

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

Kinematic models of lower limb joints for musculo-skeletal modelling and optimization in gait analysis

This is the final peer-reviewed author's accepted manuscript (postprint) of the following publication:

Published Version:

Leardini, A., Belvedere, C., Nardini, F., Sancisi, N., Conconi, M., Parenti-Castelli, V. (2017). Kinematic models of lower limb joints for musculo-skeletal modelling and optimization in gait analysis. JOURNAL OF BIOMECHANICS, 62, 77-86 [10.1016/j.jbiomech.2017.04.029].

Availability: This version is available at: https://hdl.handle.net/11585/626518 since: 2018-02-27

Published:

DOI: http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2017.04.029

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (https://cris.unibo.it/). When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

This is the final peer-reviewed accepted manuscript of:

Alberto Leardini, Claudio Belvedere, Fabrizio Nardini, Nicola Sancisi, Michele Conconi, Vincenzo Parenti-Castelli, **Kinematic models of lower limb joints for musculo-skeletal modelling and optimization in gait analysis**, Journal of Biomechanics, Volume 62, 2017, Pages 77-86, ISSN 0021-9290

The final published version is available online at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2017.04.029

Rights / License:

The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<u>https://cris.unibo.it/</u>)

When citing, please refer to the published version.

1	KINEMATIC MODELS OF LOWER LIMB JOINTS FOR											
2	MUSCULO-SKELETAL MODELLING AND OPTIMIZATION IN GAIT ANALYSIS											
3	Alberto Leardini ¹ , Claudio Belvedere ¹ , Fabrizio Nardini ² ,											
4	Nicola Sancisi ² , Michele Conconi ² , Vincenzo Parenti-Castelli ²											
5	¹ Laboratory of Movement Analysis and Functional-Clinical Evaluation of Prostheses, Istituto											
6	Ortopedico Rizzoli, Bologna, Italy											
7	² DIN—Department of Industrial Engineering, Health Sciences and Technologies,											
8	Interdepartmental Centre for Industrial Research (HST-ICIR), Università degli Studi di Bologna,											
9	Viale del Risorgimento 2, 40136 Bologna, Italy											
10												
11	SUBMISSION to the Journal of Biomechanics (special issue on STA) in December 2016											
12	Word count: 5840 / Table: 1											
13	Corresponding author:											
14	Claudio Belvedere, Ph.D.											
15	Laboratory of Movement Analysis and Functional - Clinical Evaluation of Prostheses											
16	Centro di Ricerca Codivilla-Putti											
17	Istituto Ortopedico Rizzoli											
18	Via di Barbiano 1/10, 40136 - Bologna, ITALY											
19	Tel: +39 051 6366570											
20	Fax: +39 051 6366561											
21	Email: belvedere@ior.it											
22	Keywords: Motion analysis, soft-tissue artefact, musculoskeletal modelling, multibody kinematic											
23	optimization models.											
24	Author Contributions Statement: Each author has been involved either in the study design, or in											
25	the performance of the analysis, or in data interpretation, or in the manuscript drafting. All authors											

26 have read and approved the final submitted manuscript.

27 ABSTRACT

28 Kinematic models of lower limb joints have several potential applications in musculoskeletal modelling of the locomotion apparatus, including the reproduction of the natural joint motion. 29 These models have recently revealed their value also for in vivo motion analysis experiments, 30 where the soft-tissue artefact is a critical known problem. This arises at the interface between the 31 32 skin markers and the underlying bone, and can be reduced by defining multibody kinematic models of the lower limb and by running optimization processes aimed at obtaining estimates of position 33 and orientation of relevant bones. With respect to standard methods based on the separate 34 optimization of each single body segment, this technique makes it also possible to respect joint 35 kinematic constraints. Whereas the hip joint is traditionally assumed as a 3 degrees of freedom ball 36 and socket articulation, many previous studies have proposed a number of different kinematic 37 models for the knee and ankle joints. Some of these are rigid, while others have compliant 38 39 elements. Some models have clear anatomical correspondences and include real joint constraints; other models are more kinematically oriented, these being mainly aimed at reproducing joint 40 41 kinematics. This paper provides a critical review of the kinematic models reported in literature for 42 the major lower limb joints and used for the reduction of soft-tissue artefact. Advantages and disadvantages of these models are discussed, considering their anatomical significance, accuracy of 43 predictions, computational costs, feasibility of personalization, and other features. Their use in the 44 optimization process is also addressed, both in normal and pathological subjects. 45

