Direct and indirect effects of attention and visual function on gait impairment in Parkinson’s disease: influence of task and turning
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Abstract

Gait impairment is a core feature of Parkinson’s disease (PD) which has been linked to cognitive and visual deficits, but interactions between these features are poorly understood. Monitoring saccades allows investigation of real-time cognitive and visual processes and their impact on gait when walking. This study explored; 1) saccade frequency when walking under different attentional manipulations of turning and dual-task; and 2) direct and indirect relationships between saccades, gait impairment, vision and attention. Saccade frequency (number of fast eye-movements per-second) was measured during gait in 60 PD and 40 age-matched control participants using a mobile eye-tracker. Saccade frequency was significantly reduced in PD compared to controls during all conditions. However, saccade frequency increased with a turn and decreased under dual-task for both groups. Poorer attention directly related to saccade frequency, visual function and gait impairment in PD, but not controls. Saccade frequency did not directly relate to gait in PD, but did in controls. Instead, saccade frequency and visual function deficit indirectly impacted gait impairment in PD, which was underpinned by their relationship with attention. In conclusion, our results suggest a vital role for attention with direct and indirect influences on gait impairment in PD. Attention directly impacted saccade frequency, visual function and gait impairment in PD, with connotations for falls. It also underpinned indirect impact of visual and saccadic impairment on gait. Attention therefore represents a key therapeutic target that should be considered in future research.
Introduction

Parkinson’s disease (PD) is a progressive neurodegenerative disorder characterised by cardinal motor symptoms of rigidity, bradykinesia, tremor, postural instability and gait deficit. Gait impairments present early (Galna et al., 2015) and are difficult to treat due to their refractory nature to dopaminergic treatment (Sethi, 2008). Deficits lead to significant disability and increased falls risk (Lord et al., 2016). While the motor contributions to gait are well studied, considerable non-motor contributions are increasingly becoming evidence especially the role of cognition and vision.

Cognitive deficits in PD are common, early features and include impaired executive function, visuo-spatial ability, working memory and attention, with features such as language less affected (Yarnall et al., 2014; Barker & Williams-Gray, 2015). Attention is a key contributor to gait control and gait impairment even in very early PD (Galna et al., 2015) supported by studies showing a strong association between them (Lord et al., 2014), as well as the effect of dual-task protocols on gait (Kelly et al., 2012; Rochester et al., 2014). Visual deficits are also common in PD and range from impaired visual functions such as visual acuity (VA) and contrast sensitivity (CS) to more complex processes such as depth or motion perception (Weil et al., 2016). Emerging evidence has also shown that visual dysfunction is associated with gait impairment (Spaulding et al., 1994; Swigler et al., 2012; Shin et al., 2015) and manipulation of vision through environmental changes negatively impacts gait in PD (Azulay et al., 1999; Davidsdottir et al., 2008; Cowie et al., 2010; Lebold & Almeida, 2010).

The relationship between attention, visual function and gait impairment in PD has been studied independently of each other therefore interactions between these features remain poorly understood (Stuart et al., 2016c). Relationships between vision, cognition and gait are complex, but attention likely has a central role in gait and saccadic control (Stuart et al., 2016c). During
goal-oriented tasks (e.g. gait) attention mediates visual processing of environmental information at multiple sites in the central nervous system (Borji et al., 2011); from initial visual target selection for safe navigation to high level executive processes (Baluch & Itti, 2011). Early attentional biasing of visual information (Bar et al., 2006) indicates that even though vision and cognition interact, they are possibly underpinned by attention (Borji et al., 2011). However the neural mechanisms underlying attention are transient in nature and tend to fluctuate in efficiency over time (West & Alain, 2000). Decline in attentional function and increased attentional fluctuations become prominent with ageing (Salthouse, 1996), and even more so with PD – especially with progression to dementia (Ballard et al., 2002; Emre, 2003). Attention may therefore play a greater role in saccadic (Rieger et al., 2008a) and gait impairment (Lord et al., 2014) in PD than in older adults. Establishing the relationships between attention, visual function and saccades when walking, and their impact on gait impairment in PD is central to understanding gait impairments as well as informing effective therapeutic interventions.

Saccades are fast eye movements between areas of interest within the environment that allow vital visual information to be processed, and they are influenced by both attentional (Mazer, 2011) and visual processes (Bridgeman et al., 1981; Hernandez et al., 2008). Monitoring of saccades using a mobile eye-tracker provides a methodology to investigate the influence of attention and vision during walking (Stuart et al., 2014a). Saccades allow visual information to be acquired which is then integrated into motor circuits involved in gait via attentional projections (Macaluso, 2006; Kravitz et al., 2011). Dysfunctional saccadic control (as a result of cognitive or visual impairment) could contribute to gait impairment in PD (Figure 1(D)) however to date this has not been tested. Dysfunctional saccades with PD have been noted within both static and dynamic tasks, although visuomotor research has primarily focussed on static computer-based assessments rather than monitoring during walking. Static testing has
demonstrated that people with PD make hypometric (particularly in vertical direction), slower and less frequent saccades than controls during visual search paradigms (Horowitz et al., 2006; Uc et al., 2006; Mannan et al., 2008; Nys et al., 2010; Verleger et al., 2014). Dynamic testing has demonstrated significant reduction in saccade frequency during gait in older compared to younger adults (Dowiasch et al., 2015), and non-significant reduction has been found in PD compared to older adults (Galna et al., 2012; Vitorio et al., 2012). However previous studies in PD have not robustly examined saccadic behaviour and have been limited by small sample sizes, which may have impacted results (Stuart et al., 2014a). Similarly, no previous studies have examined the underlying relationships between saccades, attention, vision or gait in PD (Stuart et al., 2014a; Stuart et al., 2016c). Reduction in saccade frequency may relate to deficits in high-level cognition that determines which areas of interest to fixate on (Yarbus, 1967; Nelson et al., 2004), and also low-level visual functions which impact the saliency or visibility of objects/areas (i.e. salient areas draw saccades) (Findlay, 1997; Zelinsky et al., 1997). Ultimately, reduction in saccade frequency would reduce the visual input to be used for guidance of walking (Patla et al., 1996), which may lead to mobility impairment and increased falls risk.

