International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

Journal homepage: www.ijrpr.com ISSN 2582-7421

# Effect of Long-Term Spaceflight on Postural Equilibrium Control

*Dr Debopriya Ghosh[1], Paul Anderson[2], Dr Gregor A[3]*

Department of Physiology, University College of Medical Sciences. Delhi, India.
[2]Department of Biomedical Engineering, Virginia Commonwealth University, USA
[3]Department of Chemical and Life Science Engineering, Virginia Commonwealth University, USA

**ABSTRACT**

Vestibular aetiology of postural ataxia after brief spaceflight is supported by studies. Astronauts' balance control systems do not utilise the otolith-mediated spatial reference given by the terrestrial gravitational force vector right after travel. In-flight centrifuges could serve as a useful countermeasure.

**KEYWORDS:** Vestibular Apparatus, Motor Control, Neuroscience, Space travel, Weightlessness.

## INTRODUCTION

In order to optimise coordinated body motions and posture management in the gravitational field of the earth, human sensory-motor systems have developed. In order to assess the biomechanical state of the body (spatial orientation), the central nervous system (CNS) has evolved neurosensory and neu- romotor systems that generate, select, and execute motor signals to rectify biomechanical state problems [1-3]. The sensory information integration mechanisms utilised to determine spatial orientation are modified by neurosensory systems in response to the abrupt loss of graviceptor (otolith) input during spaceflight [4,5]. Additionally, neuromotor systems adapt their repertoire of motor command methods and synergies for movement control in response to the abrupt removal of the static gravitational biomechanical pressure [6]. Unfortunately, these in-flight sensory-motor modifications are not suitable for the gravitational environment on Earth and instead enhance neuronal control of movement in microgravity. Immediately upon return to Earth, a disturbance in postural balance regulation is one of the operationally significant consequences of this maladaptation [7]. Systems for controlling posture on land are created to preserve biomechanical stability throughout daily activities. Early on, the central nervous system (CNS) learns to manage the body's centre of mass steadily both in peaceful posture and while anticipating or reacting to postural disturbances brought on by voluntary movements or outside disturbances. The CNS employs inputs from the ocular, vestibular, proprioceptive, and somatosensory receptors to achieve this in order to determine the body's present biomechanical condition [1]. In order to establish the body's spatial orientation and relative stability, this state input is combined with internal models of the kinematics and dynamics of the body [2]. Additionally, depending on these conclusions, the CNS chooses and orders the best motor control methods and synergies to bring the body back to the intended state of equilibrium [3, 8]. Sense-based feedback is essential for controlling posture. Nor- mally, the CNS continually and unconsciously evaluates the discrepancies between the planned biomechanical condition produced by higher level brain regions and the actual biomechanical state perceived by the available sensory feedback systems. Closed loop control neural networks may modify the motor outputs to make up for slight variations (errors). Nevertheless, an open loop control mode could be activated if the faults are significant. The CNS choose a stereotyped response from its remembered repertoire based on prior experience as well as the size, direction, and rate of change of the erroneous state vector. The set of motor commands stored in this response memory is subsequently executed, causing predefined muscles to contract at specified times without taking into account the accompanying sensory data. The CNS quickly begins continuous monitoring of the present biomechanical situation after this open loop instruction volley.