47 **1. INTRODUCTION**

48 Instrumental gait analysis deals with the estimation of kinematics and kinetics at the major joints of the lower limbs, traditionally by means of stereophotogrammetric and dynamometric measurement 49 systems (Cappozzo et al., 2005). As for the former, a number of reflective markers, i.e. the marker-50 set, are stuck on the skin in correspondence of targeted anatomical landmarks, axes or planes, 51 according to specific protocols and conventions (Wu and Cavanagh, 1995; Wu et al., 2002). From 52 the trajectories of these markers, obtained during the execution of the motor tasks under analysis, 53 three-dimensional body segment position and orientation (altogether hereinafter also referred to as 54 'pose') are calculated together with their relative motion, respectively joint displacements and 55 56 rotations. For these calculations, many different options exist (Ferrari et al., 2008; Leardini et al., 2009; Leardini et al., 2011), as for the selection of the marker-set, corresponding technical and 57 anatomical co-ordinate reference frames and joint conventions. In these series of estimations, the 58 59 interposition of soft tissues between the markers and the internal skeletal structures, the real target of gait analysis, are particularly critical (Leardini et al., 2005; Peters et al., 2010; Akbarshahi et al., 60 61 2010). This introduces the so called soft-tissue-artefact (STA), which can be as large as a few centimetres (Stagni et al., 2009). STA does affect final gait measurements much more than the 62 instrumental error derived from the stereophotogrammetric systems (Chiari et al., 2005), and more 63 than the likely erroneous identification of the anatomical landmarks by the operator (Della Croce et 64 al., 2005). This is independent from their anatomical typology (bony prominences, joint axes, or 65 internal joint centres) and of their identification via direct placement, instrumental calibration 66 (Kadaba et al., 1990; Cappozzo et al., 1995) or functional tests (Schwartz and Rozumalski, 2005). 67 Soft tissue motion results in deformation of the relevant cluster of markers, as well as in its rigid 68 displacement with respect to the underlying bones. These deformations and displacements are 69 70 associated to muscle contraction and relaxation, to gravitational and inertial effects, and also to skin sliding, particularly across the joints because of their large rotations. The major problem for the 71

possible identification and reduction of this artefact is that it has mostly the same frequency content
of target movement (Leardini *et al.*, 2005).

Many are the studies in literature reporting attempts at reducing STA in gait analysis via segmental 74 or global optimization techniques using joint models. The latter is here referred to as multibody 75 kinematics optimization (MKO). From another perspective, many studies have defined 76 biomechanical models able to reproduce joint kinematics that have been applied to MKO 77 approaches. The present is the first review paper where both these series of studies are presented 78 79 and discussed thoroughly, respectively in Section 2 and 3, for current and future similar exercises on MKO. In Section 3 the review is focused on kinematic joint models, used and validated 80 81 specifically for the compensation of STA. No single best solution is established as definite in the literature, rather the aim of this review is to clearly define the many various options, being critical 82 on their possible advantages and disadvantages, for anyone then to be able to choose the most 83 84 suitable one according to the specific contexts and conditions of the optimal estimation. Relevant selection criteria are also discussed based on findings from published studies. 85

86

2. GAIT ANALYSIS WITH JOINT CONSTRAINTS FOR MKO BASED TECHNIQUES

88 **2.1** The segmental approach

89 Many approaches have been proposed to limit STA and its propagation to the final gait analysis measurements. The simplest recommended careful locations of the markers (Cappozzo et al., 1996; 90 Manal et al., 2000; Stagni et al., 2005; Cockcroft et al., 2016), although the major effect, i.e. the 91 rigid displacement of the entire cluster, cannot be removed. At the beginning of more thorough 92 investigations, a pure segmental approach looked at this problem considering single segments 93 separately (single-body optimization), addressing marker cluster deformation and displacement 94 95 independently from other body segments. Least-squares algorithms (Veldpaus et al., 1988), singlevalue-decomposition (SVD) (Soderkvist and Wedin, 1993) and the so-called solidification (Cheze 96 et al., 1995) procedures were proposed to reduce STA on analytical bases. A little later, the pliant-97

surface (Ball and Pierrynowski, 1998) and the point-cluster (Andriacchi et al., 1998; Alexander and 98 Andriacchi, 2001) techniques were also introduced, which implied large clusters of many uniformly 99 distributed markers: eigenvalues and eigenvectors of the corresponding inertia tensors were 100 101 calculated after having assigned an arbitrary mass to each of these markers. Results in bone pose estimation, obtained with these techniques, were considered satisfactory for position error 102 103 reduction, but not for the orientation error, which is the main point of interest in gait analysis. A local motion estimation technique was also proposed (Cerveri et al., 2005), using virtual humans 104 and extended Kalman filters to work out kinematics directly from 2D measurements, without 105 requiring the 3D marker reconstruction. To account for the effect of cluster deformation due to 106 107 STA, a slightly different approach was taken from recognized statistical shape analyses (Taylor et al., 2005), the so-called Optimal Common Shape Technique, which extended the SVD procedure 108 109 over multiple time points. Validation tests on sheep revealed a better performance compared to the 110 point-cluster technique. This paper also concluded that the method is suitable for reducing errors due to the independent motion of markers from the rest of the cluster, but that this cannot reduce 111 errors associated with the synchronous rigid displacement of the cluster as a whole. 112

