹ to coordinate responses to sudden unexpected alterations in the base of support
58 or center of mass kinematics. In contrast to static and dynamic balance tasks, reactive balance is
59 initiated faster than voluntary movement and leaves little time for iterative corrections^{5,12}. Instead,
60 responses can be primed based on experiential learning in advance of the perturbation, and
61 triggered (i.e., executed) promptly upon a loss of balance. While this priming involves cognitive
62 resources¹², measures of reactive balance are independent from computerized cognitive tests,
63 clinical measures of reaction time, and measures of static and dynamic balance commonly used

64 in concussion evaluations¹³. Consequently, evaluating reactive balance introduces a distinct
65 dimension that remains independent of these conventional clinical metrics.

66 The limited prior work on reactive balance post-concussion has predominantly employed
67 standing platform perturbations to investigate the cross-sectional and chronic effects of
68 concussion (i.e., mild traumatic brain injury) on reactive balance performance⁵. Pan et al.¹⁴
69 provided preliminary evidence that individuals experiencing persistent symptoms after concussion
70 exhibit impaired reactive balance in response to a sliding platform perturbation. However, these
71 deficits were evident only among those with ongoing symptoms of disequilibrium at various
72 chronicity, spanning from seven months to seven years; asymptomatic individuals with a history
73 of concussion did not display reactive balance impairments. This heterogeneous time since
74 concussion complicates our understanding of reactive balance post-concussion, including the
75 acute and time-varying recovery of reactive balance.

76 Therefore, the purpose of this study was to assess the acute and longitudinal effects of
77 concussion on reactive balance. Following a pre-registered protocol¹⁵, reactive balance of
78 collegiate athletes with a recent concussion and matched controls was assessed at four clinically
79 relevant timepoints: acutely after injury (<72 hours), when asymptomatic and cleared to begin the
80 return-to-play (RTP) protocol (Pre-RTP), after completing the RTP protocol and cleared to return
81 to full sport participation (Post-RTP), and six months after injury (6-Month). Additionally, a subset
82 of athletes was tested upon arrival on campus before the season and any concussion event
83 (Baseline), allowing for pre-to-post injury comparisons. The assessments were administered
84 alongside the protocols of the Pac-12 CARE Affiliated Program¹⁶. The RTP protocol followed the
85 guidelines set by the University of Utah Concussion Management Plan and the Sport Concussion
86 Assessment Tool – 5 (SCAT5)¹⁷, a six-step process to monitor athlete’s concussion symptoms,
87 cognitive and balance impairment.

88 We hypothesized that (H1a) athletes with acute concussion will take longer to regain
89 balance during reactive balance tasks and (H1b) will display larger deficits in reactive balance
90 during dual-tasks compared to healthy controls; (H2) athletes with a recent concussion will
91 improve reactive balance throughout the assessments, but will still demonstrate persistent
92 longitudinal deficits compared to the controls.

93

94 **MATERIALS and METHODS**

95 Participants

96 The study involved NCAA Division I student-athletes currently enrolled at the University of
97 Utah, across the sanctioned sports, aged between 18 and 30. Exclusion criteria disqualified
98 individuals that had a concussion within the past year prior to their enrollment, lower extremity
99 surgeries within the previous two years, or planned surgeries that would affect their ability to
100 participate in their sport. Additionally, individuals with a documented history of vestibular or
101 somatosensory pathology were excluded. The testing procedures took place at the Athletic
102 Training Clinics of the University of Utah in Salt Lake City, Utah. Prior to participation, all
103 participants underwent written informed consent in accordance with a protocol approved by the
104 Institutional Review Board.

105 All concussion subjects were diagnosed by a team physician and reported to the study team
106 by the team's athletic trainer(s). The team's athletic trainer recommended control subjects among
107 the concussion subject's teammates, matched by sex, age, playing position, and skill level (in
108 order of decreasing priority). Demographic data (age, sex, race, ethnicity, height, weight, and
109 body mass index (BMI)), athletic activities (e.g., sport), lower extremity injury history, and self-
110 reported lifetime concussion history were collected for each participant before completing any
111 mobility and balance assessment.

112 Participants completed testing at five timepoints: at the start of intercollegiate competition
113 at the University of Utah, typically as a freshmen or upon arriving on campus as a transfer
114 (Baseline); within 72 hours after a concussion (Acute); within 72 hours of beginning the RTP
115 protocol (Asymptomatic/Pre-RTP); within 72 hours of being cleared for unrestricted return to
116 competition (Post-RTP); and 6 months after the initial injury (6-Month). Notably, not every
117 participant was present at each of the scheduled assessment timepoints due to scheduling
118 conflicts and referral delays.

119 Our enrollment goal was 40 participants per group at each timepoint¹⁵. The sample size
120 was calculated from differences between symptomatic concussed subjects and healthy controls
121 in response to a tethered pull perturbation¹⁴. Using an estimated difference of 1.7 standard
122 deviations (Cohen $d = 1.7$) between concussed subjects and healthy controls, we estimated 99%
123 power to detect group differences at acute assessment with 40 subjects per group. Using an
124 estimated effect size of Cohen $d = 0.72$ between asymptomatic (Pre-RTP timepoint) athletes and
125 healthy controls, we estimated 74% power to detect group differences at the primary Post-RTP
126 timepoint with 40 subjects per group. We also expected 88% power to detect group differences
127 in the change between acute and subsequent assessments (Post-RTP, 6-Month) with 40 subjects
128 per group¹⁵.

129 Instrumented Balance Assessments and Measured Outcomes

130 All procedures were part of a more extensive protocol investigating reactive balance in
131 collegiate athletes¹⁵. All testing was conducted in an athletic training room setting. Athletes
132 performed the balance task in shoes; if athletes did not wear shoes to testing (e.g., they wore
133 sandals), testing was completed in socks or barefoot.

134 Participants wore five inertial measurement units (IMUs; Opals v2; APDM Inc., Portland,
135 OR) throughout the balance assessments. Sensors, sampling at 128Hz, were located on top of
136 the metatarsals of the athlete's left and right feet, on the anterior shank, the lumbar region of the

137 spine (~L3/L4), and the mid-point of the sternum. The tests were also video recorded with an iPad
138 for reference during data processing.