This study aimed to; 1) explore saccades during walking in PD compared to age matched controls and the influence of attentional manipulation (through turning and dual-tasking); and 2) explore the direct and indirect relationships between saccades, gait impairment, attention and vision using univariate and structural equation modelling. We hypothesised that saccade frequency during gait would be significantly reduced in PD compared to older adults and changes in saccade frequency and their relationship with gait would be related to attentional rather than visual impairment in PD. An a priori model was used to guide data analysis (Figure 1), which emerged from our previous literature review; Stuart et al. (2016c).

<<Insert Figure 1 here>>
Methods

The following is a brief overview of the study methodology, for detailed information please see the published protocol; Stuart et al. (2016b) (ClinicalTrials.gov NCT02610634).

Participants

This study involved 60 people with PD and 40 age-matched older adult controls who were ≥50 years old, able to walk independently, had no marked diagnosed visual, significant mood or other neurological disorder. PD was diagnosed by a movement disorder specialist according to UK Brain Bank criteria. PD participants without severe cognitive impairment were recruited (Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA) ≥21) and testing took place one hour after medication intake. Four PD participants were excluded from analysis, as they were unable to adequately complete the study assessments. Controls were excluded if they presented with mild cognitive impairment or dementia (MoCA <26) (Dalrymple-Alford et al., 2010). The study was approved by the Newcastle and North Tyneside NHS Research Ethics Committee (Ref: 13/NE/0128) and all participants gave informed consent.

Demographic and clinical assessment

Demographics of age, sex, height and weight were recorded (see Table 1). Disease severity was measured using the Movement Disorder Society (MDS-revised) Unified Parkinson’s Disease Rating Scale (UPDRS) (Goetz et al., 2008). Fear of falling was measured using the Falls Efficacy Scale (International version; FES-I) (Yardley et al., 2005), depression with the geriatric depression scale (GDS-15) (Yesavage & Sheikh, 1986), and retrospective falls from patient interview and medical notes. Levodopa equivalent dose (LED) scores were calculated according to standardised methods (Tomlinson et al., 2010).
Cognition

Five cognitive domains were assessed:

*Global cognition*; measured with the Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA) and Addenbrookes cognitive examination (ACE-R) (Mioshi et al., 2006; Dalrymple-Alford et al., 2010).

*Attention* was assessed using the computerised cognitive drug research battery, including simple reaction-time, choice reaction-time and digit vigilance. Power of attention (PoA) was calculated as the sum of the means and fluctuating attention (FA) was calculated as the sum the coefficient of variation (CV%) from each test (Allcock et al., 2009; Lord et al., 2014).

*Executive function* was measured with clock drawing (Royall’s CLOX 1) (Royall et al., 1998).

*Visuo-spatial function* was measured using judgement of line orientation (JLO) (Montse et al., 2001), clock copying (Royall’s CLOX 2) and subsections of the visual, object and space perception (VOSP) battery (i.e. incomplete letters, dot counting and position discrimination) (Rapport et al., 1998).

*Working memory* was assessed using the maximal seated forward digit span from the Wechsler adult intelligence scale (Wechsler, 1945).

Visual function

*Visual acuity* (VA) and *contrast sensitivity* (CS) were assessed binocularly using standardised charts (LogMar and MarsCS) (Lovie-Kitchin, 1988).
**Experimental design**

**Equipment**

Saccades were measured using a head-mounted infra-red monocular mobile eye-tracker (Dikablis, Ergoneers, Germany; 50Hz) and bi-temporal electrooculography (EOG; Zerowire, Aurion, Italy; 1000Hz) (Stuart *et al.*, 2016a) (Figure 2(B)). The mobile eye-tracker consisted of a head-unit and a transmitter, which was contained within a backpack (~1kg). Participants all wore their usual corrective eye-wear that they would wear during walking in everyday life. The infra-red eye-tracker’s eye-camera was positioned so that refraction from the lower section of bi/vari-focal glasses was not possible (i.e. above or lateral to this section of the glasses, or underneath the glasses altogether).

Gait was measured using a Vicon 3D motion capture system (Oxford, UK; 100Hz), with reflective markers placed on the feet, pelvis, shoulders, head and eye-tracker. These devices automatically synchronised and recorded simultaneous eye and body movement recording for the trial duration. Full details of the testing procedures are described elsewhere (Stuart *et al.*, 2016b).

**Protocol**

Saccades were measured as participants walked at a self-selected pace for ~7m under different conditions (Figure 2(A)). The conditions were designed to influence eye movements through attentional manipulation due to turning and dual-tasking when walking (‘real-time’) as follows;

- Straight line walking (Walk\textsubscript{Straight}) (3 trials)
- Straight line walking through a doorway (80cm wide, placed 2.5m from start point) (Walk\textsubscript{Door}) (3 trials)
• Turning to cue: walk and turn 40° left or right to a white target on the floor (Turn_{Left} and Turn_{Right}) (3 trials in each direction)

• Dual task straight line walking (Walk_{Straight}) (3 trials)

• Dual task + straight line walking through a doorway (80cm wide, placed 2.5m from start point) (Walk_{Door}) (3 trials)

• Dual task + turning to cue: walk and turn 40° left or right to a white target on the floor (Turn_{Left} and Turn_{Right}) (3 trials in each direction)

Dual task involved the Wechsler forward digit span repetition while walking (Wilde et al., 2004), normalised to each individual’s maximal digit span level which was determined in sitting prior to walking tests. Participants were required to listen to random strings of numbers (digits) played over a loud speaker while walking and repeat back the strings of digits in the same order they were played at the end of the walk. This ensured that artefacts from muscle and movement activity related to talking did not influence saccadic data.

Three trials for each condition were averaged. To ensure all participants eyes started in the same position, they were asked to look straight ahead at a camera at the end of the room for three seconds prior to walking and could look wherever they wanted once told to walk.