113 Another series of studies focused on separate segment pose estimations, but joint motion from the subject under analysis was still taken into account for STA compensation. This was sought either by 114 115 replicating the anatomical landmark calibration procedure at two extreme positions, i.e. double calibration (Cappello et al., 1997; Cappello et al., 2005), or by a so-called dynamic-calibration of 116 the artefact (Lucchetti et al., 1998). In the latter, STA is meant to be first isolated in a special 117 exercise performed on purpose by the subject, and then compensated based on correspondences of 118 joint angles in this exercise and in the motor task to be analyzed. As a possible improvement, a later 119 study proposed to offset the anatomical landmark position by using a skin marker analytical 120 121 displacement for correction (Ryu et al., 2009). These three original methods demonstrated to be effective to limit STA propagation in the evaluation of knee joint rotations and displacements 122 (Stagni et al., 2009). The merit of these initial techniques is the partial compensation for the 123

artefact: knowing that it is subject specific, it is first isolated and then subtracted from the overall motion collected in the raw measurements. On the other hand, for these techniques to be applied, a supplementary exercise is required by the subject, and time-consuming additional analyses must be performed after data collection. These techniques are also based on the assumptions that STA is well revealed by the proposed exercise, and that these are repeatable intra- and inter-sessions.

129 Recent in vivo measurements with bone pins on the tibia and femur (Benoit et al., 2015) established 130 explicitly that in soft tissue deformation and displacement, non-rigid (i.e. scaling and deformation) movements of the marker clusters contribute to the overall amount of STA error much less than 131 rigid (i.e. translation and rotation) movements, supported also by a study on running (Dumas et al., 132 133 2015). These papers concluded that skin marker optimisation, based on isolated segments, which can only minimise non-rigid motion components, is superfluous, and that procedures designed to 134 account for cluster rigid translation and rotation are required to correctly represent body segments 135 136 motion. It has also been shown that STA is very subject-specific and any custom definition of a model of the artefact is impractical. The use of optimal estimation of bone poses in isolated body 137 segments (single-body optimization) is questioned by these evidences, which also suggest the 138 introduction of thorough overall lower limb models and joint constraints. This will be largely 139 discussed below. 140

141 2.2 Multi-body kinematics optimisation - An historical perspective

The real foremost alternative to this series of more local attempts is the MKO approach, which 142 entails searching solutions for the best possible segment pose estimation by considering an entire 143 lower limb multi-body model, namely a kinematics chain made of rigid segments connected by 144 145 articulating joints. These can be simple lower pairs (such as the hinge or spherical pairs) or more anatomical representation of the joints. The overall concept is to register, for each sample, and in 146 147 the three-dimensional space, a lower limb kinematic model, which includes skin markers to the cloud of corresponding markers collected during the motion exercise. In other words, the overall 148 configuration of the limb model must be searched to minimize the distances between the model-149

determined and the measured marker trajectories. The overall kinematics chain must be configured
with suitable joint models, and relevant parameters must be defined for each subject to be analyzed.
The number and nature of these parameters, such as location of centres, axes, ligament attachments,
contact surfaces, etc., depend on the model types, as discussed in depth later.

The MKO approach, based somehow on redundancy of information, seemed to have great 154 potentials, as the overall kinematics estimation can take advantage of the joint constraints, 155 information which was ignored by the segmental approaches described above. On the other hand, 156 from the beginning it was clear that the quality of the final results would have been strictly 157 correlated with the general quality and the specific custom configuration of the joint models. 158 159 Moreover, it poses also a typical iterative optimization problem, with all relevant known issues, such as selection of the variable to be minimized/maximized, efficiency of the search strategy, 160 definition of the search boundaries, identification of local and global minima, etc. The first proposal 161 162 of this type dates back to 1999 (Lu and O'Connor, 1999), although it addressed the threedimensional problem of lower limb motion analysis only in analytical terms. A skin marker-based 163 164 musculoskeletal model was defined imposing spherical joint constraints; the skin marker trajectories were taken from a standard gait analysis, and alleged STA added to these marker 165 trajectories. A global optimisation method was used to determine positions and orientations of a 166 multi-link model based on the minimisation of the weighted sum of squared distances between 167 measured and model-determined marker positions. The results showed a good capacity of this 168 global error compensation scheme to replicate original known motion, which were much better 169 170 estimated than any direct or segmental based scheme available at the time.

