



**HAL**  
open science

# Improving postural control by applying mechanical noise to ankle muscle tendons

Liliane Borel, Edith Ribot-Ciscar

## ► To cite this version:

Liliane Borel, Edith Ribot-Ciscar. Improving postural control by applying mechanical noise to ankle muscle tendons. *Experimental Brain Research*, 2016, 234, pp.2305 - 2314. 10.1007/s00221-016-4636-2 . hal-01432881

**HAL Id: hal-01432881**

**<https://hal-amu.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01432881>**

Submitted on 12 Jan 2017

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

# Improving postural control by applying mechanical noise to ankle muscle tendons

Liliane Borel and Edith Ribot-Ciscar

Aix-Marseille Université, CNRS, NIA UMR 7260. Case B, Centre Saint-Charles, Place Victor Hugo, 13331 Marseille CEDEX 03 France.

Corresponding author:

Liliane Borel

[liliane.borel@univ-amu.fr](mailto:liliane.borel@univ-amu.fr)

Tel: +33 4 13 55 08 73; fax: +33 4 13 55 08 42.

## Abstract

The application of subthreshold mechanical vibrations with random frequencies (white mechanical noise) to ankle muscle tendons is known to increase muscle proprioceptive information and to improve the detection of ankle movements. The aim of the present study was to analyze the effect of this mechanical noise on postural control, its possible modulation according to the sensory strategies used for postural control, and the consequences of increasing postural difficulty. The upright stance of 20 healthy young participants tested with their eyes closed was analyzed during the application of four different levels of noise and compared to that in the absence of noise (control) in three conditions: static, static on foam, and dynamic (sinusoidal translation). The quiet standing condition was conducted with the eyes open and closed to determine the subjects' visual dependency to maintain postural stability. Postural performance was assessed using posturographic and motion analysis evaluations. The results in the static condition showed that the spectral power density of body sway significantly decreased with an optimal level of noise and that the higher the spectral power density without noise, the greater the noise effect, irrespective of visual dependency. Finally, noise application was ineffective in the foam and dynamic conditions. We conclude that the application of mechanical noise to ankle muscle tendons is a means to improve quiet standing only. These results suggest that mechanical noise stimulation may be more effective in more impaired populations.

## Keywords

Balance, Static and dynamic posture, Proprioception, Stochastic resonance, Healthy subjects

## Introduction

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 Postural control is achieved through the integration of vestibular, visual, and  
6  
7 somatosensory information. These sensory cues contribute to head/body orientation and  
8  
9 stabilization in space. Under quiet standing conditions and in healthy subjects, the most  
10  
11 sensitive information regarding body sway is provided by proprioceptive musculo-  
12  
13 articular cues; cutaneous cues from the feet, legs, and torso; and visual cues (Fitzpatrick  
14  
15 et al. 1994; Fitzpatrick and McCloskey 1994; Kavounoudias et al. 1998; Goble et al.  
16  
17 2009; Goble 2010; Lee et al. 2013). In healthy subjects, vestibular signals play a minor  
18  
19 role. In the present study, we emphasized the role of muscle proprioceptive signals.  
20  
21 More specifically, we investigated the consequences of proprioceptive optimization that  
22  
23 was achieved through stochastic resonance, which is a counterintuitive phenomenon by  
24  
25 which the addition of an optimal level of noise to a stimulus enables the detection of  
26  
27 subthreshold events. Stochastic resonance has been described in a variety of  
28  
29 physiological functions (reviews: Moss et al. 2004; McDonnell and Ward 2011). With  
30  
31 respect to postural control, in healthy subjects, improved balance performance was  
32  
33 reported for vestibular optimization that was achieved through vestibular stimulation  
34  
35 with subthreshold electrical noise (Mulavara et al. 2011; Goel et al. 2015). When plantar  
36  
37 skin information was optimized by applying vibrations to the soles of the feet, decreased  
38  
39 body sway was also reported in healthy young and elderly individuals (Priplata et al.  
40  
41 2003; Lipsitz et al. 2015), patients with diabetes, and stroke patients (Priplata et al.  
42  
43 2006). Finally, the application of electrical noise to the anterior and/or posterior ankle  
44  
45 muscles (Magalhaes and Kohn 2012; Magalhaes and Kohn 2014) or to the knee  
46  
47 (Gravelle et al. 2002) reduced the amplitude of postural sways. The application of  
48  
49 electrical noise to the ankle muscles is thought to result in stochastic resonance by  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

increasing the sensitivity of leg muscle spindles, which then results in improved postural control.

In the present study, we chose to optimize ankle proprioceptive cues by applying mechanical noise to ankle muscle tendons. We used this method because the effects of mechanical stimulation on neuromuscular function have been accurately described and provide a solid basis for understanding the potential postural effects. Indeed, improved movement detection due to the induction of stochastic resonance by mechanical stimulation was recently demonstrated for the first time (Ribot-Ciscar et al. 2013). More specifically, the application of an optimal-amplitude random mechanical vibration to both the extensor and flexor ankle muscle tendons was shown to improve the detection of imposed ankle movements that were initially subthreshold. In addition, microneurographic recordings revealed improved muscle spindle responses during the application of an optimal level of mechanical vibration to muscle tendons (Cordo et al. 1996; Ribot-Ciscar et al. 2013). In the present study, mechanical noise was applied to both the gastrocnemius/soleus (GS) muscles and the tibialis anterior (TA) muscle to optimize ankle proprioceptive cues.