139 Reactive balance and compensatory stepping behavior were assessed with the
140 *instrumented-modified Push and Release (I-mP&R)*¹⁸⁻²⁰. This clinically viable test is commonly
141 performed as part of the BESTest and mini-BEST for balance assessment in clinical
142 populations²¹. Participants performed four directions (forward, backward, left, and right) in both a
143 single-task condition and a dual-task condition, for a total of eight trials^{15,18}. Each participant was
144 randomized to complete the single- or dual-task condition first, and the direction order was kept
145 for all timepoints. During the forward and backward directions, a footplate was placed in between
146 participants' feet to standardize their foot placement, while during the left and right directions, the
147 participants' feet were together. During the I-mP&R, the administrator wore an IMU on their right
148 hand to determine the release instant when processing the data¹⁵. Participants were instructed to
149 lean into the administrator's hands placed on the participant's shoulders. The administrator leaned
150 participants until their center of mass was just outside their base of support. This inflection point
151 was then held as participants were instructed to close their eyes, and at a random time (~2-5s),
152 the administrator rapidly released the participant and participants were allowed to open their eyes.
153 Participants were, thereafter, required to regain their balance and avoid a fall by whatever means
154 necessary. Participants were informed that they could open their eyes after they could feel the
155 administrator release. During the dual-task condition, participants were asked to begin a cognitive
156 task after closing their eyes and were released while completing it. The dual-tasks included serial
157 subtraction by 3's, reciting the alphabet by every other letter, FAS test, and category recital
158 (animals or fruit). The performance of the participants' cognitive tasks was not recorded.

159 IMU recordings were processed through custom algorithms in MATLAB (r2023b;
160 MathWorks, Natick, MA), handling raw accelerations and angular velocities. The primary reactive
161 balance outcome from the I-mP&R¹⁸ was *time to stability* (in seconds, s), defined as the time from

162 release of support (t_0), to stabilization. The release of support was detected when the
163 administrator's hand acceleration was >1.05 times gravity. Stabilization was detected when
164 lumbar acceleration was less than 1.07 times gravity and rotational rate was $<14^\circ/s$ after the last
165 step²⁰. The secondary outcome was *step latency* (in milliseconds, ms), defined as the time
166 between t_0 and the first foot movement, identified when foot acceleration was greater than 1.07
167 times gravity and the rotational rate was $>7^\circ/s$ ²⁰. Tertiary exploratory outcomes included *step*
168 *length* (in meters/meters), defined as the distance of the first step and normalized to the
169 participant's height; and *time to first contact* (in seconds) defined as the time from t_0 and the first
170 step¹⁵. To maximize reliability, summary metrics of the I-mP&R across all four directions were
171 used instead of direction-specific measures. These summary metrics were the median time to
172 stability, maximum step latency, median time to first contact, and median step length¹⁸.

173 Statistical analysis

174 Statistical analysis was performed with RStudio (2023.12.0 Build 369; Rstudio Team, 2020,
175 Boston, Ma), following the pre-registered procedure¹⁵. All analysis were based on all available
176 data. Two sample t-tests with Bonferroni adjustments (5 timepoints; significance level = $0.05 / 5$)
177 were used to determine differences between concussed and control subjects at each timepoint.

178 Considering the non-uniform attendance of participants, we implemented Generalized
179 Estimating Equations (GEEs), which accounts for random missing data²², to evaluate the acute
180 and longitudinal effects of concussion on reactive balance. GEEs were defined for time to stability
181 and latency. Fixed effects variables were the assessment timepoint (Baseline, Acute, Pre-RTP,
182 Post-RTP, 6-Month), group (concussion, control) and task (single-task, dual-task), as well as their
183 two-and three-way interactions. Retaining significant interactions at the 0.10 level, the final GEE
184 model included two-way group interactions with assessment (group x assessment timepoint) and
185 task (group x task). All models were also adjusted for covariates of age, sex, height, type of sport
186 (contact or non-contact), and footwear worn during the testing (shoes, barefoot, socks)²³. Post-

187 hoc pair-wise contrasts compared concussion and control groups at each timepoint when
188 adjusting for covariates.

189 Following visual inspection of the results, an exploratory post-hoc analysis stratified
190 participants by concussion history to explore potential differences in how lifetime concussion
191 history affected the acute and longitudinal response to a *new* concussion (i.e., the enrollment
192 concussion). In this case, athletes enrolled as concussed subjects without a lifetime history of
193 concussion experienced their first lifetime concussion. Athletes enrolled as concussed subjects
194 with a previous lifetime history of concussion had at least one previous lifetime concussion. GEE
195 models with equivalent fixed effects variables (assessment timepoint, group and task), two-way
196 interactions (group x assessment timepoint and group x task) and covariates (age, sex, height,
197 type of sport, and footwear) were defined for athletes enrolled into the concussion and control
198 groups, stratified by their lifetime history of concussion before enrollment (or the concussion event
199 that lead to enrollment).

200 To further investigate potential mechanisms underlying differences in our primary
201 outcomes, the relationship between primary and secondary I-mP&R metrics of time to stability
202 and step latency were evaluated using linear regression models and the coefficient of
203 determination, R^2 , for single- and dual-task, in concussed and control groups. A 0.05 significance
204 level was used for all GEE models and exploratory analyses.

205

206 **RESULTS**

207 Demographic and characteristics of the involved subjects is reported in Table 1. Overall, 91
208 athletes were enrolled into this longitudinal arm of the study (47 concussed athletes and 44
209 healthy teammate controls). Not every subject could be present at all timepoints, with comparable
210 missing data between concussed athletes and matched controls. High rates of lost to follow up at

211 the six months' timepoint were attributable to Covid-19 pandemic. Groups were overall similar in
212 distribution of sex, age, height, mass, and participation in contact sports, with 78% of the
213 participants being white. At all timepoints, more than half of the athletes enrolled in the concussion
214 group (59.6%) had a history of previous concussions defined as at least one lifetime concussion
215 in addition to their enrollment concussion, while only 47.7% control subjects had history of
216 previous concussions prior to enrollment. Similarly, 48.9% of the concussed athletes had history
217 of lower extremity musculoskeletal injury in the two years before enrollment, while only 31.8% of
218 controls reported a lower extremity musculoskeletal injury within two years before enrollment.

219 *Table 1 goes here.*

220 To enhance clarity and streamline the discussion, emphasis is placed on primary and
221 secondary outcomes of time to stability and step latency. Summary statistics of these I-mP&R
222 reactive balance outcomes are reported in Table 2. Supplementary material includes the results
223 for time to first step, and step length.

224 *Table 2 goes here.*

225 Time to stability

226 Bonferroni adjusted cross-sectional t-tests ($\alpha = 0.01$) revealed athletes with a recent
227 concussion had longer time to stability than healthy controls at the acute timepoint in the dual-
228 task ($p = 0.007$), but not single-task ($p = 0.027$) conditions (Figure 1; Figure 2). There were no
229 differences between groups for any other timepoint, including baseline.