A possible development of this first proposal was published later (Charlton *et al.*, 2004), and the relevant technique, i.e. optimised lower limb gait analysis (OLGA), was implemented in the conventional Newington-Helen Hayes gait analysis protocol (Kadaba *et al.*, 1990). With respect to the Lu and O'Connor's method, three-dimensional segment poses were searched following two different optimisation loops: in addition to the initial "Kinematic Fit" as in the previous paper,

geometrical parameters that define knee, ankle and foot long axes were also searched within the 176 following "Model Fit" iterative optimization procedure. This would possibly allow a better 177 identification of joint parameters (axes, centres etc.) and therefore joint angles. The improvement 178 179 compared to the original technique by Lu and O'Connor (Lu and O'Connor, 1999) was claimed in terms of intra- and inter-observer repeatability of the gait analysis variables, and standard deviation 180 of bone length estimations. A further development of this technique was proposed by another team 181 182 (Reinbolt et al., 2005). Similar to the two-level optimization by Charlton et al. (Charlton et al., 2004), "Outer" and "Inner" optimization phases were adjusted in this new order: joint parameters, 183 i.e. positions and orientations of joint axes, and degrees of freedom (DoFs), i.e. lower limb joint 184 185 rotations and displacements. Differently from the previous study by Charlton et al. (Charlton et al., 2004), there was the introduction of a two-axis model for the ankle complex that accounted for the 186 talo-crural and subtalar joint rotations. Although both procedures proposed by Charlton at al. 187 188 (Charlton et al., 2004) and Reinbolt et al. (Reinbolt et al., 2005) were demonstrated for a specific sets of joint models, they are actually applicable to generic joint geometries. 189

190 A few years later new investigations were carried out both from the joint constraint and the 191 algorithm efficiency point of view. Andersen et al. (Andersen et al., 2010) studied the effects of including spherical and revolute joint constraints in the analysis of knee kinematics from skin 192 markers during gait. Klous et al. (Klous and Klous, 2010) proposed a new analytical method for a 193 kinematics chain model, featuring spherical pairs at all joints and comparing it with either a 194 previous analytical least-squares algorithm (Veldpaus et al., 1988) or the MKO (Lu and O'Connor, 195 1999), according to the segmental and global optimization approaches, respectively. Because large 196 parts of the equations proposed can be solved analytically rather than only numerically, the speed of 197 convergence for the new method was the highest, although the final inaccuracy was slightly larger 198 199 than in the original optimisation method, as expressed by the root-mean-square error (RMSE) between the model-determined and actual marker positions. Joint constraint techniques for the 200 reduction of the STA effects have been formulated for the knee also in terms of plausible values for 201

length variations of the main ligaments (Bergamini *et al.*, 2011; Gasparutto *et al.*, 2012), but this
will be discussed later.

Another original exercise was performed in order to improve the final visual restitution of lower 204 205 limb joint rotations and displacements, after standard motion analysis data registration techniques based merely on bone morphology (Sholukha et al., 2006). The study was motivated by the 206 unrealistic current graphical representations of three-dimensional motion of the lower limbs, 207 particularly critical in computer-based simulations for medical educational purposes. An iterative 208 registration method was proposed, which implied a kinematics chain with best physiological 209 kinematic representations of the main six joints of the lower limbs, each having known specific 3D 210 211 kinematics described with a single DoF (O'Connor et al., 1998). The technique included a primary registration at the knee and ankle joints levels, where coupling curves were taken to drive joint 212 motion according to the corresponding flexion/extension DoF from gait analysis. A secondary 213 214 registration integrated the coupled joint constraints to real motion analysis from a volunteer. Finally, a realistic graphical representation of both the overall skeletal motion and physiological 215 216 kinematics at the knees and ankles were achieved. The latter enabled by modelled joint rotations 217 and displacements which were integrated in the MKO algorithm.

In the past few years, the effect of different models and constraints at the lower limb joints level 218 219 have been assessed thoroughly (Andersen et al., 2010; Duprey et al., 2010; Gasparutto et al., 2015), as well as the sensitivity to relevant parameters (Valente et al., 2014; Valente et al., 2015; Clement 220 et al., 2015; Ojeda et al., 2016; Clement et al., 2017). The most comprehensive study (Duprey et 221 al., 2010) tested the performances of a number of different sets of models of the lower limb joints, 222 and assessed their influence on the overall kinematics, although a gold-standard was not available. 223 Despite few concerns in terms of possible worse pose estimation results (Stagni et al., 2009; 224 225 Andersen et al., 2010; Li et al., 2012), the introduction of joint models, either by kinematic or anatomical constraints, showed the potential for considerable STA compensation. In addition, these 226 models could be used to estimate the forces exchanged at the anatomical structures (D'Angeli et al., 227

228 2013; D'Angeli *et al.*, 2016; Moissenet *et al.*, 2014). However, they must be implemented 229 appropriately, with careful parameter search, and validated cautiously, as it is discussed more in 230 details in the following sections.