## CONTROLLING POSTURE ALSO DEPENDS ON BIOMECHANICS AND MOTOR FUNCTION.

The kinematic and dynamic responses to a specific set of motor instructions will vary depending on changes in body mass distribution, intersegmental orientation, muscle strength, muscle tone, or reflex activity. The continual CNS adjustment of motor outputs during calm stance often makes up for mild motor performance and biomechanical impairments. However, after abrupt perturbations, the effectiveness of the subsequent motor command volleys in regaining postural equilibrium heavily depends on motor function and biomechanics. Spaceflight eliminates gravity's ordinarily constant, all-pervasive, Earth-vertical spatial reference, which is detected by the otolith organs and other cortical graviceptors. This results in a discrepancy between the anticipated and actual sensory afference caused by bodily motions. Space motion sickness (SMS) [9], perceptual illusions, and poor coordination can all be caused by this incongruence. If the discrepancy persists, it could also stimulate central adaptive processes that lead to new internal representations of the reafferent signals anticipated from efferent motor orders. The misinterpretation [4] or ignoring [5] of gravity-mediated otolith inputs has been used in the past to characterise the new internal models. In the end, this adaptation causes the CNS to stop looking for gravity inputs to utilise in determining spatial orientation. While this could help to reduce SMS and is likely to improve central neuronal control of coordinated body movements while there is no gravity, it also seems to considerably impair control of coordinated body movements right after returning to Earth [10]. Disruption of postural stability control has been shown to be one of the postflight impacts of in-flight neurosensory adaptation to microgravity [6, 7, 11–21] in both astronauts and cosmonauts. The CNS's neuromotor components are similarly impacted by the prolonged absence of gravity. For instance, when gravity is lost, the following things happen: (1) weight unloading, which results in disturbances in muscle disuse; (2) elimination of tonic antigravity muscle activation; (3) reduction of support reactions; and (4) changes in biomechanics, which are, for instance, characterised by altered relationships between the mass of a body segment and the force needed to move it [16]. The features and processes of postflight postural ataxia have previously been studied by researchers from the Russian and American space programmes. In one class of experiments, the ability of crew members to keep a steady upright position during calm stance with standard and modified sensory feedback was studied. Astronauts had to stand on slender rails with their eyes open or closed under the first such paradigm employed in the American programme [12–14, 22, 23]. Results from this paradigm showed significant postflight performance declines during the eyes-closed tests, with the first postflight test showing the largest degree of the ataxia. Recovery seems to be influenced by mission duration. Similar findings were found early on in the Russian programme using stabilogram recordings of three different standing positions: (1) silent standing with eyes open and closed; (2) sharpened Romberg posture; and (3) standing with the head inclined either forward or backward [24–26]. More complicated paradigms have been used in later investigations of postural stability in calm posture before and after flight. For instance, von Baumgarten et al. [27] asked crew members to stand on an Earth-fixed stabilometer beneath a tilting room with their eyes open, their eyes closed, conflicting visual- vestibular input while the room was tilted with a sine wave, and altered somatosensory input while the subject was standing on foam rubber placed on top of the stabilometer. They discovered reduced postural stability for up to 5 days after landing on Earth, as well as an increased dependence on visual cues for posture control immediately following spaceflight.