**Outcome Measures**

The primary behavioural outcome of this study was saccade frequency (number of saccades per second) during gait, obtained from the raw mobile eye-tracker data (Figure 2(C)) using a previously validated algorithm (Stuart et al., 2014b). Only saccades with ≥5° amplitude (≥240°/sec) were analysed to account for vestibular-ocular reflex or micro-saccade data intrusion (Galna et al., 2012; Stuart et al., 2014b), and a maximal velocity threshold of ≥1000°/sec was used to rule out flickers or other spurious movements. Saccade frequency was calculated as the number of saccades made within a walk divided by the duration of the walk,
which controlled for the different walking speeds between participants in the same manner as previous research (Galna et al., 2012).

Saccade frequency was monitored as it forms the basis for visual exploration when walking, which is a measure of how often an individual observes or samples their environment and the visual demand of the task (Patla et al., 1996). Saccades are a robust, quantifiable outcome (Becker, 1989; Gorges et al., 2014) that are mapped to underlying neural networks and processes (Kimmig et al., 2001) to a greater extent than fixations or more generic measures of visual exploration (e.g. gaze or scan paths). Fixations are coupled to saccades (i.e. they are pauses between these movements) and are also influenced by cognitive and visual processes (Just & Carpenter, 1980). However, it is difficult to know exactly when a fixation starts and ends (Salvucci & Goldberg, 2000) due to mobile eye-tracker sampling frequency (i.e. need >200Hz for accurate fixation detection) (Stuart et al., 2014a), as well as variable velocity (e.g. <30-100⁰/sec) and duration (e.g. 80-200ms) thresholds within the literature (Holmqvist & Nystrom, 2011), which have been shown to differ between static and dynamic tasks (Manor & Gordon, 2003). Gaze and scan paths also require time-consuming manual frame-by-frame analysis of eye-tracker videos (Vitório et al., 2014; Beck et al., 2015; Vitório et al., 2016), which is subjective as algorithms that quantify eye movement are not used to determine saccades or fixations.

Although there was an increase in saccade frequency with a door compared to straight walking (from Walk_{Straight} to Walk_{Door}) under single and dual task in both groups (Supplementary Material 1), there were no significant differences between straight walking and door conditions (Walk_{Straight}, Walk_{Door}), or between the two turning conditions (Turn_{Left}, Turn_{Right}). Therefore data were collapsed into walking (Walk) and turning (Turn) variables (Figure 2(A)) respectively to avoid type 1 error within our initial analysis. Saccade frequency data were reported as absolute (Walk, Turn) and change score (ΔDoor, ΔTurn) values. Change scores
were used in further analysis to overcome eye-tracker measurement limitations (Stuart et al., 2016a), which allowed each participant to act as their own control. Change scores were created using set formula (see below; 1 and 2) and showed the influence of environmental stimuli (a door) and turning on saccade frequency when walking under single and dual task.

1. $\Delta\text{Door} = \text{Walk}_{\text{Door}} - \text{Walk}_{\text{Straight}}$
2. $\Delta\text{Turn} = \text{Turn} - \text{Walk}_{\text{Straight}}$

Secondary outcomes were five gait characteristics of velocity, step length, step time, double support and single support time under single and dual task conditions.

<<Insert Figure 2 here>>

Statistical Analysis

Descriptive data

Data were analysed using SPSS (v21, IBM, Chicago, Il., USA) and assessed for normality, meeting criteria for parametric analysis (Field, 2013). Descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations (SD)) were calculated for continuous variables. Pearson chi-square ($X^2$) test was used for comparison of frequency data. Statistical tests were two-tailed with a p-value of $p<.05$ considered significant and control for multiple comparisons was not performed due to the experimental nature of the study. We present our findings as a two-stage process in which we:

1) Describe the effect of attentional (turning and dual-task) manipulation on saccade frequency in PD and controls

2) Explore the direct and indirect relationships between saccade frequency, attention, visual function, and gait characteristics based on an a priori model (Figure 1).

Step 1: Saccade frequency while walking
Repeated measures ANOVAs were used to compare the effect of turning (Walk, Turn) and dual task (single, dual) on saccade frequency, with group (PD, control) as a between subject factor. The same analysis was performed for reported gait characteristics (velocity, step length, step time, double and single support time).

Step 2: Direct and indirect determinants of saccade frequency and their relationship with gait impairment

Following preliminary Pearson’s correlations, independent cognitive or visual determinants of saccade frequency were examined through hierarchical multiple-regression analysis. Saccade frequency change scores (ΔDoor, ΔTurn) were used due to their consistent association with independent variables (Allison, 1990). Demographic features were entered into the first step (Age, MoCA, UPDRS-III, GDS-15), cognitive (FA, CLOX, JLO, Digit Span) and visual functions (VA, CS) in separate steps, and a final combined model is presented. FES-I was not entered due to the known interaction with depression/anxiety (van Haastregt et al., 2008) and a lack of pathological cause limiting interpretation (Legters, 2002). Variables that were significantly different between PD and controls in the univariate analysis were selected to represent independent cognitive domains and visual functions. Only one variable was selected for each cognitive domain to avoid over-fitting. As PoA and FA were highly correlated (r=.70, p<.001), FA was chosen to represent attention as it is sensitive to age-related cognitive decline (Salthouse, 1996) and is characteristic of PD dementia (Emre, 2003; Burn & Yarnall, 2014). Poorer FA has also been associated with increased fall frequency in PD and is a stronger predictor of falls than PoA (Allcock et al., 2009). Regression normality (histograms and P-P plots), co-linearity (tolerance and variance inflation factor) and independent errors (Durbin-Watson) were examined, which indicated that data were normal.

Structural equation modelling (SEM) was then used to examine the direct and indirect relationship between saccade frequency and gait impairment in PD, while including
hypothesised cognitive and visual relationships (Figure 1). SEM is statistically valid with modest sample sizes (5-20 cases per independent variable) that are realistic for observational research studies (Bentler & Chou, 1987; Tanguma, 2001; Menz et al., 2007; Christopher Westland, 2010; Byrne, 2013; Wolf et al., 2013; Hoyle & Gottfredson, 2014; Xiong et al., 2015). The model was created in SPSS AMOS (v22).