In addition, even in a simple postural condition such as standing quietly on a firm support in a stable visual environment, interindividual variability has been reported in healthy subjects, *i.e.*, each person relies differently on the sensory information available for postural control. Comparative analysis of postural sway with eyes open (EO) and eyes closed (EC) revealed the different weighting the subjects applied to visual cues for the maintenance of static postural control. With EC, some subjects displayed larger postural sway, whereas for others, the oscillations were reduced (Lacour et al. 1997; Borel et al. 2008). Such individual differences may reflect the differential use of proprioceptive information for the control of static posture. Therefore, in the present

1 study, we sought to determine whether the consequences of ankle proprioceptive  
2 optimization were modulated according to individual sensory strategies for postural  
3 control. To determine the postural consequences of ankle proprioceptive optimization,  
4 we applied different levels of noise and compared the postural performance effects of  
5 each noise level to a control without noise. Postural performance was analyzed using  
6 posturographic and motion analysis evaluations.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13

14 Another main issue was to specify whether the effects of mechanical noise  
15 depended on the difficulty of postural control. Indeed, the natural activation of muscle  
16 spindles differs according to postural condition, and the consequences of mechanical  
17 noise may vary accordingly. Stochastic resonance may increase the number of recruited  
18 muscle spindles and/or their sensitivity. Therefore, applying mechanical noise to ankle  
19 muscle tendons may have differential effects under static and dynamic conditions. In  
20 addition to during the static quiet standing condition, the effect of noise was also  
21 analyzed while the subjects were standing on a foam block and in a dynamic condition  
22 that consisted of sinusoidal anteroposterior translations.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## Materials and methods

### Participants

Twenty healthy young subjects were included: 7 men (aged  $26.4 \pm 2.4$  years (mean  $\pm$  SD); body weight:  $67.4 \pm 7.5$  kg) and 13 women (aged  $27.6 \pm 6.0$  years; body weight:  $63.1 \pm 10.9$  kg). All participants met the following inclusion criteria: no previous physical, neurological, or sensory disorders; no medication that might influence balance; and no musculoskeletal impairment in the past 2 years. Each participant provided written informed consent prior to their inclusion in the study, and the study was approved by the local ethics committee (CPP Sud Méditerranée I # 14 001).

### Experimental protocol

The experiments were conducted while the participants stood quietly without making voluntary gestures and with their hands held in a natural position along the vertical body axis. The participants stood barefoot on a force plate mounted on a translator (Synapsys, Marseille, France) with their feet shoulder-width apart. The participants were tested under three postural conditions with EC. In the first (*static condition*), postural performance was evaluated on the motionless force plate by asking the participants to stand straight. In the second (*foam condition*), balance performance was measured while the participants stood on a 6-cm-thick foam pad (Airex Balance Pad); this condition was aimed at generating larger body oscillations. In the third (*dynamic condition*), the participants were tested on a moving platform that made sinusoidal anteroposterior translations with an amplitude of 7 cm and a frequency of 0.25 Hz. Twelve oscillation cycles were completed per trial. The participants were asked to keep their balance and avoid stepping. In all postural conditions, a special device prevented them from falling

1 in case they lost their balance. The 3 postural conditions (static, foam, and dynamic)  
2 were run in random order. In each postural condition, 5 noise levels (B0, B1, B2, B3,  
3 and B4) were randomly used. In addition, in the static condition, 3 more trials were  
4 performed with EO to determine the weighting of visual input in the postural control of  
5 each participant.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 Noise stimulation was synchronously initiated with the recording of posturographic and  
11 motion analysis data and was stopped at the end of the recording (trial duration: 51.2 s).  
12 Each participant completed the three experimental sessions on the same day, and each of  
13 the sessions included one postural condition and five noise levels; each noise was  
14 repeated three times. All of the participants completed all of the postural conditions. To  
15 rule out the effect of fatigue, a 20-s delay was included between each consecutive trial;  
16 during this delay, the participants were required to move their ankles and knees. In  
17 addition, a 5-minute rest period, during which the participants sat on a chair, was  
18 observed every six trials. Considering potential carry-over effect, this delay may be too  
19 short but may have been minimized by randomizing conditions and noise stimulation  
20 intensities. To avoid surprise and startle responses, in each experimental condition, the  
21 participants completed one trial before the start of data acquisition.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

### 43 **Mechanical noise stimulation**

44 During quiet standing, the TA muscle is mostly passive, whereas the GS muscles are  
45 generally active (Aniss et al. 1990). Consequently, muscle proprioceptive information  
46 that originates from the TA muscle is related only to ankle movement, while that arising  
47 from the GS muscles is also due to the contraction of intrafusal muscle fibers (Hulliger  
48 et al. 1985; al-Falahe et al. 1990; Ribot-Ciscar and Roll 1998). For this reason, it is  
49 generally agreed that TA muscle proprioceptive information is principally involved in  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1 the coding of ankle movements (Di Giulio et al. 2009), and it may seem reasonable to  
2 apply mechanical noise to these muscles only. However, because the proprioceptive role  
3 of the anterior and posterior leg muscles may also change according to the direction of  
4 postural oscillations, we chose to simultaneously vibrate the TA and GS muscle tendons.  
5  
6  
7  
8

9 Two light vibrating elements (C-2 tactor, Engineering Acoustics, Winter Park,  
10 FL, USA) were strapped to both ankles over the distal tendon of the TA and GS muscles  
11 with soft elastic tape. The noise generator consisted of a single-chip record/playback  
12 device that delivered a digitized white noise signal band-pass filtered at 100-300 Hz  
13 (Priplata et al. 2003). The noise was applied at levels that were called B1, B2, B3 and  
14 B4, which corresponded to an amplitude with a root mean square of 20, 30, 100, and 280  
15  $\mu\text{m}$ , respectively. The absence of noise, *i.e.*, the control trial, was referred to as B0. The  
16 same stimulation signals were simultaneously delivered to both the TA and GS muscle  
17 tendons. Noises at the two lower levels were not perceived, while those at the two higher  
18 levels were slightly-to-clearly perceivable.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