230 *Figure 1 and Figure 2 go here.*

231 When adjusting for covariates using the GEE framework (Table 3), a main effect of task (p
232 = 0.012) and a group*task interaction ($p = 0.013$) indicated both groups exhibited longer time to
233 stability (i.e., worse reactive balance) in the dual-task condition, with the concussion group
234 exhibiting greater increases in time to stability across tasks. Pair-wise contrasts at each time

235 indicated significant group differences at the Acute timepoint for dual-task time to stability ($p=$
236 0.004), where the concussion group exhibited longer time to stability compared to the control
237 group. There were no other significant differences when adjusting for covariates for single-task
238 (Baseline $p = 0.940$; Acute $p = 0.051$; Pre-RTP $p = 0.643$; Post-RTP $p = 0.493$; 6-Month $p = 0.401$)
239 or dual-task (Baseline $p = 0.390$; Pre-RTP $p = 0.613$; Post-RTP $p = 0.097$; 6-Month $p = 0.121$).

240

Table 3 goes here.

241 When stratified by history of concussion, Bonferroni-corrected t-tests indicated that athletes
242 with their first lifetime concussion (i.e., athletes in the concussion group without a prior history of
243 concussion before the enrollment concussion) exhibited longer times to stability at the Acute
244 timepoint for both single-task ($p = 0.010$) and dual-task ($p = 0.006$) conditions compared to
245 athletes with no lifetime history of concussion enrolled in the study as controls (Figure 3; Figure
246 4). These dual-task differences between concussed athletes and healthy controls, both without a
247 prior history of concussion before the enrollment event, were also evident during the Post-RTP (p
248 = 0.006) and 6-Month ($p = 0.017$) timepoints. In contrast, no differences were observed between
249 concussed and control (all $p > 0.177$) athletes who reported a history of concussion prior to the
250 enrollment event (i.e., all had at least one lifetime concussion before enrollment)

251

Figure 3 and Figure 4 go here.

252 Similar results were observed when adjusting for covariates in a GEE framework (Table 4).
253 Pair-wise contrasts revealed concussed athletes without a prior concussion history (i.e., first
254 lifetime concussion) exhibited longer single-task time to stability at the Post-RTP timepoint ($p =$
255 0.035), and longer dual-task times to stability at Acute ($p = 0.037$) and Post-RTP ($p = 0.004$)
256 timepoints compared to athletes with no lifetime concussion. Notable, but non-significant effects
257 were also observed at 6-Months for both single-task ($p = 0.073$) and dual-task ($p = 0.054$). Similar
258 to the unadjusted t-tests, no differences were observed between the concussion and control
259 athletes with a lifetime history of concussion before enrollment (all $p > 0.414$).

260

Table 4 goes here.

261

Step latency

262

263

264

265

266

267

No statistically significant group differences in latency were observed using Bonferroni adjusted t-tests (all $p > 0.067$) or when adjusting for covariates in the GEE framework (Table 3) for single-task (Supplement Figure S1) or dual-task conditions (Supplement Figure S2), ($p > 0.128$ at all timepoints). Within the GEE framework, a main effect of task was observed ($p < 0.001$), where latency was longer in dual-task conditions compared to single-task conditions, but there was no significant group * task interaction ($p = 0.160$).

268

Time to stability vs Step latency

269

270

271

There was no significant relationship between time to stability and step latency in any group or condition at the Acute timepoint (Figure 5). Linear relationships ranged from $R^2 = 0.005$ for controls during dual-task conditions to $R^2 = 0.091$ for controls during single-task.

272

Figure 5

273

274

275 **DISCUSSION**

276 This study explored the longitudinal effects of concussion on reactive balance in college
277 athletes. Acutely after concussion (i.e., < 72 hours), athletes exhibited impaired reactive balance,
278 characterized by longer times to stability in dual-task conditions. We observed no group
279 differences in time to stability at baseline, providing strong evidence that the slower time to
280 stabilities at post-concussion timepoints were associated with the concussion injury. When further
281 adjusting for demographic (age, sex, height, sport type) and test-specific covariates (footwear),
282 we still observed acute impairments in dual-task reactive balance. These impairments in reactive
283 balance were transient; athletes did not exhibit overall group differences at longitudinal
284 assessments outside the Acute timepoint. However, we observed differential effects of
285 concussion on reactive balance based on one's lifetime history of concussion; athletes who
286 suffered their first lifetime concussion exhibited acute and longitudinal impairments in both single-
287 and dual-task reactive balance compared to their peers with no lifetime concussion.

288 Dual-task performance differences between concussed and control athletes align with
289 previous studies emphasizing the importance of attentional resources in managing cognitive and
290 motor demands²⁴. The link between cognitive processing and postural stability is challenged
291 during dual-task scenarios¹², where simultaneous engagement strains attentional capacity,
292 affecting performance²⁵. Dual-task paradigms have also proven to be more effective in
293 challenging athletes, possibly explaining the differences that were observed exclusively in dual-
294 task conditions rather than single-task situations. Additionally, similar tests on non-athletes might
295 yield different results due to the specialized training, skills and familiarity with reactions tasks of
296 athletes.

297 The differences between groups at the acute timepoint were not solely due to a regression,
298 relative to baseline, in reactive balance performance in the concussion group – deficits appeared
299 to be driven by the concussion group getting slower *and* the control group getting faster relative

300 to baseline. Such improvements in the control group across time are likely indicative of learning
301 and adaptation effects commonly observed in assessments of reactive balance^{26,27}. Considering
302 the large time from baseline to acute timepoints (mean 281 days), it is also possible such
303 improvements in reactive balance in health controls reflect overall improvements in motor function
304 and postural control – including reactive balance – through the balance, strength, and conditioning
305 training integrated into collegiate programs. In contrast, athletes with concussion did not exhibit
306 improved performance relative to baseline until they were asymptomatic (Pre-RTP timepoint).
307 These findings suggest that concussion have repercussions on learning effects seen in the control
308 group^{28,29}.

309 While the mechanisms underlying the acute post-concussion deficits in reactive balance
310 remain unclear, it is unlikely that reaction time is an underlying cause. Slower reaction times are
311 well-documented after concussion using both computerized neurocognitive testing and clinical
312 drop-stick tests³⁰. Yet, these traditional measures of reaction time are not associated with postural
313 reaction times^{13,23} (e.g., step latency). We did not observe differences in step latency across
314 groups at any timepoint, and there were negligible associations between step latency and time to
315 stability at the acute timepoint. Further, a notable but non-significant interaction, was evident
316 where athletes with acute concussion exhibited *slower* time to stability, yet *faster* step latencies,
317 in the dual-task condition compared to their healthy teammates. Combined, such results across
318 time and (lack of) associations with step latency suggest post-concussion reactive balance
319 impairments in time to stability may be associated with altered trans-cortical loops, rather than
320 short- or medium-latency responses. Altered long-latency trans-cortical responses may be
321 influenced by an inability to appropriately prime a stepping response before the release³¹ or an
322 inappropriate motor responses, driven by altered sensory integration and state estimation, after
323 a loss of balance.^{14,32} However, such conclusions remain speculative and further research is
324 needed to uncover the mechanisms underlying concussion-related reactive balance impairments.