231 2.3 Anatomical significance, accuracy, and personalisation feasibility

All these techniques have a value for the description of physiological joint motion, but their 232 reliability and usability still needs to be tested and validated carefully. This additional work is 233 particularly necessary for their use in the description of pathological gait, when the joint function is 234 not natural. In this respect, it is expected that most of the pathological conditions, both abnormal 235 kinematics and lesions at the anatomical structures, are difficult to be replicated in joint models, 236 237 particularly in case of simple non-anatomical joint constraints. Most papers focus only on knee joint, although these techniques are devoted to understand the physiology and pathology of gait 238 over the entire lower limb. Particularly for joints with complex motion, such as the knee and the 239 240 ankle, it is expected that the more the joint model is anatomically realistic, the more accurate the final bone pose estimation will be. However, this higher accuracy would require more careful 241 242 identification of the joint model parameters and therefore higher computational time. A proper 243 validation of these techniques is also a major problem, as described in the next paragraph section. Another limitation of the MKO approach is that the quality of the final estimations is affected by 244 245 the quality of the collected experimental marker motion data. In particular, the risk of inclusion of joint parameters in the overall optimisation is that a lowest cost function value may imply their 246 erroneous estimation (Reinbolt et al., 2005); in other words, optimized joint parameters provide 247 only the best possible fit to the original raw data, which can be considerably imperfect. 248

In literature these MKO methods are rarely proposed together with relevant, thorough and convincing validation activities (Reinbolt *et al.*, 2005). Some have supported the technique by analytical simulations (Lu and O'Connor, 1999; Reinbolt *et al.*, 2005), but the random error added to each marker trajectory separately does facilitate the task to any such algorithm, and the results are misleading because these perturbations are unrealistic (Benoit *et al.*, 2015). The most accurate

condition for these tests would be prescribing skin marker displacements with respect to underlying 254 255 bone, both in terms of deformation and of rigid motion of the cluster, the latter being very difficult to be removed or compensated. The top condition for thorough validations would have the 256 simultaneous knowledge of marker and corresponding skeletal motion during activities as gold-257 standard. This is however very difficult to be achieved because of the invasiveness of some imaging 258 techniques or of bone pins. Validation studies using fluoroscopy, stereo radiography or bone pins 259 were however proposed. Since these studies were more related to the validation of specific joint 260 constraints, they will be analysed in the next section. Sensitivity of final joint kinematics estimation 261 to multi-body model parameters (El Habachi et al., 2015; Martelli et al., 2015) shall also be 262 263 investigated further.

264

3. LOWER LIMB JOINT MODELS FOR MKO BASED TECHNIQUES

266 Joint models are the core of MKO: different models imply different joint constraints imposed to the relative motion of adjacent body segments, and thus a different overall full-leg motion. A number 267 of joint models have been proposed for each of the main articulations of the lower limb (i.e., hip, 268 knee and ankle) leading to different lower limb models according to their combination. These joint 269 models can be validated individually; however, critical issues such as the choice of the constraint 270 type and the identification of the model parameters can still arise when these models are included in 271 MKO, which can result in critical outcomes of the method. Major efforts have been spent in past 272 and recent works to investigate these issues. 273

The first lower limb models adopted simple lower pairs (sometimes referred to as ideal joints in the literature) to constrain the relative motion of adjacent segments, the most common choices being spherical (S) and revolute (R or hinge) joints. Specifically for the ankle, a further common choice is the 2R constraint, namely two intersecting (Duprey *et al.*, 2010) or non-intersecting (Reinbolt *et al.*, 2005) hinges. It is worth noting that, as far as the two hinges represent the tibio-talar and the talocalcaneal rotation axes, experimental evidence shows that these hinges are not actually intersecting