SEM analysis was conducted in line with current recommendations (Kline, 2011; Byrne, 2013; Xiong et al., 2015) which were applied in four separate steps. Figure 4(A) shows that we first created latent variables for cognition, visual function, saccade frequency and gait impairment from the same observed variables used within our multiple regression analysis. Significantly reduced step length, velocity and increased double support time represented gait impairment in PD compared to controls within univariate analysis. Second, poor latent variable representations were removed (i.e. standardised factor loading of <0.70). Third, any observed variables with ‘perfect fit’ (i.e. standardised factor loading ≥1.00) were used in place of the latent variable to avoid overfitting. Finally, model trimming and effect calculation were performed, which involved removal of non-significant associations (connection arrows / paths), and calculation of direct and indirect effects (i.e. for indirect effects the coefficients for each path were multiplied (Menz et al., 2007)). The final SEM provided direct and indirect relationships between attention and visual functions, saccade frequency and gait velocity in PD (Figure 4(B) and Table 4).

**Results**

**Participants**

Participant demographic, cognitive, visual and clinical features are summarised in Table 1. PD and controls were well matched for age (p=.605) and corrective eye-wear (p=.184) but were significantly different in terms of gender (p=.036) and education (p=.023). Males were over
represented in the PD group and the PD group had fewer years of education. The PD cohort was a heterogeneous group (Median disease duration; ~60 months) with moderate disease severity (UPDRS III, ~37 ± 14) and impaired global cognition (MoCA, ACE-R; p<.001). This was expected as the PD group involved participants with mild cognitive impairment (MoCA ≥21) while the control group did not (MoCA ≥26). Attention (PoA and FA, p<.001), executive function (CLOX 1, p=.002), visuo-spatial ability (JLO, p=.029) and working memory (Digit span, p<.001) were all significantly impaired in PD compared to controls. Basic visual functions of VA (p=.005) and CS (p<.001) were also significantly impaired in PD compared to controls.

People with PD walked significantly slower (F=14.9, d.f.=1, p<.001), with shorter steps (F=9.7, d.f.=1, p=.002) and increased double support time (F= 0.20, d.f.=1, p=.003) than controls for all walking conditions (Table 2). Step time (F=2.87, d.f.=1, p=.094) and single support time (F=0.02, d.f.=1, p=.890) were not significantly different between the groups.

Saccade frequency while walking: effect of PD and attentional manipulation

Saccade frequency (Walk, Turn) was lower in PD participants than controls in all conditions (main effect; F=9.9, d.f.=1, p=.002) (Figure 3). There was a main effect of turning and dual-task on saccade frequency irrespective of participant group, where saccade frequency increased under the Turn condition compared to Walk (F=159.1, d.f.=1, p<.001) and decreased under the dual-task condition compared to single-task (dual-task; F=28.7, d.f.=1, p<.001) (Figure 3 and Supplementary Material 1).

<<Insert Figure 3 here>>
Direct and indirect determinants of saccade frequency and their relationship with gait impairment

Saccade frequency determinants

Under single task, regression analysis demonstrated that better attention (FA) was associated with a greater increase in saccade frequency during Walk<sub>Door</sub> and Turn conditions compared to Walk<sub>Straight</sub> in PD (ΔDoor β=-.45, p=.009, ΔTurn β=-.36, p=.041, Table 3), independent of demographic or visual function (VA and CS). Under dual task conditions poorer working memory was associated with a greater increase in saccade frequency in PD for the Turn condition only (ΔTurn β=-.34, p=.018). There were no significant associations for control participants (as shown in Table 3).

Saccade frequency relationship with gait characteristics

There were no significant associations between saccade frequency and gait characteristics in PD (Supplementary Material 3). However, in control participants, increased saccade frequency in the Turn condition was related to increased velocity (r=.35, p=.026) and longer steps (r=.33, p=.038) under both single and dual task respectively (Supplementary Material 3).

Saccade frequency relationship with gait impairment in Parkinson’s disease

SEM analysis was used to explore direct and indirect relationships between saccade frequency and gait in PD (see Figure 4 and Table 4). Gait outcomes under single task walking conditions in PD were used for the final model because this was the only condition in which a significant relationship was observed. It was not possible to formulate a SEM for controls due to limited quality of indicators (factor loadings <.70).

Standardised regression coefficients (β) are shown for associations between each variable in the model (next to each arrow) and amount of variance explained (r²) by the model is provided
in bold above appropriate variables (Figure 4(B)). After appropriate trimming, hypothesised relationships were examined between two latent (visual function and saccade frequency (ΔDoor, ΔTurn)) and two observed variables (FA and gait velocity). Three non-significant paths (represented by dashed lines within Figure 4(B)) were trimmed and the overall fit of the model was confirmed with $X^2 = 4.0$ (d.f.=8, $p=.853$), Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) (.977) and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) (0.00), which indicated acceptable model fit. The final model explained 18% of the variance in saccade frequency (ΔDoor, ΔTurn) and 10% of the variance in gait velocity in PD.

Attention (FA) played a central role in all hypothesised relationships in PD. Attention also shared a significant relationship with visual function ($\beta=.46$, $p=.014$), where better visual function (lower score is better) related to better attention in PD (Figure 4(B)), consistent with correlational analysis (Supplementary Material 2). There was a significant direct effect of attention on both saccade frequency ($\beta=-.42$, $p=.011$) and gait velocity ($\beta=-.32$, $p=.012$) in PD. This demonstrated that poorer attention directly related to poorer visual function, dysfunctional saccade frequency and slower velocity. Visual function was not associated with saccade frequency ($\beta=.13$, $p=.482$) or gait velocity ($\beta=-.10$, $p=.531$), nor was saccade frequency and gait velocity ($\beta=.04$, $p=.756$). Instead, there were significant indirect relationships between these features with visual function ($\beta=-.15$, $p=.008$) and saccade frequency ($\beta=.13$, $p=.011$) demonstrating a significant indirect effect on gait velocity, which was underpinned by their relationship with attention. For example; poorer visual function and dysfunctional saccades related to gait impairment in PD because of the impact of attentional deficit on all of these features.
Discussion

To our knowledge, this is the first study to explore and explain saccade frequency during walking in PD and older adults and its relationship to gait impairment. The evidence presented suggests that attention is central to gait and visual impairment in PD. In line with our hypothesis, saccade frequency while walking was reduced in PD compared to older adults in all conditions. However both groups responded in a similar manner to turning and attentional load. Our findings support a key role for attention in gait impairment in PD, which differs from age-matched controls. Attention directly impacted gait, saccade frequency and visual function in PD. Alternatively, contrary to our hypothesis saccade frequency was not directly related to gait in PD, but was in controls. Instead, visual function and saccade frequency had an indirect influence on gait impairment in PD, which was underpinned by their relationship with attention. Therefore, attention was central to direct and indirect impact on gait impairment in PD.