325 Stratifying time to stability based on concussion history indicated that the acute reactive
326 balance impairments are influenced by one's lifetime history of concussion. Significant group
327 differences were observed in athletes without a history of concussion acutely and, for dual-task,
328 at Post-RTP and 6-Month timepoints. While comparisons across the four groups were omitted
329 due to insufficient statistical power and misalignment with the study's scope, descriptive
330 comparisons revealed that athletes in the control group, who did not experience any lifetime
331 concussions, exhibited the fastest time to stability amongst all groups. Conversely, concussed
332 with a history of concussion did not differ from control athletes with a history of concussion, and
333 both groups exhibited worse performance during dual-task conditions, indicating that deficits from
334 previous concussions may persist over time³³. Declines in dual-task performance are linked to an
335 increased risk of musculoskeletal injury¹⁰, particularly in individuals with worsened abilities relative
336 to baseline³⁴ or those exhibiting regression during the return-to-play protocol³⁵.

337 The primary limitation of the presented study is the non-uniform attendance at each
338 assessment, potentially introducing bias from fluctuating sample sizes and affecting the
339 generalizability of our findings. Nonetheless, the GEE model is advantageous for handling missing
340 data, assuming completely at random missing data mechanism, allowing for a robust analysis of
341 longitudinal observations²². Additionally, noisy assessment environment and inter-administrator
342 variability may have affected the results, although they reflect clinical settings of concussion
343 assessments and a previous investigation reported moderate inter-administrator reliability and
344 high validity of the I-mP&R¹⁸. The comprehensive understanding of the neurophysiological
345 mechanisms influencing reactive balance was also compromised by the absence of muscle
346 activity data. Addressing these constraints, future research should enhance the robustness of
347 longitudinal assessments by directly investigating the effects of concussion on the ability to prime
348 (i.e., prepare) a motor response and the ability to execute said motor response. The identified
349 long-term deficits and the importance of history of concussion in reactive balance, particularly in

350 dual-task scenarios, emphasize the need to expand traditional evaluations incorporating reactive
351 balance assessments into concussion protocols.

352

353 **CONCLUSION**

354 Athletes demonstrated acute, but transient, reactive balance impairments in dual-task
355 conditions. While the mechanisms of these impairments remain unclear, such impairments are
356 unlikely to be attributed to slower reaction times. Additionally, the effects of concussion on reactive
357 balance were influenced by concussion history; athletes experiencing their first lifetime
358 concussion exhibited both acute and longitudinal impairments in single- and dual-task reactive
359 balance compared to control athletes with no lifetime concussion. Such persistent reactive
360 balance impairments may be associated with the increased risk of musculoskeletal injury risk
361 post-concussion. Future work should further explore the mechanistic origins and clinical
362 significance (e.g., injury risk) of reactive balance impairments after concussion.

363

364 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

365 The authors would like to acknowledge the contributions of Benjamin Cassidy, Ryan Pelo,
366 Nicholas Kreter, Sarah Hill, Brody Roemmich, Christina Geisler, Jun Son, Cameron Jensen,
367 Corinne Mayfield, and the University of Utah Athletic Training Staff.

368

369 **DISCLOSURES / CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

370 CM, AM, RC, NF, TP, TJ, LD, and PF have no conflicts of interest directly relevant to the
371 content of this manuscript.

372

373 **FUNDING**

374 This project was supported with support from the Pac-12 Conference’s Student-Athlete
375 Health and Well-Being Initiative (PI: Fino, Dibble). Additional funding support was provided by the
376 Eunice Kennedy Shiver National Institute of Child Health & Human Development of the National
377 Institutes of Health under Award Number K12HD073945, and the University of Utah Study Design
378 and Biostatistics Center, with funding in part from the National Center for Research Resources
379 and the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences, National Institutes of Health,
380 through Grant UL1TR002538 (formerly 5UL1TR001067-05, 8UL1TR000105, and
381 UL1RR025764). The content of this manuscript is solely the responsibility of the authors and does
382 not necessarily represent the official views of the Pac-12 Conference, or its members, or of the
383 National Institute of Health.