Another category of postural studies looked at crew members' capacities to return to stable upright posture after being disturbed by outside forces. In the U.S. program, external postural perturba- tions were provided most frequently by moving the sup- port surface upon which the subject stood. For instance, Anderson et al. [11] translated the support surface abruptly and gradually. They discovered that the segmental biomechanical responses were heightened, the soleus muscle's first electromyographic (EMG) response had a longer latency, and it took more time to reach a new equilibrium position during spaceflight than it did previously. Using abrupt step-wise pitch rotations of the support surface, Kenyon and Young [14] discovered that the late (long loop) EMG response had a larger amplitude after flight than it had before. Researchers have regularly employed postural perturbations at the chest rather than the base of support to explore ataxia following flight in the Russian space programme. For instance, Grigoriev and Yegorov [28] investigated the three key members of the long-duration MIR-Quant expedition's postflight posture control. They discovered that, as compared to preflight values, less force was needed to disrupt posture on the sixth day after flight, and that both the time it took to recover from the perturbation and the amount of muscle activation after the perturbation both increased. Other long-duration trips, short-duration missions, and microgravity simulation trials also resulted in similar modifications, which were also observed in larger groups of participants [6, 15, 26, 29]. These experiments led the authors to the conclusion that support unloading was crucial in the development of postural ataxia after short-term (up to 30 days) exposure to both real and simulated microgravity. This was explained by a decrease in afferent influx from the support regions, which led to a loss in the tone of the muscles that resist gravity (extensors), as well as by a hypersensitivity of the spinal reflex mechanisms. They proposed that peripheral diseases, such as muscle hypotrophy, changes in neuromuscular transfer functions, and changes in muscle membrane characteristics, were also significant for longer-term hypogravity exposures. Furthermore, they hypothesised that perturbations to the processes of reorganising motor patterns occurred during long-term spaceflights and that recovery time was significantly influenced by mission duration. Disturbances in post-flight postural balance have significant effects on the likelihood that emergency escape from the Shuttle right after landing would be successful. Although there seems to be a quick initial adaptation to the terrestrial environment, crew members' subjective accounts suggest that, at least in some circumstances, it would have been challenging to exit the vehicle as soon as the wheels stopped. The severity of the postflight ataxia would significantly worsen if the crew compartment were filled with smoke or made gloomy by broken lights, according to earlier research showing that the microgravity acclimated individual leans more largely on visual system inputs for posture regulation. Emergency escape would be difficult or impossible under these circumstances. If emergency escape is necessary on the runway after landing, the vehicle's 6-degree forward pitch position is likely to make the situation much more difficult. The apparent (visual) vertical within the vehicle may differ from the vertical outside the vehicle, and the visible vertical may differ from the gravitational (otolith) vertical as a result of the forward pitch. Additionally, the sensations of self-motion and/or surround-motion reported to be generated by head motions during entrance and just after flight [4, 30] might significantly worsen these egress issues. The de facto need that emergency escape be accomplished while donning a huge, unwieldy launch and entry suit and changes in effector characteristics like muscle tone and strength may also make things more difficult (LES). Numerous investigations on the causes and severity of postflight postural ataxia have been conducted. Each of these research' findings broadly agrees with the ideas being investigated in Detailed Supplementary Objective (DSO) 605. There is, however, a great deal of uncertainty regarding the extent to which non-vestibular variables may account for the observed postflight ataxia because to the limited population size and lack of supporting data in abnormal human patients. The fundamental issue that all prior research on posture control changes related to spaceflight have in common is the small number of people evaluated. It is impossible to interpret the outcomes of trials on two to f people conclusively, especially given the significant variations in demographic parameters, such as age, gender, flying experience, and mission duration, that may have an impact on the outcomes. Moreover, only when the impact of these demographic characteristics is understood can specialised countermeasures to the undesirable effects of in-flight sensory-motor adaptation be developed and/or evaluated. By (1) examining the components of neu- rosensory control of posture with a more sensitive posturography technique than previously used, (2) systematically evaluating the entire post-flight recovery process, (3) explicitly controlling for prior spaceflight experience, and (4) studying enough subjects to draw statistically significant conclusions, DSO 605 was created to build on the findings of previous studies of postflight postural ataxia. The main objectives of this study were to (1) describe the postural equilibrium control recovery process in crew members returning from Shuttle flights and (2) verify the dynamic posturography system as a dependent measure for upcoming vestibular and/or sensory-motor countermeasure evaluations. This investigation's long-term goal was to identify the fundamental causes of postflight postural ataxia in astronauts taking part in lengthy Orbiter spaceflight missions. It was anticipated that this information would produce revelations that would direct the creation of efficient defences against the impacts of sensory-motor adaptation to space travel. The following theories were examined: When gravitational otolith stimulation is lost during flight, along with corresponding reductions in the biomechanical restraints on body motion, the central nervous system (CNS) undergoes adaptive modifications that replace gravity-mediated otolith information in determining spatial orientation (partially) by giving visual spatial information more weight. As a result, postflight vestibular regulation of posture will be less effective, and visual inputs will be more dependent on posture control as a result. Because of the persistence of in-flight sensory-motor adaptation, the efficiency of posture control during silent stance and in reaction to stability-threatening external shocks will be diminished early after spaceflight. Due to the longer time required for in-flight sensory-motor adaptation to microgravity, the severity and recovery time of this postflight postural ataxia will both grow with mission duration. As a result of repeated exposures to microgravity, a training effect develops, causing postflight postural ataxia to become less severe and to recover more quickly over time. Less severe ataxia will be present in astronauts with prior spaceflight experience compared to those taking their first jney.

## STUDIES ON POSTURAL EQUILIBRIUM CONTROL

Researcher shows, Every individual showed a significant reduction in postural stability on landing day compared to their preflight assessments, which were typically above the 80th percentile scores for a normative population. F out of the ten had clinically abnormal scores, falling below the 5th percentile for the normative group. The first readaptation, which was subjectively reported by all individuals, was quantitatively supported in each of the f subjects who were evaluated twice on landing day. All participants achieved preflight stability levels by 8 days after the wheels stopped, despite significant variation in the time needed. Based on these findings, a double exponential process was used to describe postflight readaptation [7]. The Levenberg-Marquardt nonlinear least squares method was used to fit normalised composite equilibrium score data to this model. The results of this exercise showed that (1) at wheels stop, the average returning crew member was below the threshold of clinical normality, (2) the initial rapid phase of readaptation had a time constant of about 2.7 hs and accounted for about 50% of the postural instability, and (3) the slower secondary phase of readaptation had a time constant of about 100 hs and also contributed to about 50% of the postural instability.