Saccade frequency while walking: effect of PD and attentional manipulation

In line with our hypothesis, saccade frequency was lower in PD when walking compared to controls, but changed in a similar manner to controls in response to turning and dual task manipulation. Gait was also significantly impaired in PD compared to age-matched controls, which was expected with deficits in three of five gait characteristics (slower velocity, shorter step length and increased double support time).

We found an increase in saccade frequency in both groups when performing a turn. This agrees in part with previous work which demonstrated an increase in horizontal saccade frequency during turns in PD (Galna et al., 2012). Methodological differences however, limit comparison to other turning studies which report saccades when turning while standing in place rather than walking (Anastasopoulos et al., 2011; Lohnes & Earhart, 2011). In contrast their findings show
that saccade frequency increases in PD compared to controls when turning. A possible explanation for this difference could be that impaired smooth pursuit with catch up saccades results in a higher number of saccades during a turn in place (Stuart et al., 2014a). The reasons for an increased saccade frequency strategy with turns are speculative but older adults and people with PD have been shown to rely more on visual rather than proprioceptive or vestibular input for appropriate motor control when walking (Azulay et al., 1999; Hollands et al., 2017). Therefore greater visual information may have been required when performing a turn which lead to greater saccade frequency. Increased visual feedback may be required to stabilise various body segments (head, trunk etc.) and augment the vestibular or proprioceptive feedback mechanisms involved in critical challenges of turning (i.e. balance, trajectory and stepping maintenance) (Land, 2004), which have only partially been examined (Guitton et al., 1986). Alternatively, our external visual cue (a line on the floor to turn towards) may also have enabled the pre-motor cortex to bypass the supplementary motor area and BG deficits in PD (Morris et al., 1996; Morris, 2000; Morris et al., 2001), which would allow greater movement (i.e. saccade frequency or gait). These explanations have obvious links to gait control and falls risk due to visual impairments but also implicate attention.

Turning performance may require attentional activation of various structures at many levels of information processing, with projections underpinned by dopaminergic and cholinergic systems (Calabresi et al., 2006). Redgrave et al. (2010) highlighted that motor control impairment occurs early in PD and requires attentional effort to overcome the loss of automatic movement, particularly when performing complex motor tasks (i.e. a turn when walking). Age-related studies have demonstrated a tendency to focus visual exploration and attention on task goals when walking (Pelz et al., 2001; Hayhoe et al., 2003; Mennie et al., 2007; Hayhoe et al., 2009), which indicates that attention, saccadic and body movements are inter-related (Beurskens & Bock, 2012). Therefore a possible explanation for the increase in saccade
frequency due to turning in our study could be due to increased attention in response to the
goal-directed cued turning task, which implicates the systems theory of motor control
(Bernstein, 1967; Shumway-Cook & Woollacott, 2007). Goal-directed attentional drive of
more frequent saccades with a turn would enable further visual information to be integrated
into forward planning and initiation of walking trajectory changes (Reed-Jones et al., 2009),
which may be required to compensate for age or Parkinson’s related sensorimotor deficits
(Rieger et al., 2008b; Gilat et al., 2015).

The influence of dual-tasks on saccade frequency further supports the attentional control of
saccades during gait. Saccade frequency reduced in both groups under walk and turn conditions
in response to a dual-task where attention was distracted from walking. Attention has been
implicated in saccadic initiation and control in previous dual-task research (Stuyven et al.,
2000). Reduced saccade frequency under dual-task suggests that cognitive, particularly
attentional processes underpin saccade frequency during gait, comparable to previous research
(Hoffman & Subramaniam, 1995). Previous studies of saccades during motor tasks such as
reaching (Pashler et al., 1993) or button pressing (Huestegge & Koch, 2009) have also shown
similar change under dual-task conditions (e.g. slower, reduced or inappropriate saccades).
Dual-task gait performance has also been extensively associated with attention in both PD
(Yoge et al., 2005) and older adults (Yoge-Seligmann et al., 2008), which indicates that
within the current study attentional resources were divided between gait, saccades and
cognition. Therefore under dual-task, attentional resources become saturated in response to
competing task goals (Moehler & Fiehler, 2014), which may result in preferential allocation of
resource to gait control (Lee et al., 2003) or the secondary cognitive task when walking rather
than saccadic initiation. As a consequence this may impact attentional control of saccades,
particularly in PD where attention is impaired and resources are limited.
Attentional control of saccades involves the pre-frontal cortex (PFC) and its complex interaction with the basal ganglia (BG) and brain stem (Javaid et al., 2012; Matsumoto et al., 2012). Brain stem saccade mechanisms are reportedly unaffected in PD (Gorges et al., 2014), which implicates PFC and BG impairment in saccadic deficits (Gorges et al., 2015). Attentional projections from the PFC, via the BG, inhibit the superior colliculus to facilitate initiation of voluntary and inhibit reflexive saccades (Terao et al., 2011). Dopamine depletion in the striatum in PD impacts cortico-BG loops (Deijen et al., 2006; Tommasi et al., 2015), which may be one reason for the overall reduction in saccade frequency in PD compared to controls.

**Direct and indirect determinants of saccade frequency and their relationship with gait impairment**

We were interested to understand the determinants of saccade frequency when walking and to examine their relationship with gait. Our results demonstrate that even though there is a relationship between cognitive and visual function (Supplementary Material 2), attentional rather than visual deficits underpin gait impairment and saccade frequency when walking in PD.