### 34 **Data acquisition and processing**

35 Postural control was assessed by means of posturography and motion analysis  
36 evaluations.  
37  
38

#### 39 *Posturographic evaluation of postural performance*

40 In each of the three postural conditions, 51.2-s recordings were acquired. The center of  
41 foot pressure (CoP) displacement was sampled at 40 Hz in the static and foam conditions  
42 and at 100 Hz in the dynamic condition. The recordings were processed using  
43 PosturoPro software (Framiral, Cannes, France) to analyze the postural sway of the  
44 participant. Body sway was analyzed by CoP displacement in the anteroposterior  
45 direction. Postural performance was quantified using both the CoP area (the area of the  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 confidence ellipse including 95% of the CoP displacements, mm<sup>2</sup>) and the wavelet  
2 transformation (time-frequency analysis), which is a more accurate non-linear analysis  
3 of the CoP displacement processing of the postural data (Lacour et al. 2008; Bernard-  
4 Demanze et al. 2009; Young et al. 2012). The wavelet transformation method provides a  
5 three-dimensional representation of body sway: the CoP displacement frequency as a  
6 function of time, and as a third dimension, the spectral power is represented by a color  
7 code (“hot” colors for high powers and “cold” colors for low powers). The wavelet  
8 analysis enabled us to compute the mean spectral power for all frequencies over the  
9 entire recording time. The mean spectral power density of the recorded signal was  
10 divided into three frequency bands (0.05–0.5 Hz, 0.5–1.5 Hz, and 1.5–10 Hz; arbitrary  
11 units: AU). These steps in the analysis of body sway are illustrated in Figure 1.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

29 *(Figure 1 about here)*  
30  
31  
32  
33

### 34 *Motion analysis evaluation of postural performance*

35 Motion recordings were made along with the postural recordings of CoP displacements.  
36 Body stabilization was recorded using a video motion analyzer (Codamotion,  
37 Charnwood Dynamics, UK). Six active markers were placed on the head (in infraorbital  
38 and acoustic meatus positions), acromion, iliac crest, patella, and ankle on one side of  
39 the body. Two supplementary markers were also placed on the platform. Marker  
40 positions were sampled every 10 ms (100 Hz). In our experimental setup, the overall  
41 accuracy of marker angular position was ~0.02°. For all postural conditions, body  
42 segment angular displacements were measured in the XY, XZ, and YZ planes and  
43 computed from the position of each active marker. The two markers placed on the head  
44 allowed the Frankfurt plane to be defined. Head stabilization was defined as the variance  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 of each angle (Tardieu et al. 2009). In the dynamic condition, the gain of head  
2 compensatory control was computed as the ratio of head motion in space to platform  
3 motion. Similar calculations were made to obtain trunk (acromion and iliac crest), hip  
4 (iliac crest and patella), and knee (patella and ankle) stabilization and gain.  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

### 10 11 *Sensory strategy for posture control*

12  
13  
14 Based on the hypothesis that the effects of mechanical noise stimulation may depend on  
15 the weighting of sensory information for postural control, we quantified the weighting of  
16 visual cues for postural quality control in each participant. To accomplish this, we used  
17 the mean Percentage Difference of postural Sway (PDS) as evaluated by the ratio [(EC  
18 area-EO area)/(EC area+EO area)x100] (Lacour et al. 1997). Positive values indicate  
19 larger-amplitude body sway with EC compared to EO, suggesting a major contribution  
20 of visual cues to postural control (referred to as a visual postural strategy). In contrast,  
21 negative values indicate smaller-amplitude body sway with EC compared to EO,  
22 suggesting that the participant did not rely on visual cues to control their posture  
23 (referred to as a nonvisual strategy). The mean PDS was calculated for the static postural  
24 condition.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

### 43 **Statistical analyses**

44  
45 For each participant, each noise was applied three times in each experimental condition.  
46  
47 The average of the 3 measurements obtained for each variable was analyzed. The  
48 parameters used in the posturographic evaluation of postural performance through body  
49 sway (CoP area and the spectral power density of the three frequency bands) were  
50 analyzed using Friedman ANOVAs and post hoc Wilcoxon tests. We used  
51 nonparametric statistics because the data did not meet the normality requirement of  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

ANOVA, as revealed by Shapiro-Wilk test. The effects of gender and visual dependency were evaluated in the control trial (without noise) and when noise was applied using the Mann-Whitney U test. For each of these parameters, the data obtained for the different noise levels (B0, B1, B2, B3, and B4) were compared. Separate ANOVAs were performed for all three postural conditions (static, foam, and dynamic). The motion analysis postural performance data were analyzed by using ANOVAs to compare the displacement of the different markers located on the body. ANOVAs were also used to compare body segment (head, trunk, hip, and knee) stabilization between all three postural conditions. For the dynamic postural condition, an additional ANOVA was used to analyze the effect of noise through the gain of the head, trunk, hip and knee. The results were considered statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$ .