- 385 1. Harmon KG, Clugston JR, Dec K, et al. American Medical Society for Sports Medicine Position
386 Statement on Concussion in Sport. *Clin J Sport Med*. Mar 2019;29(2):87-100.
387 doi:10.1097/JSM.0000000000000720
- 388 2. Horak FB. Postural orientation and equilibrium: what do we need to know about neural control
389 of balance to prevent falls? *Age Ageing*. Sep 2006;35 Suppl 2:ii7-ii11. doi:10.1093/ageing/afl077
- 390 3. Horak FB. Postural orientation and equilibrium: what do we need to know about neural control
391 of balance to prevent falls? *Age Ageing*. Sep 2006;35:7-11. doi:10.1093/ageing/afl077
- 392 4. Horak FB, Wrisley DM, Frank J. The Balance Evaluation Systems Test (BESTest) to Differentiate
393 Balance Deficits. *Phys Ther*. May 2009;89(5):484-498. doi:10.2522/ptj.20080071
- 394 5. Morris A, Casucci T, McFarland MM, et al. Reactive Balance Responses After Mild Traumatic
395 Brain Injury: A Scoping Review. *J Head Trauma Rehab*. Sep-Oct 2022;37(5):311-317.
396 doi:10.1097/Htr.0000000000000761
- 397 6. Condon C, Cremin K. Static balance norms in children. *Physiother Res Int*. Mar 2014;19(1):1-7.
398 doi:10.1002/pri.1549
- 399 7. Davlin CD. Dynamic balance in high level athletes. *Percept Mot Skills*. Jun 2004;98(3 Pt 2):1171-6.
400 doi:10.2466/pms.98.3c.1171-1176
- 401 8. Pollock AS, Durward BR, Rowe PJ, Paul JP. What is balance? *Clin Rehabil*. Aug 2000;14(4):402-6.
402 doi:10.1191/0269215500cr342oa
- 403 9. Kim Y, Vakula MN, Bolton DAE, et al. Which Exercise Interventions Can Most Effectively Improve
404 Reactive Balance in Older Adults? A Systematic Review and Network Meta-Analysis. *Front Aging*
405 *Neurosci*. Jan 18 2022;13doi:ARTN76482610.3389/fnagi.2021.764826
- 406 10. Morris A, Fino NF, Pelo R, et al. Reactive postural responses predict risk for acute
407 musculoskeletal injury in collegiate athletes. *J Sci Med Sport*. Feb 2023;26(2):114-119.
408 doi:10.1016/j.jsams.2023.01.003
- 409 11. Takakusaki K. Functional Neuroanatomy for Posture and Gait Control. *J Mov Disord*. Jan
410 2017;10(1):1-17. doi:10.14802/jmd.16062
- 411 12. Maki BE, Mcllroy WE. Cognitive demands and cortical control of human balance-recovery
412 reactions. *J Neural Transm (Vienna)*. 2007;114(10):1279-96. doi:10.1007/s00702-007-0764-y
- 413 13. Morris A, Petersell TL, Pelo R, et al. Use of Reactive Balance Assessments With Clinical Baseline
414 Concussion Assessments in Collegiate Athletes. *J Athl Train*. Jan 1 2024;59(1):39-48. doi:10.4085/1062-
415 6050-0231.22
- 416 14. Pan T, Liao K, Roenigk K, Daly JJ, Walker MF. Static and dynamic postural stability in veterans
417 with combat-related mild traumatic brain injury. *Gait Posture*. Oct 2015;42(4):550-557.
418 doi:10.1016/j.gaitpost.2015.08.012
- 419 15. Morris A, Cassidy B, Pelo R, et al. Reactive Postural Responses After Mild Traumatic Brain Injury
420 and Their Association With Musculoskeletal Injury Risk in Collegiate Athletes: A Study Protocol. *Front*
421 *Sports Act Living*. 2020;2:574848. doi:10.3389/fspor.2020.574848
- 422 16. Bohr AD, Aukerman DF, Harmon KG, et al. Pac-12 CARE-Affiliated Program: structure, methods
423 and initial results. *BMJ Open Sport Exerc Med*. 2021;7(2):e001055. doi:10.1136/bmjsem-2021-001055
- 424 17. McCrory P, Meeuwisse W, Dvorak J, et al. Consensus statement on concussion in sport-the 5(th)
425 international conference on concussion in sport held in Berlin, October 2016. *Br J Sports Med*. Jun
426 2017;51(11):838-847. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2017-097699
- 427 18. Morris A, Fino NF, Pelo R, et al. Interadministrator Reliability of a Modified Instrumented Push
428 and Release Test of Reactive Balance. *J Sport Rehabil*. May 1 2022;31(4):517-523. doi:10.1123/jsr.2021-
429 0229

- 430 19. Smith BA, Carlson-Kuhta P, Horak FB. Consistency in Administration and Response for the
431 Backward Push and Release Test: A Clinical Assessment of Postural Responses. *Physiother Res Int*. Mar
432 2016;21(1):36-46. doi:10.1002/pri.1615
- 433 20. El-Gohary M, Peterson D, Gera G, Horak FB, Huisinga JM. Validity of the Instrumented Push and
434 Release Test to Quantify Postural Responses in Persons With Multiple Sclerosis. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*.
435 Jul 2017;98(7):1325-1331. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2017.01.030
- 436 21. Franchignoni F, Horak F, Godi M, Nardone A, Giordano A. Using psychometric techniques to
437 improve the Balance Evaluation Systems Test: the mini-BESTest. *J Rehabil Med*. Apr 2010;42(4):323-31.
438 doi:10.2340/16501977-0537
- 439 22. Liang KY, Zeger SL. Longitudinal Data-Analysis Using Generalized Linear-Models. *Biometrika*. Apr
440 1986;73(1):13-22. doi:DOI 10.1093/biomet/73.1.13
- 441 23. Petersell TL, Quammen DL, Crofts R, et al. Instrumented Static and Reactive Balance in Collegiate
442 Athletes: Normative Values and Minimal Detectable Change. *J Athl Train*. Nov 28
443 2023;doi:10.4085/1062-6050-0403.23
- 444 24. Yogev-Seligmann G, Hausdorff JM, Giladi N. The role of executive function and attention in gait.
445 *Mov Disord*. Feb 15 2008;23(3):329-42; quiz 472. doi:10.1002/mds.21720
- 446 25. Posner MI, Boies SJ. Components of Attention. *Psychol Rev*. 1971;78(5):391-&. doi:DOI
447 10.1037/h0031333
- 448 26. Welch TDJ, Ting LH. Mechanisms of Motor Adaptation in Reactive Balance Control. *Plos One*.
449 May 8 2014;9(5)doi:ARTNe9644010.1371/journal.pone.0096440
- 450 27. Horak FB, Nashner LM. Central programming of postural movements: adaptation to altered
451 support-surface configurations. *J Neurophysiol*. Jun 1986;55(6):1369-81. doi:10.1152/jn.1986.55.6.1369
- 452 28. Bourassa ME, Dumel G, Charlebois-Plante C, Gagnon JF, De Beaumont L. Persistent implicit
453 motor learning alterations following a mild traumatic brain injury sustained during late adulthood. *J Clin*
454 *Exp Neuropsych*. Jan 2 2021;43(1):105-115. doi:10.1080/13803395.2021.1879735
- 455 29. Cantarero G, Choynowski J, St Pierre M, et al. Repeated Concussions Impair Behavioral and
456 Neurophysiological Changes in the Motor Learning System. *Neurorehab Neural Re*. Sep 2020;34(9):804-
457 813. doi:Artn 154596832094357810.1177/1545968320943578
- 458 30. Lempke LB, Howell DR, Eckner JT, Lynall RC. Examination of Reaction Time Deficits Following
459 Concussion: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Sports Med*. Jul 2020;50(7):1341-1359.
460 doi:10.1007/s40279-020-01281-0
- 461 31. Kreter N, Rogers CL, Fino PC. Anticipatory and reactive responses to underfoot perturbations
462 during gait in healthy adults and individuals with a recent mild traumatic brain injury. *Clin Biomech*
463 *(Bristol, Avon)*. Dec 2021;90:105496. doi:10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2021.105496
- 464 32. Campbell KR, King LA, Parrington L, Fino PC, Antonellis P, Peterka RJ. Central sensorimotor
465 integration assessment reveals deficits in standing balance control in people with chronic mild traumatic
466 brain injury. *Front Neurol*. 2022;13:897454. doi:10.3389/fneur.2022.897454
- 467 33. Howell DR, Beasley M, Vopat L, Meehan WP, 3rd. The Effect of Prior Concussion History on Dual-
468 Task Gait following a Concussion. *J Neurotrauma*. Feb 15 2017;34(4):838-844.
469 doi:10.1089/neu.2016.4609
- 470 34. Oldham JR, Howell DR, Knight CA, Crenshaw JR, Buckley TA. Gait Performance Is Associated with
471 Subsequent Lower Extremity Injury following Concussion. *Med Sci Sport Exer*. Nov 2020;52(11):2279-
472 2285. doi:10.1249/Mss.0000000000002385
- 473 35. Howell DR, Buckley TA, Lynall RC, Meehan WP. Worsening Dual-Task Gait Costs after Concussion
474 and their Association with Subsequent Sport-Related Injury. *J Neurotraum*. Jul 2018;35(14):1630-1636.
475 doi:10.1089/neu.2017.5570