Attention (specifically FA) was a consistent determinant of saccade frequency (ΔDoor, ΔTurn) independent of demographic and visual functions in PD, but not controls. This was despite the response to environmental manipulation (a doorway) or turning and dual-task on saccade frequency being the same for both groups, and the reasons for this are unclear. We controlled for age, depression and global cognition, but a lack of cognitive impairment (MoCA <26) in control participants may have had an impact (Peltsch et al., 2014). Numerous other factors may also determine saccade frequency, such as colour properties or saliency of the environment; level of fatigue (Faber et al., 2012); motivation (Kaplan et al., 2012); and emotional state.
(Oatley et al., 2011). These features may therefore play a greater role in controls compared to PD where attentional impairment dominates.

Environmental (a doorway), turning and dual-task manipulation suggested that saccade frequency was driven predominantly by attention in PD, which indicates that saccade frequency may be a proxy measure of attention in PD. This agrees with previous research that has suggested attention plays a vital role in the execution of saccades (Hoffman & Subramaniam, 1995; Liversedge & Findlay, 2000). Under single task conditions, when participants performed a turn a greater increase in saccade frequency was related to better attention. However, when distracted under dual-task conditions there was no relationship between attention and saccade frequency. This suggests that when attention is constrained under dual-task it cannot drive saccades. Despite a lack of attentional association, we identified a relationship between working memory (digit span) and saccade frequency under dual-task in PD. Earlier work has implicated working memory in the attentional control of saccades (Kane et al., 2006) with poorer working memory related to reduced saccades under dual-task conditions (Mitchell et al., 2002). However poorer working memory related to increased saccade frequency with turns under dual-task, which may demonstrate a lack of saccadic control with attentional impairment and distraction in PD. However the specific attentional mechanisms remain unclear, as it is difficult to tease out whether top-down (frontal or cognitive, voluntary control) or bottom-up (parietal or automatic, reflexive control) attentional control drives saccade frequency when walking under different conditions in PD (N'Guyen et al., 2014).

To understand the relationship between saccade frequency (ΔDoor, ΔTurn) and gait impairment in PD, we developed an SEM based on hypothesised relationships between cognition, vision, saccades and gait impairment in PD (Figure 1) (Stuart et al., 2016c). Contrary to our hypothesis reduced saccade frequency did not directly influence gait in PD, but it did in controls. Lack of direct association was unexpected but highlights the complexity of the
underlying mechanisms involved in PD. Attention (specifically FA) shared a direct relationship with visual function, which indicated that these features influence each other. For example; poor visual function would directly impact attention, as visual information is integrated into subsequent higher-level cognitive processing (Archibald et al., 2009; Hajee et al., 2009; Bodis-Wollner et al., 2013). Alternatively, attentional impairment would directly influence visual processing from an early stage, as attention is involved in initial selection of visual stimuli (Baluch & Itti, 2011) and influences stimulus appearance (Carrasco et al., 2004), contrast (Carrasco et al., 2000), resolution (Carrasco et al., 2002) and salience (by up to 51%) (Reynolds et al., 2000). Despite the inter-related nature of visual function and attention the early biasing of visual input and subsequent influence on visual processing would denote that attention likely underpins visual function (Stuart et al., 2016c). Attention also directly related to saccade frequency and gait impairment in PD, and underpinned indirect relationships between all of the other model features, which suggests an over-arching or dominant role of attention in gait impairment in PD (Lord et al., 2014; Lückmann et al., 2014). For example, people with PD who had poorer attention, also had poorer visual function, increased their saccade frequency to a lesser extent in response to a door or turn, and had slower gait. These findings highlight the pivotal role that attentional dysfunction plays in visual, saccadic and gait impairment in PD, and are comparable to the extensive literature regarding relationship between attention and gait in PD (Lord et al., 2014; Morris et al., 2016).

Previous studies have shown that visual function deficits impact gait in older adults and PD (Spaulding et al., 1994; Geldmacher, 2003; Hallemans et al., 2010; Swigler et al., 2012; Elliott, 2014; Shin et al., 2015). However such studies tend to alter the visual environment (e.g. low lighting or walk in darkness) and have not accounted for the role of attention (Stuart et al., 2016c), which provides only partial insight into the underlying mechanisms of gait impairment in PD. When hypothesised relationships between visual function, attention, saccades and gait...
were entered into SEM analysis, attention rather than visual function was found to primarily contribute to saccadic and gait performance in PD. Visual function only indirectly influenced these features, which was underpinned by attention. Levels of explained variance (10% gait impairment, 18% saccade frequency) and the relationship with attention concur with earlier saccadic (Buhmann et al., 2015) and gait research in PD (Lord et al., 2010) and older adults (Liu-Ambrose et al., 2010; MacAulay et al., 2014). The remaining variance of both gait and saccade frequency may be due to numerous influences on these complex behavioural outcomes, such as; fatigue (Faber et al., 2012), motivation (Kaplan et al., 2012), prior knowledge of testing procedures (learning effect between walks) (Kim & Rehder, 2011), emotional state (Oatley et al., 2011), colour properties of the visual scene (Amano et al., 2012) and saliency of objects (i.e. doorway) (t Hart et al., 2013). It is not possible to control or assess all of the influences on these outcomes, but the explained variance is functionally relevant because attentional impairment is central to PD (Taylor et al., 2008) and is linked to gait deficit and falls risk (Allcock et al., 2009; Lord et al., 2014; Lord et al., 2016).

A possible explanation for these findings are that attention may be required to compensate for underlying visual or motor (gait) deficits in PD, which has been discussed in previous work (Stuart et al., 2016c). For example; those with better attention have more neural resources available to compensate for the dysfunctional BG (Rubinstein et al., 2002; Tombu & Jolicoeur, 2003; Heuninckx et al., 2008; Yogev-Seligmann et al., 2008) or enhance vision (Carrasco & McElree, 2001; Carrasco et al., 2004; Carrasco, 2006). However visual, saccadic and gait deficits persist despite attentional compensation. Compensation is most likely constrained by attentional, particularly FA impairment with PD progression (Ballard et al., 2002), which has been linked to cholinergic dysfunction (Emre et al., 2004; Molloy et al., 2006). Increased cholinergic burden with PD has been related to gait impairment (Bohnen & Albin, 2011; Rochester et al., 2012), cognitive dysfunction (Burn et al., 2006), and falls (Yarnall et al., 2011;
Henderson et al., 2016). Therefore impaired FA as a result of progressive cholinergic burden with PD would lead to deficits in visual functions, saccadic activity and gait, with implication for increased trips and falls.