## Results

### Noise stimulation effect on postural performance in the static condition

The wavelet transformation data reported for the anteroposterior direction showed that the mean spectral power density in the first frequency band (0.05 to 0.5 Hz), which corresponded to the slowest movements, was significantly lower when mechanical noise was applied compared to control (absence of noise: B0) (Friedman ANOVA,  $\chi^2_{(20, 4)}=10.16$ ;  $p<0.04$ ), indicating a lower energetic cost. These data indicate that postural control improved when mechanical noise was applied. More detailed analysis revealed that the effect of noise was significant only for B2 (Wilcoxon test,  $p<0.02$ ), with a mean decrease in spectral power density of  $30.4\pm 13.8\%$  (Fig. 2). For the middle frequency range (0.5-1.5 Hz), the mean spectral power density noise stimulation was  $15\pm 19.7\%$  lower for B2 than B0. However, this difference was not significant ( $p=0.41$ ). For the highest frequency range (1.5-10 Hz), the mean spectral power density for the B2 noise stimulation was significantly lower than that for B0 ( $p<0.02$ ), with a mean decrease of  $22.6\pm 9.0\%$ . The data analysis also indicated that most of the signal power was in the low frequency band (Fig. 1). The mean spectral power density of body sway recorded in the low, medium, and high frequency bands represented 93.8%, 5.9%, and 0.3%, respectively, of the total spectral power density of body sway. Because the B2 noise significantly improved postural control, B2 was defined as “optimal” compared to the other noise levels. A systematic check indicated that this noise level was not perceived. Statistical analysis performed on the wavelet transformation data reported for the mediolateral direction showed no significant effect of noise for all three frequency bands. Finally, the traditional posturography data were less discriminating since the variance analysis showed that the CoP area did not significantly differ between the noise stimulation and control without noise.

(Figure 2 about here)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 ANOVA of the motion analysis data showed that neither the head stabilization  
6  
7 nor the stabilization of the other body segments differed between the various mechanical  
8  
9 noise stimulations. Figure 3 illustrates the head stabilization, *i.e.*, the head angular  
10  
11 displacement in the three spatial planes (sagittal, frontal and horizontal). Similar results  
12  
13 were obtained for trunk, hip and knee stabilization. Thus, in our young and healthy  
14  
15 participants, the improved postural performance, as demonstrated by the reduced  
16  
17 spectral power density, was not associated with improved head or other body segment  
18  
19 stabilization in space.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 (Figure 3 about here)

28  
29  
30  
31 The effect of noise on postural control, as evaluated using the spectral power density  
32  
33 parameter, indicated considerable interindividual variability: the standard deviations  
34  
35 were large, suggesting that the noise effect varied among the participants. To pinpoint  
36  
37 individual differences in the effect of noise stimulation on postural performance, we  
38  
39 evaluated the correlation between the noise effect and postural performance without  
40  
41 noise. The noise effect was expressed as the ratio between the spectral power density for  
42  
43 B0 (without noise) and spectral power density for B2 (the optimal noise level). These  
44  
45 data are illustrated in Figure 4 and revealed a positive correlation between the noise  
46  
47 effect and postural performance without noise (Pearson  $r=0.56$ ;  $p<0.01$ ) for individual  
48  
49 mean data. In other words, the effect of noise stimulation on postural performance in the  
50  
51 static condition depended on individual postural performance without noise: the higher  
52  
53 the spectral power density for B0, the greater the noise effect.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

(Figure 4 about here)

To evaluate the sensory strategy used for posture control, we quantified the weighting of visual cues for postural control in the static condition. For each participant, body sway area with EO and EC was compared using the PDS. The PDS allowed us to directly compare the participants and to rank them along a continuum whose extremes were between 100 and -100. The histogram in Figure 5 shows the distribution of PDS values. Ten participants (visual participants) exhibited a positive mean PDS of  $21.2 \pm 19.4\%$  (mean $\pm$ SE) (range 4 to 65%). They swayed more with EC than with EO; therefore, visual cues played a major role in the postural control strategy of these participants (*i.e.*, they used a visual strategy to control their posture). The remaining 10 participants (nonvisual participants) showed a negative mean PDS of  $-20.1 \pm 11.9\%$  (range -1 to -35%). They swayed less with EC than with EO, indicating that they did not rely on visual cues to control their posture (*i.e.*, they used a nonvisual strategy to control their posture).

A Mann-Whitney test performed on the spectral power density without noise (B0) indicated that there was no effect of sensory strategy for postural control in our participants ( $Z=1.74$ ;  $p=0.08$ ). Moreover, the effect of noise did not significantly differ between the visual and nonvisual participants ( $Z=0.26$ ;  $p=0.79$ ). Therefore, the individual differences in the effect of mechanical noise stimulation on postural performance described above were not related to the sensory strategy that the participants' preferentially used for postural control. Additionally, the interindividual variability was not explained by the participants' gender because no gender effect was found for B0 ( $Z=0.36$ ;  $p=0.75$ ). The effect of noise was also similar in women and men ( $Z=1.18$ ;  $p=0.23$ ).

1  
2 (Figure 5 about here)  
3  
4  
5  
6

7 **Effect of noise stimulation on postural performance in the foam and dynamic**  
8  
9 **conditions**  
10

11 A comparison of the effect of the optimal noise on postural control in the different  
12 postural conditions is illustrated in Figure 6. In the foam condition, a Wilcoxon test  
13 indicated the absence of significant changes in spectral power density in the  
14 anteroposterior direction during mechanical noise stimulation compared to during the  
15 absence of noise. However, a trend towards significance ( $p=0.07$ ) was found in the lower  
16 frequency band (0.05–0.5 Hz), with a mean decrease in spectral power density of  
17 13.1±15.3% for B2 noise stimulation compared to B0. In the 0.5–1.5 Hz and 1.5–10 Hz  
18 frequency bands, no significant differences in spectral power density were found  
19 between B0 and B2. Statistical analysis of the wavelet transformation data for the  
20 mediolateral direction revealed the absence of a significant effect of noise for all three  
21 frequency bands. These data were associated with the absence of difference in head,  
22 trunk, hip and knee stabilization between B0 and B2.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 In the dynamic condition, when the platform was sinusoidally translated in the  
42 anteroposterior direction, the application of noise to the ankle tendons did not induce  
43 postural changes. This was true for the mean spectral power density, which did not  
44 significantly differ between the optimal noise (B2) and without noise (B0) conditions for  
45 any of the frequency bands in both the anteroposterior and mediolateral directions.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