## STRATEGIES FOR HEAD-TRUNK COORDINATION AFTER SPACEFLIGHT

To learn more about the mechanisms underlying post-flight postural ataxia, it was examined whether adopted strategies intended to reduce head movements have an impact on post-flight postural biomechanics. Before taking off, subjects were subjected to three consecutive abrupt support surface translations in the posterior direction. To determine the centre of pressure and sway trajectories in the sagittal plane, ground reaction forces and segmental body movements were measured and employed [33]. On R+0 compared to preflight, sway responses to translational perturbations were heightened. The learning associated with repeated sequential perturbations vanished in some people after flight, and the centre of force and hip sway trajectories were usually more labile, or under- damped, on R+0 than before flight. On R+0, some participants' head motions were significantly decreased compared to preflight, while other subjects' head movements were accentuated. When compared to preflight, it was commonly seen that hip sway was higher while shoulder sway and/or head movement in space were lower. Although seldom witnessed before flight, Nashner's [35] proposed strap down and stable platform head trunk coordination strategies were often observed after flight. Preflight patterns returned by R+4 or R+8 days, and the biomechanical alterations appeared to follow recovery trajectories comparable to those observed in the sensory test performance measures. We come to the conclusion that postflight postural instabilities were partially induced by new restrictions on biomechanical movement brought about by the CNS implementing methods intended to reduce head movement. Studies shows that, tests of sensory organisation show a substantial difference between people with prior spaceflight experience and those without when the performances of the rookie and veteran groups are compared. On every test of sensory organisation, preflight performances between these groups were statistically identical [7]. These findings show that experienced space travellers were more adept at utilising vestibular data right after landing than novices. Experienced astronauts may have been somewhat dual-adapted and able to switch from one set of internal models to another more easily since they had previously transitioned between unit gravity and microgravity. No differences between rookies and veterans were seen on tests 1 through 4, which supports claim that altered vestibular system input processing is the primary mechanism causing postflight postural ataxia.

## CONCLUSION

The vestibular aetiology of postural ataxia after brief spaceflight is supported by studies. We investigated the vestibular system's function in balance regulation in astronauts during calm stance both before and after spaceflight using the computerised dynamic posturography approach developed by Nashner et al. [39]. Unmistakably, findings show that balance control is impaired in all astronauts as soon as they land from space. The worst-affected crew members who later returned to duty fared similarly to individuals with vestibular deficiency who had undergone this battery of tests. We come to the conclusion that the astronauts' balance control systems do not utilise the otolith-mediated spatial reference given by the terrestrial gravitational force vector right after travel. Studies suggest that intermittent intervals of exposure to artificial gravity may serve as a useful in-flight countermeasure because the postflight ataxia appears to be predominantly driven by CNS adaptation to the altered vestibular inputs induced by absence of gravitational stimulation. We specifically suggest that in-flight centrifugation will allow crew members to maintain their sensory-motor adapted states from the terrestrial environment while concurrently establishing microgravity adapted states. The shift from microgravity to unit gravity should be relatively smooth for the dual-adapted astronaut. We have started a ground-based initiative to create prescriptions for short arm centrifuges that will maximise adaptability to different gravitational conditions. The outcomes of these trials are anticipated to directly influence the in-flight assessment of the suggested centrifuge countermeasure. Because computerised dynamic posturography system was able to (1) quantify the postflight postural ataxia reported by crew members and observed by flight surgeons and scientists, (2) track the recovery of preflight normal balance control, (3) distinguish between novice and experienced subjects, and (4) provide normative and clinical data- bases for comparison, and because study successfully characterised postflight balance control recovery in a significant cross-section, Results of 28 astronauts' motor control tests from 14 different Shuttle missions, each lasting 4 to 10 days, were examined.