(Dettwylera et al., 2004). The three-segment model by Lu and O'Connor (Lu and O'Connor, 1999) 280 281 featured two spherical pairs (S-S) to represent the hip and the knee joints. After this seminal work, several different kinematic chains were proposed to model the lower limb, like the S-S-S (Charlton 282 et al., 2004) and the S-R-2R (Reinbolt et al., 2005) to represent the hip, knee and ankle joints 283 respectively (the same order will be used in the following nomenclature), where 2R represents two 284 non-intersecting hinges. A first major result related to the use of the abovementioned pairs, was to 285 286 avoid the apparent dislocation of the joints. However, these models represent an oversimplification of the anatomy for the knee and ankle joints that, therefore, could not reproduce the physiological 287 motion. For instance, R constrains the joint to rotate about a fixed axis, despite the instantaneous 288 289 helical axes (IHA) actually varying in these two joints over the flexion arc (Blankevoort et al., 1990; Leardini et al., 1999b). Likewise, S constrains the joint to rotate about a fixed point, and this 290 implies that all IHA pass through this point, as well as that joint translation (i.e., the instantaneous 291 292 joint motion along the IHA) is prevented. This represents a spherical motion in kinematics, and this fixed point is the pivot point (PP). These characteristics do not reflect accurately what is observed 293 294 experimentally, since IHA motion patterns at the knee and the ankle are not perfectly convergent at a single point and some translations along IHA can be measured (Blankevoort et al., 1990; Leardini 295 et al., 1999b). Some studies (Stagni et al., 2009; Andersen et al., 2010) also reports that S (and 296 similarly also R) cannot reproduce joint displacements, defined as the relative displacement 297 between two reference points (often chosen as coincident with the anatomical frame origins) of two 298 different bony segments. However, this latter S limitation should be clarified and mitigated. The 299 problem in this case lies in the identification of S (namely, of the sphere centre C_S), not in the type 300 301 of constraint. This because S prevents any relative motion at PP, but not between any other pair of points of the two bodies: joint displacements can be represented if C_S is not placed at the reference 302 points used to measure these displacements. Studies showed indeed that joint displacements are 303 well represented if C_S is placed near the point where the IHA converge the most, i.e. the 304 approximate PP (Sancisi et al., 2011; Sancisi et al., 2014). The joint motion appears highly 305

sensitive to the C_S position, in particular along the proximal-distal and anterior-posterior axes (Sancisi *et al.*, 2015). Errors in the C_S location affect joint motion, thus its careful identification is paramount. However, since C_S is not closely related to any anatomical landmark, its identification is not straightforward. Together with constraint type, parameter identification is a major issue for all these models.

The use of simple constraints imposed by lower pairs in the MKO was validated in Stagni et al. 311 (Stagni et al., 2009). This is also the first comparison between a MKO technique and fluoroscopy-312 based motion at the knee measured in vivo. High errors were found at the knee level, which were 313 not confirmed in other studies. Andersen et al. (Andersen et al., 2010) also validated different lower 314 315 pair constraints at the knee in a MKO approach in vivo. The study compared joint angles obtained at the knee during walking trials using two types of constraints (S and R) or no constraints (N). 316 Similar RMSEs were obtained on the joint angles by S and R (Table 1). In both cases, higher errors 317 318 were found when compared to N, so that authors suggested that no benefits are obtained for STA reduction if overly simplistic joint models are used, and model parameter identification is not 319 320 accurate. Opposite results were found in more recent studies (Gasparutto et al., 2015; Richard et al., 321 2016) where S performed better than N, and RMSEs were lower than in Andersen et al. (2010) (Table 1), leading the authors to conclude that joint constraints can actually be of value to 322 323 compensate STA. However, also in these studies the authors concluded that more advanced models implementing anatomical constraints, together with accurate parameter identification, can improve 324 results. The different outcomes from these studies may be due to their different experimental 325 conditions and procedures (i.e. population of subjects, motor task, marker set, gait analysis 326 protocol, etc...), as reported in Table 1. 327

328

TABLE 1 HERE

Coupling curves (CC) defining the motion parameters of a single DoF joint as a function of its flexion-extension, were used to drive joint kinematics (Sholukha *et al.*, 2006; Li *et al.*, 2012; Gasparutto *et al.*, 2015). These curves are usually obtained in vitro (Sholukha *et al.*, 2006; Walker

et al., 1988) and registered to gait data, constraining the joint to follow an imposed physiological 332 movement. An important drawback of this approach is the lack of subject specificity, which reduces 333 its accuracy when applied to different subjects and it is unfeasible in pathological subjects. Li et al. 334 (Li et al., 2012) evaluated the accuracy of a scaled generic lower limb model with knee constraints 335 based on CC (Walker et al., 1988) on ten subjects performing level running and stair-ascent with a 336 posterior cruciate ligament (PCL) injury. It is worth noting that the CC defined in Walker et al. 337 338 (1988) has null medial-lateral displacement. This study reported high RMSEs (Table 1) both for the injured and the healthy knee. Moreover, the error found in every component of the joint motion was 339 equal or greater than the difference between the motion of the injured and healthy knee, concluding 340 341 that the scaled generic model based on CC was not sensitive to pathological motion. An evaluation of the CC accuracy in vivo at knee level was performed also by Gasparutto et al. (Gasparutto et al., 342 2015) confirming Li et al. (Li et al., 2012) results in terms of mean RMSEs for ab-adduction, in-343 344 external rotation and medio-lateral displacement, while better results were obtained for flexionextension, antero-posterior and proximal-distal displacements (Table 1). 345