(Table 1 & Figure 6 about here)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 It is noteworthy that in the foam and dynamic conditions, the participants  
6  
7 displayed larger-amplitude body sways to maintain their balance. Compared to those in  
8  
9 the static condition, the spectral power density values were significantly larger in the  
10  
11 foam condition, ( $\text{Chi}^2_{(20, 9)}=140.6$ ;  $p<0.00001$ ) as were the linear displacements in the  
12  
13 anteroposterior direction of the markers located on the body ( $F_{(1,19)}=124.72$ ;  $p<0.00001$   
14  
15 for the head, trunk, hip, knee, and ankle) (Fig. 6). Such displacements result from both  
16  
17 rotation and/or translation of the body segment supporting the markers. In the dynamic  
18  
19 condition, the spectral power values were increased even farther over those in both the  
20  
21 static ( $\text{Chi}^2_{(20, 9)}=139.4$ ;  $p<0.00001$ ) and foam ( $\text{Chi}^2_{(20, 9)}=133.4$ ;  $p<0.00001$ ) conditions.  
22  
23 Similar findings were observed for the markers' linear displacements in the  
24  
25 anteroposterior direction ( $F_{(1,19)}=2637.67$ ;  $p<0.00001$  and  $F_{(1,19)}=640.14$ ;  $p<0.00001$  for  
26  
27 the static and foam conditions, respectively) (Fig. 6). In the foam and dynamic  
28  
29 conditions, the mean ankle linear displacement in the anteroposterior direction was  
30  
31 increased by a factor of 5.7 and 94.2, respectively, and the mean knee linear  
32  
33 displacement was increased by a factor of 3.0 and 12.6, providing evidence of a major  
34  
35 increase in leg movements in these conditions compared to the static postural condition.  
36  
37 For comparison, the linear displacement of other body parts was also increased but to a  
38  
39 lesser extent: by a factor of 2.8 and 6.8 for the hip and by a factor of 2.4 and 4.8 for the  
40  
41 head. This increase in leg movements may account for the differential effects of  
42  
43 mechanical noise stimulation on postural performance in the different postural  
44  
45 conditions.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## Discussion

This study investigated the effect of the application of mechanical noise to ankle muscle tendons on postural control in healthy young adults as well as the consequences of increasing postural difficulty. The effects of ankle proprioceptive optimization during different postural conditions (static, foam and dynamic sinusoidal anteroposterior translation) were studied while the participants' eyes were closed. Postural performance was analyzed for different noise levels using posturographic and motion analysis evaluations. The effects of different noise levels were compared to a control response without noise.

### **1. The application of mechanical noise to ankle muscle tendons improves postural control during the maintenance of an upright stance**

In the present study, the wavelet transformation data demonstrated a reduction in the spectral power density of body sway in the anteroposterior direction specifically in the frequency bands that corresponded to the slowest and fastest movements. In the middle frequency band, an average reduction was observed, but it did not reach significance. These results highlight a decrease in the energetic cost of maintaining an upright stance during the application of mechanical noise to the ankle muscle tendons. Postural improvement was reported only for the B2 noise level, which corresponded to stochastic stimulation with a mean amplitude of 30  $\mu\text{m}$  and was referred to as the optimal noise level. This noise level was not perceived, ruling out the possibility that attentional changes affected postural control during ankle stimulation. The improvement of postural performance was not significant when it was evaluated based on CoP area. This finding confirms our previous data indicating that non-linear analyses are more discriminating

1 than the classical parameter of CoP area (Bernard-Demanze et al. 2009; Young et al.  
2 2012). However, during quiet standing, no significant differences in body segment  
3 stabilization were reported between the B2 noise level and the control without noise.  
4 These results are probably related to the fact that the participants tested in this study  
5 were young and healthy and therefore had good balance and could easily maintain an  
6 upright stance in the static condition. Stabilization of the head and other body segments  
7 may have already been optimal. We demonstrated that the stabilization of head and other  
8 body segments remained unchanged even in the participants whose body sway showed  
9 the greatest improvement.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 In a previous study that used the same methodology, we showed that the  
23 application of mechanical noise to the ankle muscle tendons improved the detection of  
24 the direction of imposed movements that were initially subthreshold (Ribot-Ciscar et al.  
25 2013). More specifically, the optimal level of noise, which was associated with the best  
26 discriminative performance of movement direction, was the same as the one that led to  
27 the best postural performance in the current study (B2 noise level). The effect of the  
28 application of mechanical noise can be explained by stochastic resonance. As a simple  
29 explanation, the addition of optimal noise leads to small membrane potential fluctuations  
30 that cause receptors to reach threshold for stimuli that were initially subthreshold  
31 (Volgushev and Eysel 2000). Therefore, the noise effect found here presumes the  
32 presence of muscle spindles that are not recruited by the ankle displacements and that  
33 these muscle receptors are close to threshold, which is then surpassed due to the  
34 application of noise. These hypotheses are rooted in microneurographic recording-based  
35 demonstrations of improved muscle spindle responses during noise stimulation (Cordo et  
36 al. 1996; Ribot-Ciscar et al. 2013). However, the possibility that proprioceptive  
37 information of cutaneous origin might also be improved cannot be completely ruled out.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 This type of increase in the number of recruited proprioceptors increases proprioceptive  
2 feedback, which, in turn, improves the detection of ankle movements and, ultimately,  
3 postural performance.  
4  
5