**References**

1. Nashner LM, McCollum G. The organization of human postural movements: a formal basis and experimental syntheses. Behav Brain Sci 1985; 8:135-72.
2. Gurfinkel VS, Levik YS. Sensory complexes and sen- somotor integration. Translated from Fiziologya Che- loveka 1978; 3:399-414.
3. Massion, J. Movement, posture and equilibrium: interaction and coordination. Prog Neurobiol 1992; 38: 35-56.
4. Parker DE, Reschke MF, Arrott AP, Homick JL, Lichtenberg BK. Otolith tilt-translation reinterpreta- tion following prolonged weightlessness: implica- tions for preflight training. Aviat Space Environ Med 1985; 56:601-6.
5. Young LR. Adaptation to modified vestibular input. In: Adaptive Mechanisms in Gaze Control. Berthoz A, Melvill Jones G, editors. Amsterdam: Elsevier; 1985.
6. Kozlovskaya IB, Kreidich YV, Rakham OV. Mecha- nisms of the effects of weightlessness on the motor system of man. Physiologist 1981; 24:59-64.
7. Paloski WH, Black FO, Reschke MF, Calkins DS. Altered CNS processing disrupts balance control after spaceflight. Exp Brain Res 1998. (Submitted; in review)
8. Nashner LM. Fixed patterns of rapid postural responses among leg muscles during stance. Exp Brain Res 1978; 43:395-405.
9. Reason JT, Brand JJ. Motion Sickness. London: Aca- demic Press; 1975.
10. Reschke MF, Bloomberg JJ, Harm DL, Paloski WH, Parker DE. Neurophysiological aspects: sensory and sensory-motor function. In: Space Physiology and Medicine. Nicogossian AE, Huntoon CL, Pool SL, editors. 3rd ed. Philadelphia: Lea & Febiger; 1994.
11. Anderson DJ, Reschke MF, Homick JL, Werness SAS. Dynamic posture analysis of Spacelab-1 crew members. Exp Brain Res 1986; 64:380-91.
12. Homick JL, Reschke MF. Postural equilibrium fol- lowing exposure to weightless space flight. Acta Oto- laryngol 1977; 83:455-64.
13. Homick JL, Reschke MF, Miller EF II. Effects of pro- longed exposure to weightlessness on postural equi- librium. In: Biomedical Results from Skylab (NASA SP-377). Johnston RS, Dietlein LF, editors. 1977. p 104-12.
14. Kenyon RV, Young LR. MIT/Canadian vestibular experiments on Spacelab-1 mission 5: postural responses following exposure to weightlessness. Exp Brain Res 1986; 64:335-46.
15. Kozlovskaya IB, Aslanova IF, Grigorieva LS, Krei- dich YV. Experimental analysis of motor effects of weightlessness. Physiologist 1982; 25:49-52.
16. Kozlovskaya IB, Demetrieva I, Grigorieva LS, Kiren- skaya AV, Kreidich YV. Gravitational mechanisms in the motor systems: studies in real and simulated weightlessness. In: Stance and Motion, Facts and Fic- tion. Gurfinkel VS, Ioffe ME, Massion J, Roll JP, edi- tors. New York: Plenum; 1988. p 37-48.
17. Paloski WH, Harm DL, Reschke MF, Doxey DD, Skinner NC, Michaud LJ, Parker DE. Postural changes following sensory reinterpretation as an ana- log to spaceflight. In: Proceedings of the Fth Euro- pean Symposium on Life Sciences Research in Space (ESA SP-307). Trieste, Italy; 28 May - 01 June 1990. p 175-8.
18. Paloski WH, Reschke MF, Black FO, Doxey DD, Harm DL. Recovery of postural equilibrium control following space flight. In: Sensing and Controlling Motion: Vestibular and Sensorimotor Function. Cohen B, Tomko DL, Guedry F, editors. Ann NY Acad. Sci; 682: 1992. p 747-54.
19. Paloski WH, Reschke MF, Doxey DD, Black FO. Neurosensory adaptation associated with postural ataxia following spaceflight. In: Posture and Gait: Control Mechanisms. Woolacott M, Horak F, editors. Eugene: University of Oregon Press; 1992. p 311-15.
20. Paloski WH, Black FO, Reschke MF. Vestibular ataxia following shuttle flights: effects of transient microgravity on otolith-mediated sensorimotor con- trol of posture. Am J Otology 1993; 1:9-17.
21. Paloski WH, Bloomberg JJ, Reschke MF, Harm DL. Spaceflight-induced changes in posture and locomo- tion. Proc Biomech XIVth I.S.B. Congress. Paris, France; 1993. p 40-41.
22. Berry CA, Homick JL. Findings on American astro- nauts bearing on the issue of artificial gravity for future manned space vehicles. Aerospace Med 1973; 44:163-8.
23. Homick JL, Miller EF II. Apollo flight crew vestibu- lar assessment. In: Biomedical results of Apollo (NASA SP-368). Johnston RS, Dietlein LF, Berry CA, editors. 1975. p 323-40.
24. Bryanov II, Yemel'yanov MD, Matveyev AD, Mant- sev EI, Tarasov IK, Yakovleva IY, Kakurin LI, Koz- erenko OP, Myasnikov VI, Yeremin AV, Pervushin VI, Cherepakhin MA, Purakhin YuN, Rudometkin NM, Chekidra IV. Characteristics of statokinetic reactions. In: Space Flights in the Soyuz Spacecraft: Biomed- ical Research. Gazenko OG, Kakurin LI, Kuznetsov AG, editors. Leo Kanner Associates, Redwood City, CA. Translation of Kosmicheskiye Polety na Korablyakh 'Soyuz' Biomeditsinskiye Issledovaniya. Moscow: Nauka Press; 1976. p 1-416.