346 Equivalent spatial parallel mechanisms (ESM) are one-DoF rigid models of the joint that feature a one-to-one representation of the joint anatomical constraints. These have been employed largely for 347 both knee (Wilson and O'Connor, 1997; Parenti-Castelli and Di Gregorio, 2000; Di Gregorio and 348 Parenti-Castelli, 2003; Feikes et al., 2003; Ottoboni et al., 2010) and ankle (Franci et al., 2009; Di 349 Gregorio et al., 2007) joints. These constraints are the articular surfaces and the isometric fibres of 350 the main ligaments, namely the anterior cruciate ligament (ACL), the PCL and the medial collateral 351 ligament (MCL) for the knee, the calcaneal-fibular (CaFiL) and the tibio-calcaneal (TiCaL) 352 ligaments for the ankle. ESM were also proposed to model the whole knee joint, including the 353 patella (Sancisi and Parenti-Castelli, 2011b; Sancisi and Parenti-Castelli, 2011a). All these 354 355 mechanisms have a strong anatomical basis and proved to be able to well replicate joint passive motion (Franci et al., 2009; Ottoboni et al., 2010). All these models are basically a generalization in 356 the 3D space of previous planar mechanisms, based on the four-bar linkage, where motion is guided 357

by two isometric ligament fibres at the knee (Menschik, 1974; O'Connor *et al.*, 1989; Gill and O'Connor, 1996) and at the ankle level (Leardini *et al.*, 1999a; Leardini *et al.*, 1999b). At the same time, ESM are the basis of mechanisms (called ESMs hereinafter) that feature a one-DoF spherical motion (i.e., a spherical motion constrained along a single path by joint anatomical constraints) and aimed at simplifying the model geometry (Sancisi *et al.*, 2011; Sancisi *et al.*, 2014; Di Gregorio *et al.*, 2007).

Duprey et al. (2010) firstly proposed the use of ESM and ESMs in MKO for the knee and ankle 364 joints (Feikes et al., 2003; Di Gregorio et al., 2007). The hypothesis was that anatomical constraints 365 could allow a better compensation of STA. Moreover, ESM and ESMs allow: (i) model 366 personalization on the specific patient, for example by means of medical imaging, and (ii) model 367 generalization to include ligament stiffness (Sancisi and Parenti-Castelli, 2011c) for kinetostatic and 368 dynamic analysis. In this thorough study (Duprey et al., 2010), seven different kinematic chains 369 were considered for the lower limb: S-S-S, S-S-2R, S-S-ESMs, S-R-S, S-ESM-S, S-R-2R, S-ESM-370 ESMs, where in this case 2R are two intersecting hinges at the ankle joint. By comparing the 371 372 outputs of the seven lower limb models, the following was observed: (i) flexion-extension curves of all joints are not or scarcely influenced by the different sets of constraints, (ii) the motion of 373 proximal joints is almost not influenced by the distal ones (only the knee in-external rotation was 374 375 affected by different ankle constraints), (iii) in-external rotation curves showed higher dispersion compared to other motion parameters in all joints, (iv) only ESM and ESMs can reproduce the 376 known rollback at the knee and rolling at the ankle. This study tested the aforementioned models on 377 five volunteers during gait, but lacked of in vivo data for the model validation. However, relevant 378 results indicated the anatomical constraints imposed by ESM and ESMs as a valuable alternative to 379 the other tested constraints (i.e. 2R and S), since they allow a physiological motion that can be 380 381 tailored on a specific subject.

Further insights in the application of ESM for STA compensation was recently given in Gasparutto et al. (Gasparutto *et al.*, 2015). ESM with deformable ligaments are introduced in a two-segment

kinematic chain featuring the knee only; the deformation is handled by a purely kinematic approach 384 385 and is not based on ligament stiffness. This means that ligaments are treated as additional markers and are allowed to minimally vary their length in order to comply with lower limb movements; the 386 objective function to be minimized is changed accordingly, in order to add this further constraint to 387 the one imposed by skin markers. ESM are implemented allowing either no (ΔL_0) (Ottoboni *et al.*, 388 2010), prescribed (ΔL_{θ}) (Bergamini *et al.*, 2011) or minimized (ΔL_{min}) (Gasparutto *et al.*, 2012) 389 ligament length variations; N, S and CC constraints are also analysed for comparison. Lowest 390 RMSEs were obtained using ESM with deformable ligaments and S, which showed similar 391 performance. Since ESM geometry was not customized, improvements are expected in possible 392 393 future personalization. Deformable ligaments showed some improvements with respect to ΔL_0 , in particular for the in-external rotation (Table 1). A systematic error on this motion component could 394 be due to the non-customized model geometry (Richard et al., 2016), which affects rigid models in 395 396 particular. Indeed, in-external rotation at full extension shows a high inter-subject variability that 397 cannot be handled by ΔL_0 without personalization, whereas deformable models allow small 398 adjustments in their given geometry during the MKO process, to comply with this variability. 399 In general, the identification of model geometrical parameters is becoming increasingly crucial