6  
7 An improvement in static postural control via stochastic resonance is consistent  
8 with previous reports of the enhancement of plantar cutaneous information by  
9 mechanical noise (Priplata et al. 2003; Priplata et al. 2006) and by noisy electrical  
10 stimulation of the vestibular system (Mulavara et al. 2011; Goel et al. 2015). More  
11 particularly, the present results agree with the studies of Magalhaes and Kohn  
12 (Magalhaes and Kohn 2012; Magalhaes and Kohn 2014) and Gravelle and collaborators  
13 (Gravelle et al. 2002), which investigated the effect of electrical noise stimulation of the  
14 ankle and knee muscles, respectively.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 In addition, the present results revealed considerable interindividual variability.  
27 We found that the effect of noise stimulation on postural performance in the static  
28 condition depended on individual postural performance in the absence of noise. The  
29 greater the body sways in the absence of noise, the greater the noise effect. These results  
30 are consistent with stochastic resonance. We suggest that the larger the participant's  
31 postural oscillations, the greater the number of muscle spindles near threshold, and the  
32 more the addition of noise improves movement coding and postural performance. This  
33 type of baseline-dependent effect of stochastic mechanical stimulation has been  
34 described for postural variability (Priplata et al. 2006; Kelty-Stephen and Dixon 2013) as  
35 well as for spatial stride-to-stride variability in gait (Galica et al. 2009; Stephen et al.  
36 2012), *i.e.*, stochastic resonance results in greater reductions in variability in subjects  
37 with greater baseline variability. Our data suggest that individual differences in the  
38 effect of mechanical noise stimulation on postural performance are not based on the  
39 participants' preferred sensory strategy for postural control. Stated another way, the  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 effect of mechanical noise stimulation does not depend on the initial weighting of visual  
2 and proprioceptive cues in the absence of noise.  
3  
4  
5  
6

## 7 **2. Mechanical noise is ineffective in more challenging postural conditions**

8

9 Because the application of mechanical noise to ankle muscle tendons can be used to  
10 facilitate an upright stance, we were even more interested to investigate this effect under  
11 more challenging postural conditions. Our results showed that when postural difficulty  
12 was increased through the use of a foam pad or by sinusoidally translating the support  
13 platform in the anteroposterior direction, the application of mechanical noise was  
14 ineffective, *i.e.*, body sway was not significantly improved compared to that observed  
15 without noise. In both the foam and dynamic conditions, these data were confirmed by  
16 motion analysis, which showed that head and body segment stabilization remained  
17 unchanged during the noise stimulation. Note that in the foam condition, although noise-  
18 induced changes tended to decrease the spectral power density in the lower frequency  
19 band, the trend did not reach significance ( $p=0.07$ ).  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 Under conditions of decreased stability, such as in the foam and dynamic  
37 conditions, ankle displacements are larger, resulting in greater recruitment of anterior  
38 and posterior leg muscle spindles. Consequently, the number of muscle spindles that  
39 were silent in the absence of noise and likely to be recruited during the application of  
40 noise was probably very small in the foam condition and even smaller in the dynamic  
41 condition; this small number of available muscle spindles would explain the absence of  
42 noise-induced postural improvement. Moreover, muscle spindles recruited by  
43 suprathereshold movements may elicit movement-induced responses contaminated by  
44 vibration-induced responses (Roll et al. 1989). This type of mixed response to both  
45 vibration and movement has been previously demonstrated to degrade upright standing  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

in young as well as older adults (Hay et al. 1996) and may be partially responsible for the absence of improvement observed in the dynamic condition in the present study.

## Conclusion

In summary, we showed that the application of subthreshold mechanical noise to the ankle muscle tendons improves postural control during quiet standing. The effect of the application of mechanical noise can be explained by stochastic resonance. The underlying mechanism involves an increased recruitment of proprioceptors and especially muscle spindles. The increased recruitment of muscle spindles increases proprioceptive feedback, which, in turn, improves postural performance. We reported considerable variability in the effects of mechanical noise stimulation among the participants. This variability depends on the initial body sway: the greater the amplitude of body sways in the absence of noise, the greater the noise effect. Moreover, a fixed noise (*i.e.*, not adjusted to the muscle spindle sensory threshold) may have different effects in different people and may account for the variability of postural responses observed among our participants. This variability also does not seem to be based on the participants' preferred sensory strategy for postural control. Furthermore, we found that the effect of mechanical noise stimulation was ineffective in more challenging postural conditions.

These results identify possible mechanisms for the effects of subthreshold mechanical stimulation of the ankle muscle tendons. Because a better postural response was obtained in the healthy young subjects, more consistent improvement can be expected in persons with balance problems. This may be the case for older adults in whom ankle proprioceptive acuity is impaired (Goble et al. 2009) and in patients with vestibular deficits that are not fully compensated because they favor visual cues

(Guerraz et al. 2001), which could negatively impact proprioceptive cues. For patients, mechanical stimulation may also be effective in more challenging postural conditions due to the reduced involvement of muscle spindles in the maintenance of balance as well as during complex tasks that involve increased cognitive load (Keshner et al. 2014). All of these considerations suggest that subthreshold mechanical noise stimulation may be a simple tool to facilitate the rehabilitation of patients with postural deficits.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## Figure legends

**Fig. 1:** Posturographic recording analysis for the static, foam, and dynamic postural conditions. *Top:* CoP displacement in the anteroposterior direction. *Middle:* three-dimensional chart obtained by wavelet analysis. Time is represented on the abscissa, while frequency is represented on the ordinate. Spectral density power is color coded. *Bottom:* spectral density power versus frequency plot.