25. Yegorov AD. Results of medical studies during long- term manned flights on the orbital Salyut-6 and Soyuz complex. NASA TM-76014. U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences; 1979.

26. Kozlovskaya IB, Kreidich YV, Oganov VS, Koserenko OP. Pathophysiology of motor functions in prolonged manned space flights. Acta Astronau- tica 1981; 8:1059-72.

27. Baumgarten von R, Benson A, Berthoz A, Bles W, Brandt T, Brenske A, Clarke A, Dichgans J, Eggerts- berger R, J¸rgens K, Kass J, Krafczyk S, Probst T, Scherer H, Th¸mler R, Vieville T, Vogel H, Wetzig J. European experiments on the vestibular system during the Spacelab D-1 mission. In: Proc Norderney Symp on Scientific Results of the German Spacelab Mission D1. Sahm PR, Jansen R, Keller MH, editors. Norder- ney, Germany; 27-29 August 1986. p 477-90.

28. Grigoriev AI, Yegorov AD, editors. Preliminary med- ical results of the 180-day flight of prime crew 6 on Space Station MIR. Proc Fourth Meeting of the US/USSR Joint Working Group on Space Biology and Medicine. San Francisco, CA; 16-22 September 1990.

29. Kozlovskaya IB, Aslanova IF, Barmin VA, Grigorieva LS, Gevlich GI, Kirenskaya AV, Sirota MG. The nature and characteristics of gravitational ataxia. Physiologist Supplement, 1983; 26:108-9.

30. Harm DL, Parker DE. Perceived self-orientation and self-motion in microgravity, after landing, and during preflight adaptation training. J Vestib Res 1993; 3:297-305.

31. Croskey MI, Dawson PM, Lueson AC, Mahron IE, Wright HE. The height of the center-of-gravity in man. Am J Physiol 1922; 61:171-185.

32. Anonymous. Equitest system version 4.0 data inter- pretation manual. Clackamas OR: NeuroCom Inter- national; 1991.

33. Nicholas SC, Gasway DD, Paloski WH. A link-seg- ment model of upright human posture for analysis of head-trunk coordination. J Vest Res 1998; 8(3). (In Press)

34. Horak FB, Nashner LM. Central programming of pos- tural movements: adaptation to altered support-surface conditions. J Neurophysiol 1986; 55:1365-81.

35. Nashner LM. Strategies for organization of human posture. In: Vestibular and Visual Control on Posture and Locomotor Equilibrium. Igarashi M, Black FO, editors. Basel: Karger; 1985. p 1-8.

36. Marquardt DW. J Soc Ind Appl Math 1963; 11:431- 41.

37. Huynh H, Feldt LS. Performance of traditional F tests in repeated measures designs under covariance het- erogeneity. Commun Statist – Theor Meth 1980; A9(1):61-74.

38. Geisser S, Greenhouse SW. An extension of Box’s results on the use of the F distribution in multivariate analysis. Annals of Mathematical Statistics 1958; 29:885-91.

39. Nashner LM, Black FO, Wall C. Adaptation to altered support and visual conditions during stance: patients with vestibular deficits. J Neurosci 1982; 5:536-44.