**Clinical Implications**

Our findings suggest that impaired attention, which is a common and early problem in PD, negatively impacts gait directly and indirectly through reduced visual observation which in turn impairs gait. Visual observation is critical to effective and safe gait, and impairment may lead to trips and falls, and overall reduced mobility. Greater awareness of the need for visual observation during gait, particularly how frequently an individual scans their environment as they move through it may therefore be important to improve overall safety. Targeting attention directly and through saccadic deficits with specific attentional therapeutic interventions (e.g. visual cues), rehabilitation (e.g. eye movement training (Zampieri & Di Fabio, 2008)) or pharmacological manipulation (e.g. rivastigmine (Henderson et al., 2016)) may improve saccade frequency and gait in PD, which could reduce falls risk. Further research is required to understand the specific attentional mechanisms driving saccades during gait in PD in order to inform the most appropriate method of intervention.

**Study Strengths and Limitations**

A key strength of this hypothesis driven observational study was the use of SEM analysis and a clear *a priori* model to guide analysis (Figure 1). SEM allowed for examination of hypothesised relationships between cognition, vision, change in saccade frequency and gait, and uncovered important direct and indirect relationships.

A limitation of this study was the range of vision assessments performed, as we only used basic chart measures typically performed in clinic. Other vision measures such as depth or motion perception, or ideally a full neuro-ophthalmic battery should be performed in future studies.
These features may alter the contribution of vision within our model, or may highlight further interactions between visual and cognitive functions.

Conclusions

Our findings highlight important effects of attention on saccade frequency and gait when walking in PD. Attention has a central role in saccadic and gait impairment in PD. It had direct impact on visual observation of the environment when walking (reduced saccades) which in turn may influence safe navigation and avoidance of trip hazards. In addition, attention also shared a direct relationship with visual function which will influence visual observation when walking. Attention therefore represents a key target for therapeutics. Future research examining gait and vision in PD must consider the role of attention within visual, saccadic and gait impairment.
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**Figure Legends:**

**Figure 1** - Theoretical Model of Cognitive and Visual Contribution to Gait Impairment in Parkinson's disease [Six pathways are involved; A) Cognition and gait, B) Vision and gait, C) Interaction between cognitive and visual functions, D) Saccades and gait, E) Cognition and saccades, and F) Vision and saccades]

**Figure 2** - Study Protocol: A) Walking conditions, B) Dikablis mobile infra-red eye-tracker and electrooculography (EOG) placement, C) Mobile eye-tracker raw data [an example of a saccade occurrence has been marked on each x axis at the point when detected]

**Figure 3** - Saccade frequency during gait [Mean and standard deviation (SD) results for single and dual task walking are displayed]

**Figure 4** – Structural equation model of cognitive and visual contributions to gait impairment in Parkinson’s disease [*significance level p<.05, dashed lines are non-significant pathways, indirect pathways are represented by faded block arrows underlying direct pathways, solid arrows are direct pathways, double-headed arrows represent correlations or shared relationships, latent variables are represented via circles/ovals and observed variables via rectangles]*
Table 1 - Demographic, cognitive, visual and clinical characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Control (n=40) Mean (SD)</th>
<th>PD (n=56) Mean (SD)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>66.93 (10.86)</td>
<td>67.91 (7.78)</td>
<td>.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>17M/ 23F</td>
<td>37M/19F</td>
<td>.036†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective eye-wear</td>
<td>Correction 31 / None 9</td>
<td>Correction 36 / None 20</td>
<td>.184†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (cm)</td>
<td>166.42 (10.65)</td>
<td>171.32 (9.03)</td>
<td>.017*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight (kg)</td>
<td>72.26 (12.62)</td>
<td>82.62 (19.77)</td>
<td>.005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (years)</td>
<td>14.80 (3.03)</td>
<td>13.20 (3.55)</td>
<td>.023*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression scale (GDS)</td>
<td>0.70 (0.88)</td>
<td>2.66 (2.67)</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls efficacy scale (FES-I)</td>
<td>18.98 (4.15)</td>
<td>24.55 (8.14)</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrospective Falls (no. in 12 months)</td>
<td>0 (1)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA)</td>
<td>28.45 (1.28)</td>
<td>26.73 (2.17)</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addenbrookes (ACE-R)</td>
<td>95.03 (4.00)</td>
<td>89.84 (7.16)</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power of attention (PoA)</td>
<td>1266.08 (144.76)</td>
<td>1452.56 (269.37)</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluctuating attention (FA)</td>
<td>48.22 (8.85)</td>
<td>59.37 (14.35)</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive function</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royals CLOX 1</td>
<td>13.60 (1.17)</td>
<td>12.71 (1.45)</td>
<td>.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royals CLOX 2</td>
<td>13.90 (1.03)</td>
<td>13.46 (1.57)</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgement of line orientation (JLO)</td>
<td>25.15 (4.02)</td>
<td>23.07 (4.85)</td>
<td>.029*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOSP - Total</td>
<td>48.83 (1.28)</td>
<td>47.71 (3.56)</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOSP - Incomplete letters</td>
<td>19.43 (0.63)</td>
<td>19.11 (1.11)</td>
<td>.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOSP - Dot counting</td>
<td>9.88 (0.34)</td>
<td>9.82 (0.51)</td>
<td>.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOSP - Position Discrimination</td>
<td>19.53 (0.93)</td>
<td>18.79 (2.98)</td>
<td>.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visuo-spatial ability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Digit Span Length (sitting)</td>
<td>6.50 (1.01)</td>
<td>5.66 (1.13)</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working memory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Digit Span Length (sitting)</td>
<td>6.50 (1.01)</td>
<td>5.66 (1.13)</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual function</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual acuity (LogMar)</td>
<td>-0.06 (0.13)</td>
<td>0.03 (0.16)</td>
<td>.005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast sensitivity (LogCS)</td>
<td>1.62 (0.09)</td>
<td>1.55 (0.14)</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoehn and Yahr stage (H&amp;Y)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>I (21)/II (30)/III (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease duration (months) [median and range]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60.00 (4 - 444)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPDRS part I</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10.77 (5.24)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPDRS part II</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10.82 (7.26)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPDRS part III</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36.75 (14.10)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPDRS part IV</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.45 (3.07)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freezing of gait questionnaire (FOGQ)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.52 (6.24)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levodopa equivalent daily dosage (LED)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>599.87 (402.56)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[*significance level p<.05, SD = standard deviation, VOSP= visual object and spatial perception battery, † = χ²]
### Table 2 – Gait characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Velocity (m/sec) Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Step length (m) Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Double support (sec) Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>Single Walk</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.07 (0.19)</td>
<td>0.62 (0.10)</td>
<td>0.31 (0.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turn</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.95 (0.17)</td>
<td>0.54 (0.09)</td>
<td>0.34 (0.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual Walk</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.99 (0.19)</td>
<td>0.59 (0.08)</td>
<td>0.33 (0.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turn</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.90 (0.16)</td>
<td>0.54 (0.09)</td>
<td>0.34 (0.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Single Walk</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.26 (0.18)</td>
<td>0.70 (0.09)</td>
<td>0.26 (0.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turn</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.09 (0.15)</td>
<td>0.60 (0.08)</td>
<td>0.28 (0.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual Walk</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.09 (0.20)</td>
<td>0.64 (0.08)</td>
<td>0.30 (0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turn</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.99 (0.16)</td>
<td>0.57 (0.07)</td>
<td>0.31 (0.06)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group Main Effect $F (p)$