**Fig. 2:** Effect of mechanical noise stimulation on postural performance in the static postural condition. Spectral power density in the three frequency bands for the different noise levels (B0: no noise, B1: 20  $\mu\text{m}$ , B2: 30  $\mu\text{m}$ , B3: 100  $\mu\text{m}$ , and B4: 280  $\mu\text{m}$ ). Vertical bars represent the standard error. Significant differences between noise levels are indicated by asterisks. \*  $p < 0.05$ . Note that B2 is the optimal noise level.

**Fig. 3:** Effect of mechanical noise stimulation on head stabilization. Head stabilization in the three spatial planes for the five noise levels in the static postural condition.

**Fig. 4:** Correlation between the amplitude of the effect of noise and the initial postural stability in the static condition for each subject. Abscissa: the effect of noise corresponds to the ratio between the spectral power density for B0 and B2. Ordinate: the postural stability corresponds to the mean spectral power density in the control test (without noise). Both types of measures correspond to the low frequency band (0.05-0.5 Hz).



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

**Fig. 5:** Individual sensory strategies used for posture control. Histogram of the number of participants in bins of 10% that represent the percentage difference of sway (PDS) with eyes closed compared to eyes open in the static postural condition.

31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

**Fig. 6:** Effect of mechanical noise stimulation on postural performance in the static, foam, and dynamic postural conditions. *Top:* posturographic evaluation of postural performance. Comparison of the mean spectral power density in the 0.05- to 0.5-Hz frequency band for postural performance without noise (B0) and with the optimal noise level (B2). The same conventions used in Fig. 2 are applied. *Bottom:* motion analysis evaluation of postural performance. Schematic representation of a participant standing on the platform. The mean displacement of markers on the head, shoulder, hip, knee, and ankle over all of the participants, as reported for postural responses without noise (B0).

### **Acknowledgments**

This study was supported by grants from Ministère de l'Enseignement Supérieur et de la Recherche (CNRS UMR 7260). The authors would like to thank Michel Dumitrescu, Jacques Léonard and Nelson Martins Gomes for assistance. We also thank American Journal Experts for revising the English manuscript.

**Conflicts of interest:** none

1  
2 **References**  
3

- 4 al-Falahe NA, Nagaoka M, Vallbo AB (1990) Response profiles of human muscle  
5 afferents during active finger movements. *Brain* 113 (Pt 2):325-346  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 Aniss AM, Diener HC, Hore J, Gandevia SC, Burke D (1990) Behavior of human  
11 muscle receptors when reliant on proprioceptive feedback during standing. *J*  
12 *Neurophysiol* 64:661-670  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19 Bernard-Demanze L, Dumitrescu M, Jimeno P, Borel L, Lacour M (2009) Age-related  
20 changes in posture control are differentially affected by postural and cognitive task  
21 complexity. *Curr Aging Sci* 2:139-149  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 Borel L, Lopez C, Péruch P, Lacour M (2008) Vestibular syndrome: a change in internal  
28 spatial representation. *Neurophysiol Clin* 38:375-389  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33 Cordo P, Inglis JT, Verschueren S, et al. (1996) Noise in human muscle spindles. *Nature*  
34 383:769-770  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39 Di Giulio I, Maganaris CN, Baltzopoulos V, Loram ID (2009) The proprioceptive and  
40 agonist roles of gastrocnemius, soleus and tibialis anterior muscles in maintaining  
41 human upright posture. *J Physiol* 587:2399-2416  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47 Fitzpatrick R, Burke D, Gandevia SC (1994) Task-dependent reflex responses and  
48 movement illusions evoked by galvanic vestibular stimulation in standing humans.  
49 *J Physiol* 478 ( Pt 2):363-372  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56 Fitzpatrick R, McCloskey DI (1994) Proprioceptive, visual and vestibular thresholds for  
57 the perception of sway during standing in humans. *J Physiol* 478 ( Pt 1):173-186  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1 Galica AM, Kang HG, Priplata AA, et al. (2009) Subsensory vibrations to the feet  
2 reduce gait variability in elderly fallers. *Gait Posture* 30:383-387  
3  
4  
5  
6 Goble DJ (2010) Proprioceptive acuity assessment via joint position matching: from  
7  
8 basic science to general practice. *Phys Ther* 90:1176-1184  
9  
10  
11 Goble DJ, Coxon JP, Wenderoth N, Van Impe A, Swinnen SP (2009) Proprioceptive  
12 sensibility in the elderly: degeneration, functional consequences and plastic-  
13  
14 adaptive processes. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 33:271-278  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20 Goel R, Kofman I, Jeevarajan J, De Dios Y, Cohen HS, Bloomberg JJ, Mulavara AP  
21  
22 (2015) Using Low Levels of Stochastic Vestibular Stimulation to Improve Balance  
23  
24 Function. *PLoS One* 10:e0136335  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29 Gravelle DC, Laughton CA, Dhruv NT, Katdare KD, Niemi JB, Lipsitz LA, Collins JJ  
30  
31 (2002) Noise-enhanced balance control in older adults. *Neuroreport* 13:1853-1856  
32  
33  
34  
35 Guerraz M, Yardley L, Bertholon P, Pollak L, Rudge P, Gresty MA, Bronstein AM  
36  
37 (2001) Visual vertigo: symptom assessment, spatial orientation and postural  
38  
39 control. *Brain* 124:1646-1656  
40  
41  
42  
43 Hay L, Bard C, Fleury M, Teasdale N (1996) Availability of visual and proprioceptive  
44 afferent messages and postural control in elderly adults. *Exp Brain Res* 108:129-  
45  
46 139  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51 Hulliger M, Nordh E, Vallbo AB (1985) Discharge in muscle spindle afferents related to  
52  
53 direction of slow precision movements in man. *J Physiol* 362:437-453  
54  
55  
56  
57 Kavounoudias A, Roll R, Roll JP (1998) The plantar sole is a 'dynamometric map' for  
58  
59 human balance control. *Neuroreport* 9 (14): 3247-3252  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 Kelty-Stephen DG, Dixon JA (2013) Temporal correlations in postural sway moderate  
2 effects of stochastic resonance on postural stability. *Hum Mov Sci* 32:91-105  
3