476


477 **FIGURES**

478 Figure 1.



480

Figure 2.




481


482

Figure 3.

483




484 Figure 4.



487 Figure 5.

488

489



490 **FIGURE CAPTIONS**

491 *Figure 1. Time to stability (s) for single-task I-mP&R at each assessment timepoint for*
492 *concussed (red) and control (blue) subjects. Violin plot reports data distribution, mean (white*
493 *circle) and interquartile range (gray box). Results of each subject relate with semi-transparent*
494 *lines; thick lines link the averages of each distribution.*

495

496 *Figure 2. Time to stability (s) for dual-task I-mP&R at each assessment timepoint for*
497 *concussed (red) and control (blue) subjects. Violin plot reports data distribution, mean (white*
498 *circle) and interquartile range (gray box). Results of each subject relate with semi-transparent*
499 *lines; thick lines link the averages of each distribution. ^ highlights significance of the Bonferroni*
500 *adjusted t-test.*

501

502 *Figure 3. Time to stability (s) for single-task I-mP&R stratified by history of concussion prior*
503 *to enrollment, at each assessment timepoint for concussed (red) and control (blue) subjects.*
504 *Violin plot reports data distribution, mean (white circle) and interquartile range (gray box). Results*
505 *of each subject relate with semi-transparent lines; thick lines link the averages of each distribution.*
506 *^ highlights significance of the Bonferroni adjusted t-test.*

507

508 *Figure 4. Time to stability (s) for dual-task I-mP&R stratified by history of concussion prior*
509 *to enrollment, at each assessment timepoint for concussed (red) and control (blue) subjects.*
510 *Violin plot reports data distribution, mean (white circle) and interquartile range (gray box). Results*
511 *of each subject relate with semi-transparent lines; thick lines link the averages of each distribution.*
512 *^ highlights significance of the Bonferroni adjusted t-test.*

513

514 *Figure 5. Scatter histogram of the relationship between time to stability (s) and step latency*
515 *(ms) at acute timepoint. For single- and dual-task, concussed (red) and control (blue) populations*
516 *are reported distributions curves and R^2 regression coefficients.*

517

TABLES

Table 1. Demographics and characteristics of the population involved (where: N number, s seconds, cm centimeters, kg kilograms, m

meters). Mean and standard deviation (SD) are reported for age, weight, body mass index (BMI). Number and percentages are reported for

history of concussion, contact sport and previous musculoskeletal (MSK) injury.

		Assessment timepoints					
		Overall	Baseline	Acute	Pre-RTP	Post-RTP	6-Month
N	Total	91	52	77	73	75	33
	Concussed	47	28	42	38	39	18
	Control	44	24	35	35	36	15
Age, years mean (SD)	Total	19.4 (1.4)	19.2 (1.3)	19.4 (1.4)	19.5 (1.4)	19.5 (1.4)	19.4 (1.5)
	Concussed	19.4 (1.3)	19.3 (1.2)	19.4 (1.3)	19.5 (1.3)	19.5 (1.3)	19.4 (1.6)
	Control	19.5 (1.5)	19.2 (1.4)	19.5 (1.4)	19.6 (1.6)	19.6 (1.5)	19.5 (1.4)
Sex (F, M)	Total	(56, 35)	(34, 18)	(47, 30)	(49, 24)	(46, 29)	(24, 9)
	Concussed	(30, 17)	(20, 8)	(27, 15)	(26, 12)	(25, 14)	(14, 4)
	Control	(26, 18)	(14, 10)	(20, 15)	(23, 12)	(21, 15)	(10, 5)
Race ¹ N (%) W / B / AA / NAAN / NHPI / Un	Total	71 / 8 / 2 / 1 / 6 / 3 (78 / 9 / 2 / 1 / 7 / 3)	46 / 4 / 0 / 0 / 1 / 1 (88 / 8 / 0 / 0 / 2 / 2)	60 / 6 / 2 / 1 / 5 / 3 (78 / 8 / 3 / 1 / 6 / 4)	57 / 6 / 2 / 1 / 6 / 1 (78 / 8 / 3 / 1 / 8 / 1)	60 / 6 / 1 / 1 / 6 / 1 (82 / 8 / 1 / 1 / 8 / 1)	27 / 2 / 1 / 1 / 1 / 1 (82 / 6 / 3 / 3 / 3 / 3)
	Concussed	37 / 4 / 1 / 1 / 0 / 2 / 3 (79 / 9 / 2 / 0 / 4 / 6)	24 / 2 / 0 / 0 / 1 / 1 (86 / 7 / 0 / 0 / 4 / 4)	34 / 3 / 1 / 1 / 0 / 1 / 3 (81 / 7 / 2 / 0 / 2 / 7)	32 / 2 / 1 / 1 / 0 / 2 / 1 (84 / 5 / 3 / 0 / 5 / 3)	33 / 2 / 1 / 1 / 0 / 2 / 1 (85 / 5 / 3 / 0 / 5 / 3)	16 / 0 / 1 / 1 / 0 / 0 / 1 (89 / 0 / 6 / 0 / 0 / 6)
	Control	34 / 4 / 1 / 1 / 1 / 4 / 0 (77 / 9 / 2 / 2 / 9 / 0)	22 / 2 / 0 / 0 / 0 / 0 (92 / 8 / 0 / 0 / 0 / 0)	26 / 3 / 1 / 1 / 1 / 4 / 0 (74 / 9 / 3 / 3 / 11 / 0)	25 / 4 / 1 / 1 / 1 / 4 / 0 (71 / 11 / 3 / 3 / 11 / 0)	27 / 4 / 0 / 1 / 1 / 4 / 0 (75 / 11 / 0 / 3 / 11 / 0)	11 / 2 / 0 / 1 / 1 / 1 / 0 (73 / 13 / 0 / 7 / 7 / 0)
Ethnicity ² N (%) H / NH / Un	Total	10 / 75 / 6 (11 / 82 / 7)	5 / 44 / 3 (10 / 85 / 6)	9 / 62 / 6 (12 / 81 / 8)	7 / 61 / 5 (10 / 84 / 7)	7 / 63 / 5 (9 / 84 / 7)	5 / 28 / 0 (15 / 85 / 0)
	Concussed	7 / 37 / 3 (15 / 79 / 6)	4 / 23 / 1 (14 / 82 / 4)	6 / 33 / 3 (14 / 79 / 7)	5 / 31 / 2 (13 / 82 / 5)	5 / 31 / 3 (13 / 79 / 8)	4 / 14 / 0 (22 / 78 / 0)
	Control	3 / 38 / 3 (7 / 86 / 7)	1 / 21 / 2 (4 / 88 / 8)	3 / 29 / 3 (9 / 83 / 9)	2 / 30 / 3 (6 / 86 / 9)	2 / 32 / 2 (6 / 89 / 6)	4 / 14 / 0 (7 / 93 / 0)
Height, cm mean (SD)	Total	174.5 (11.9)	175.2 (11.4)	173.7 (12.4)	173.4 (12.3)	173.9 (11.3)	170.4 (11.4)
	Concussed	174.6 (11.9)	175.1 (9.0)	173.9 (12.0)	174.0 (12.4)	174.0 (11.9)	168.9 (11.5)
	Control	174.4 (12.0)	175.3 (13.9)	173.4 (13.1)	172.7 (12.3)	173.8 (10.9)	172.2 (11.5)