- 14.9 (<0.001)*
- 9.7 (0.002)*
- 0.2 (0.003)*

[sec = seconds, m = meters, SD = standard deviation]
Table 3 - Demographic, cognitive and visual function association with saccade frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Change in Saccade Frequency (ΔSacc/sec)</th>
<th>PD β</th>
<th>PD p</th>
<th>Control β</th>
<th>Control p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>ΔDoor</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-2.44</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>-2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UPDRS III</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MoCA</td>
<td>-1.66</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>-2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GDS-15</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.906</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>-0.449</td>
<td>.009*</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JLO</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>-1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CLOX 1</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>-.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Digit span</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.725</td>
<td>-.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>-1.82</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>-3.65</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>-1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔTurn</td>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-1.154</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>-2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UPDRS III</td>
<td>-2.10</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MoCA</td>
<td>-2.80</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>-2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GDS-15</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>-1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>-0.359</td>
<td>.041*</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JLO</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CLOX 1</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.868</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Digit span</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td>-.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>-2.55</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>-.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual</td>
<td>ΔDoor</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>.865</td>
<td>-.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UPDRS III</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MoCA</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>-.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GDS-15</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td>.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>-1.60</td>
<td>.341</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JLO</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>-.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CLOX 1</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td>-.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Digit span</td>
<td>-.277</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>-.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.990</td>
<td>-.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔTurn</td>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UPDRS III</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MoCA</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>-.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GDS-15</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>-.164</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>-.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JLO</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td>.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CLOX 1</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.759</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Digit span</td>
<td>-.343</td>
<td>.018*</td>
<td>.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>-.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[*significance level p<0.05, UPDRS III = Unified Parkinson’s disease rating scale – motor section, GDS-15 = Geriatric depress scale, MoCA = Montreal cognitive assessment, FA = Fluctuating attention, CLOX 1 = Royalls clock drawing, JLO = judgement of line orientat, Digit Span = Maximal forward digit span, VA = visual acuity, CS = contrast sensitivity]
Table 4 - Structural equation model direct, indirect and total effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Direct effect pathway</th>
<th>Indirect effect pathways</th>
<th>Total effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cognition β (p)</td>
<td>Visual Function β (p)</td>
<td>Saccade Frequency β (p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gait</td>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td>-.323 (.012)*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.046 (.376)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual Function</td>
<td>-.103 (.531)</td>
<td>-.151 (.008)*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saccade Frequency</td>
<td>.035 (.756)</td>
<td>.135 (.011)*</td>
<td>-0.013 (.502)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Saccade Frequency | Cognition     | -.420 (.011)*          | -                        | .059 (.361)  | -            | -.361 (.011)* |
|                  | Visual Function | .134 (.482)         | -.192 (.006)*            | -            | -            | -.058 (.482)  |

[*significance level p<.05, Direct effect pathway = path between Outcome and Predictor, Indirect effect pathways = path between Outcome and Predictor through relationship with x (where x represents either cognition, visual function or saccade frequency), Total effect = sum of all direct and indirect effects, ß = standardised coefficient]
Figure 1 - Theoretical Model of Cognitive and Visual Contribution to Gait Impairment in Parkinson's disease [Six pathways are involved; A) Cognition and gait, B) Vision and gait, C) Interaction between cognitive and visual functions, D) Saccades and gait, E) Cognition and saccades, and F) Vision and saccades]
Figure 2 - Study Protocol: A) Walking conditions, B) Dikabis mobile infra-red eye-tracker and electrooculography (EOG) placement, C) Mobile eye-tracker raw data (examples of saccade occurrences has been marked on each x axis at the point when detected)
Figure 3 - Saccade frequency during gait [Mean and standard deviation (SD) results for single and dual task walking are displayed]
A) Initial Structural equation model

B) Final Structural Equation Model

Figure 4 – Structural equation model of cognitive and visual contributions to gait impairment in Parkinson’s disease [*significance level p<.05, dashed lines are non-significant pathways, indirect pathways are represented by faded block arrows underlying direct pathways, solid arrows are direct pathways, double-headed arrows represent correlations or shared relationships, latent variables are represented via circles/ovals and observed variables via rectangles]