4  
5  
6 Keshner EA, Slaboda JC, Day LL, Darvish K (2014) Visual conflict and cognitive load  
7 modify postural responses to vibrotactile noise. *J Neuroeng Rehabil* 11:6  
8  
9

10  
11 Lacour M, Barthelemy J, Borel L, Magnan J, Xerri C, Chays A, Ouaknine M (1997)  
12 Sensory strategies in human postural control before and after unilateral vestibular  
13 neurotomy. *Exp Brain Res* 115:300-310  
14  
15  
16

17  
18  
19  
20 Lacour M, Bernard-Demanze L, Dumitrescu M (2008) Posture control, aging, and  
21 attention resources: models and posture-analysis methods. *Neurophysiol Clin*  
22  
23 38:411-421  
24  
25  
26

27  
28  
29 Lee BC, Martin BJ, Ho A, Sienko KH (2013) Postural reorganization induced by torso  
30 cutaneous covibration. *J Neurosci* 33: 7870-7876  
31  
32

33  
34  
35 Lipsitz LA, Lough M, Niemi J, Trivison T, Howlett H, Manor B (2015) A shoe insole  
36 delivering subsensory vibratory noise improves balance and gait in healthy elderly  
37 people. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 96:432-439  
38  
39  
40

41  
42  
43 Magalhaes FH, Kohn AF (2012) Imperceptible electrical noise attenuates isometric  
44 plantar flexion force fluctuations with correlated reductions in postural sway. *Exp*  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

McDonnell MD, Ward LM (2011) The benefits of noise in neural systems: bridging theory and experiment. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 12:415-426

Moss F, Ward LM, Sannita WG (2004) Stochastic resonance and sensory information processing: a tutorial and review of application. *Clin Neurophysiol* 115:267-281

Mulavara AP, Fiedler MJ, Kofman IS, et al. (2011) Improving balance function using vestibular stochastic resonance: optimizing stimulus characteristics. *Exp Brain Res* 210:303-312

Priplata AA, Niemi JB, Harry JD, Lipsitz LA, Collins JJ (2003) Vibrating insoles and balance control in elderly people. *Lancet* 362:1123-1124

Priplata AA, Patritti BL, Niemi JB, et al. (2006) Noise-enhanced balance control in patients with diabetes and patients with stroke. *Ann Neurol* 59:4-12

Ribot-Ciscar E, Hospod V, Aimonetti JM (2013) Noise-enhanced kinaesthesia: a psychophysical and microneurographic study. *Exp Brain Res* 228:503-511

Ribot-Ciscar E, Roll JP (1998) Ago-antagonist muscle spindle inputs contribute together to joint movement coding in man. *Brain Res* 791:167-176

Roll JP, Vedel JP, Ribot E (1989) Alteration of proprioceptive messages induced by tendon vibration in man: a microneurographic study. *Exp Brain Res* 76:213-222

Stephen DG, Wilcox BJ, Niemi JB, Franz JR, Kerrigan D, D'Andrea SE (2012) Baseline-dependent effect of noise-enhanced insoles on gait variability in healthy elderly walkers. *Gait Posture* 36:537-540

1 Tardieu C, Dumitrescu M, Giraudeau A, Blanc JL, Cheynet F, Borel L (2009) Dental  
2 occlusion and postural control in adults. Neurosci Lett 450:221-224  
3

4  
5 Volgushev M, Eysel UT (2000) Neuroscience. Noise makes sense in neuronal  
6 computing. Science 290:1908-1909  
7

8  
9  
10  
11 Young LR, Bernard-Demanze L, Dumitrescu M, Magnan J, Borel L, Lacour M (2012)  
12 Postural performance of vestibular loss patients under increased postural threat. J  
13 Vestib Res 22:129-138  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

**Table 1.** Average gain for each noise stimulation level.  
Mean ( $\pm 95\%$  confidence intervals).

	<b>Head</b>	<b>Trunk</b>	<b>Hip</b>	<b>Knee</b>
B0	1.7 $\pm$ 0.07	1.6 $\pm$ 0.06	1.5 $\pm$ 0.05	1.1 $\pm$ 0.02
B1	1.6 $\pm$ 0.10	1.6 $\pm$ 0.08	1.4 $\pm$ 0.06	1.1 $\pm$ 0.03
B2	1.7 $\pm$ 0.08	1.6 $\pm$ 0.07	1.5 $\pm$ 0.06	1.2 $\pm$ 0.03
B3	1.6 $\pm$ 0.10	1.6 $\pm$ 0.08	1.4 $\pm$ 0.06	1.1 $\pm$ 0.04
B4	1.7 $\pm$ 0.07	1.6 $\pm$ 0.06	1.5 $\pm$ 0.06	1.2 $\pm$ 0.03




Figure 1






Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 4




Figure 5




Figure 6