Mass, kg mean (SD)	Total	72.1 (14.1)	73.3 (13.9)	71.8 (14.6)	71.1 (14.8)	71.5 (14.7)	70.0 (13.2)
	Concussed	72.7 (14.7)	74.0 (14.7)	72.3 (14.7)	72.5 (16.2)	72.0 (15.8)	68.7 (12.8)
	Control	71.5 (13.6)	72.6 (13.3)	71.2 (14.7)	69.7 (13.2)	70.9 (13.6)	71.5 (13.8)
BMI, kg/m ² mean (SD)	Total	23.6 (3.1)	23.8 (3.1)	23.6 (3.2)	23.5 (3.2)	23.5 (3.2)	24.0 (3.3)
	Concussed	23.7 (3.4)	24.0 (3.4)	23.8 (3.4)	23.8 (3.6)	23.6 (3.5)	24.1 (3.8)
	Control	23.4 (2.8)	23.6 (2.9)	23.5 (3.0)	23.2 (2.8)	23.3 (2.9)	23.9 (2.6)
Concussion history N (%)	Total	48 (52.7%)	26 (50.0%)	39 (50.6%)	41 (56.2%)	40 (53.3%)	18 (54.5%)
	Concussed	28 (59.6%)	17 (60.7%)	24 (57.1%)	23 (60.5%)	24 (61.5%)	10 (55.6%)
	Control	20 (45.5%)	9 (37.5%)	15 (42.9%)	18 (51.4%)	16 (44.4%)	8 (53.3%)
Contact Sport ³ N (%)	Total	44 (48.4%)	27 (51.9%)	33 (42.9%)	36 (49.3%)	38 (50.7%)	10 (30.3%)
	Concussed	23 (48.9%)	16 (57.1%)	19 (45.2%)	19 (50.0%)	20 (51.3%)	5 (27.8%)
	Control	21 (47.7%)	11 (45.8%)	14 (40.0%)	17 (48.6%)	18 (50.0%)	5 (33.3%)
Previous MSK injury N (%)	Total	37 (40.7%)	23 (44.2%)	29 (37.7%)	30 (41.1%)	31 (41.3%)	9 (27.3%)
	Concussed	23 (48.9%)	15 (53.6%)	20 (47.6%)	19 (50.0%)	19 (48.7%)	6 (33.3%)
	Control	14 (31.8%)	8 (33.3%)	9 (25.7%)	11 (31.4%)	12 (33.3%)	3 (20.0%)
Days between concussion and each timepoint mean (SD)			-281 (279)	2 (1)	10 (6)	16 (8)	190 (12)

¹ Race: White (W), Black or African American (B), Asian (AA), Native American or Alaska Native (NAAN), Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (NHPI), Unspecified (Un).

² Ethnicity: Hispanic or Latino (H), Not Hispanic or Latino (NH), Unspecified (Un).

³ Contact sports: football, lacrosse, soccer, basketball.

Non-contact sports: gymnastics, cheerleading, volleyball, beach volleyball, baseball, softball, swimming, diving, tennis, track and field, cross country, skiing, golf.

524 *Table 2. I-mP&R reactive balance outcomes. Mean and standard deviation (SD) of time to*
 525 *stability (s) and step latency (ms) for single-task and dual-task at each timepoint. Significance of*
 526 *Bonferroni adjusted t-test are bold and highlighted with * ($\alpha < 0.01$).*

			Assessment timepoints				
			Baseline	Acute	Pre-RTP	Post-RTP	6-Month
Time to stability (s)							
Single-task mean (SD)	All	Concussed	1.06 (0.22)	1.13 (0.32)	0.98 (0.21)	0.98 (0.28)	0.98 (0.25)
		Control	1.07 (0.29)	0.97 (0.22)	0.99 (0.30)	0.92 (0.24)	0.90 (0.17)
	With hx of concussion	Concussed	1.05 (0.20)	1.07 (0.25)	0.97 (0.19)	0.92 (0.19)	0.86 (0.12)
		Control	1.11 (0.32)	1.03 (0.26)	1.04 (0.33)	0.95 (0.24)	0.91 (0.16)
	Without hx of concussion	Concussed	1.07 (0.25)	1.22 (0.39) *	1.00 (0.25)	1.11 (0.38)	1.22 (0.29)
		Control	1.04 (0.29)	0.93 (0.17) *	0.93 (0.25)	0.90 (0.23)	0.89 (0.20)
Dual-task mean (SD)	All	Concussed	1.24 (0.29)	1.22 (0.32) *	1.06 (0.25)	1.06 (0.26)	1.09 (0.23)
		Control	1.10 (0.20)	1.02 (0.23) *	1.01 (0.25)	0.96 (0.21)	0.95 (0.24)
	With hx of concussion	Concussed	1.21 (0.28)	1.18 (0.22)	1.07 (0.21)	0.99 (0.21)	1.02 (0.17)
		Control	1.06 (0.19)	1.15 (0.23)	1.07 (0.29)	1.00 (0.21)	1.04 (0.27)
	Without hx of concussion	Concussed	1.28 (0.32)	1.29 (0.44) *	1.05 (0.30)	1.21 (0.30) *	1.21 (0.28)
		Control	1.13 (0.21)	0.95 (0.20) *	0.94 (0.17)	0.92 (0.22) *	0.83 (0.15)
Step latency (ms)							
Single-task mean (SD)	Concussed		183 (40)	196 (43)	164 (30)	165 (45)	164 (21)
	Control		175 (35)	187 (59)	165 (24)	159 (18)	169 (39)
Dual-task mean (SD)	Concussed		219 (49)	218 (50)	209 (47)	188 (30)	200 (25)
	Control		233 (56)	243 (58)	208 (47)	189 (39)	193 (32)

527

528

529 *Table 3. Generalized estimating equation (GEE) results for time to stability (s) and step*
530 *latency (ms), reporting for each covariate estimated coefficient β , confidence interval CI, and p*
531 *value. Reference level for each factor: control for group, Acute for timepoint, single-task for task,*
532 *female for sex, contact sport for type of sport, shoes for footwear.*

	Time to stability (s)		Step latency (ms)	
	β (95% CI)	p value	β (95% CI)	p value
(Intercept)	0.503 (-0.383, 1.389)	0.266	158 (29, 2867)	0.016
Time				
Baseline	0.097 (0.012, 0.182)	0.026	-11 (-29, 7)	0.219
Acute	Ref		Ref	
Pre-RTP	-0.013 (-0.082, 0.055)	0.702	-28 (-44, -12)	<0.001
Post-RTP	-0.068 (-0.141, 0.006)	0.070	-42 (-59, -26)	<0.001
6-Month	-0.099 (-0.189, -0.009)	0.030	-32 (-52, -12)	0.002
Group				
Control	Ref		Ref	
Concussed	0.110 (-0.001, 0.222)	0.051	-3 (-23, 17)	0.773
Task				
Single-task	Ref		Ref	
Dual-task	0.038 (0.008, 0.068)	0.012	42 (31, 53)	<0.001
Sex				
Female	Ref		Ref	
Male	-0.135 (-0.229, -0.041)	0.005	5 (-11, 21)	0.554
Age	0.020 (-0.003, 0.043)	0.086	2 (-1, 5)	0.142
Height	0.001 (-0.003, 0.004)	0.670	-0 (-1, 1)	0.951
Sport type				
Contact sport	Ref		Ref	
Non-contact sport	0.025 (-0.075, 0.125)	0.618	-9 (-22, 3)	0.145
Footwear				
Shoes	Ref		Ref	
Socks	0.060 (-0.098, 0.217)	0.459	-8 (-21, 6)	0.275
Barefoot	0.001 (-0.066, 0.068)	0.972	-1 (-12, 11)	0.918
Time * Group				
Baseline * Concussed	-0.115 (-0.276, 0.046)	0.161	6 (-20, 32)	0.633
Acute * Concussed	Ref		Ref	
Pre-RTP * Concussed	-0.138 (-0.245, -0.030)	0.012	8 (-16, 32)	0.512
Post-RTP * Concussed	-0.064 (-0.172, 0.044)	0.248	12 (-13, 37)	0.352
6-Month * Concussed	-0.045 (-0.189, 0.100)	0.543	7 (-21, 36)	0.619
Task * Group				
Single-task * Concussed	Ref		Ref	
Dual-task * Concussed	0.055 (0.012, 0.099)	0.013	-10 (-23, 4)	0.160

533

534 *Table 4. Generalized estimating equation (GEE) of time to stability (s), stratified by history*
535 *of concussion, reporting for each covariate estimated coefficient β , confidence interval CI, and p*
536 *value. Reference level for each factor: control for group, Acute for timepoint, single-task for task,*
537 *female for sex, contact sport for type of sport, shoes for footwear.*

	Time to stability (s)			
	With history of concussion (n = 48)		Without history of concussion (n = 43)	
	β (95% CI)	p value	β (95% CI)	p value
(Intercept)	1.662 (0.229, 3.095)	0.023	-0.262 (-1.598, 1.074)	0.701
Time				
Baseline	0.035 (-0.128, 0.197)	0.677	0.143 (0.032, 0.254)	0.011
Acute	Ref		Ref	
Pre-RTP	-0.054 (-0.123, 0.016)	0.133	-0.027 (-0.120, 0.066)	0.575
Post-RTP	-0.130 (-0.257, -0.002)	0.046	-0.045 (-0.119, 0.029)	0.231
6-Month	-0.152 (-0.228, -0.077)	<0.001	-0.072 (-0.168, 0.024)	0.143
Group				
Control	Ref		Ref	
Concussed	0.014 (-0.127, 0.155)	0.846	0.168 (-0.039, 0.374)	0.112
Task				
Single-task	Ref		Ref	
Dual-task	0.057 (0.007, 0.108)	0.026	0.025 (-0.008, 0.057)	0.138
Sex				
Female	Ref		Ref	
Male	0.018 (-0.094, 0.131)	0.747	-0.306 (-0.427, -0.184)	<0.001
Age	0.006 (-0.026, 0.037)	0.727	0.027 (-0.006, 0.060)	0.110
Height	-0.004 (-0.010, 0.001)	0.137	0.005 (-0.003, 0.012)	0.208
Sport type				
Contact sport	Ref		Ref	
Non-contact sport	0.021 (-0.088, 0.129)	0.712	-0.038 (-0.173, 0.097)	0.581
Footwear				
Shoes	Ref		Ref	
Socks	0.117 (-0.052, 0.286)	0.176	-0.079 (-0.237, 0.078)	0.322
Barefoot	-0.030 (-0.114, 0.053)	0.480	0.011 (-0.070, 0.092)	0.798
Time * Group				
Baseline * Concussed	-0.026 (-0.230, 0.179)	0.806	-0.154 (-0.394, 0.085)	0.206
Acute * Concussed	Ref		Ref	
Pre-RTP * Concussed	-0.063 (-0.169, 0.043)	0.245	-0.142 (-0.327, 0.042)	0.131
Post-RTP * Concussed	-0.045 (-0.184, 0.093)	0.519	0.034 (-0.121, 0.190)	0.664
6-Month * Concussed	-0.008 (-0.125, 0.110)	0.897	0.057 (-0.218, 0.333)	0.684
Task * Group				
Single-task * Concussed	Ref		Ref	
Dual-task * Concussed	0.049 (-0.009, 0.108)	0.098	0.042 (-0.021, 0.106)	0.193