since more advanced models require careful parameter identification. Habachi et al. (El Habachi et 400 al., 2015) investigated the influence of these parameters on the kinematics of each joint as 401 computed by MKO. The lower limb was modelled by a S-ESM-ESMs kinematic chain with fixed-402 length ligaments also featuring the patello-femoral joint at the knee (Sancisi and Parenti-Castelli, 403 2011b). Results showed that some parameters highly influence joints motion, both for simple lower 404 pairs (S and R) and for advanced models (ESM and ESMs). However, the higher number of 405 parameters make the latter more likely to be sensitive to parameter variations, as recently observed 406 407 elsewhere (Sancisi et al., 2015). Therefore, personalization is considered essential for MKO (El Habachi et al., 2015). 408

Recently, subject-specific constraints have been introduced within MKO (Valente et al., 2015; 409 410 Clement et al., 2015). In particular, subject-specific geometries were used with ESM in the latter study. Four different kinematic chains were compared (i.e., N-N-N, S-S-S, S-ΔL_{min}-S, S-^cΔL_{min}-S, 411 where $^{c}\Delta L_{min}$ stands for customized minimal ligaments length variation model) and tested against 412 quasi-static bi-planar radiographic images during squat. The effect of subject-specific constraints at 413 the knee was assessed testing these models on ten healthy and ten osteoarthritic subjects. Results 414 showed that personalization improves STA compensation in particular for knee in-external rotation, 415 ab-adduction, antero-posterior and proximal-distal displacements both in healthy and osteoarthritic 416 subjects (Table 1). As shown in previous studies, RMSEs obtained from both ΔL_{min} and $^{c}\Delta L_{min}$ are 417 418 comparable to those from S (Table 1). As discussed above, knee displacements appear null with S constraint since in this case C_S is placed at the joint centre, like in most of MKO related literature. 419 Therefore, this approximation does not appear to affect the errors on antero-posterior, proximo-420 421 distal, medio-lateral displacement reconstructions, since these motion components are usually small. However, placing C_S at the joint centre does not produce a physiological motion. 422

423 Recently, assuming that the final accuracy of MKO analyses could be enhanced by the use of non-424 rigid constraints, a stiffness matrix was proposed and tested in order to constrain tibio-femoral relative motion (Richard et al., 2016). Despite this constraint is not strictly kinematic, it is reported 425 here since it is handled in MKO similarly to other kinematic constraints that are not relying on the 426 forces applied at the lower limb. The stiffness matrix constraint (K) was compared to N, S and ESM 427 models using the joint motion acquired by bi-planar fluoroscopy as gold-standard. The constraint 428 imposed by the stiffness matrix was obtained by minimizing joint deformation energy. Two 429 430 subjects were enrolled in this study, and were asked to perform a stair-climbing task. Results confirmed the importance of joint kinematic constraints for STA compensation; moreover, K 431 432 proved to be a promising alternative compared to rigid models.

Finally, the present review focused only on kinematic lower limb joint models, specifically appliedin MKO and validated for compensation of STA. Of course many other lower limb joint models can

be found in literature, in particular finite element and deformable multibody analyses (Adouni *et al.*, 2012; Guess *et al.*, 2013; Lenhart *et al.*, 2015; Shelburne *et al.*, 2004, Sancisi *et al.*, 2011c,
Forlani *et al.*, 2015). However, these find noteworthy applications in musculo-skeletal modelling,
aimed at increasing anatomical adherence in the description of joint structures, but fall outside the
scopes of the present review.

440

441 **4. CONCLUDING REMARKS**

Lower limb joint kinematics and kinetics are sought in gait analysis both in clinical and 442 performance analyses, but also in inverse-forward dynamic analyses, and musculoskeletal 443 modelling. To obtain reliable joint kinematics from skin markers, STA represents a major problem, 444 and must be reduced or compensated. Many MKO methods have been proposed, where predefined 445 kinematic models are employed to limit STA by minimizing the differences between model 446 447 predicted and skin-based marker positions. These lower limb kinematic models include a large variety of different single joint representations, from simple lower pairs to advanced spatial 448 449 mechanisms. Model parameters, however, should be determined for the specific lower limbs under 450 analysis; in other words, subject-specific models of the joints and overall kinematics chain should be defined each time to improve accuracy. Therefore, the final reliability of these optimization 451 452 methods depends not only on the chosen lower limb and joint models, but also on any experimental and analytical procedure necessary to estimate the model parameters. Reliability of the estimated 453 lower limb kinematics is also affected by the arrangement of the marker clusters, including relevant 454 trajectory collections, and by the quality of the experimental and analytical procedures implied in 455 456 the motor tasks necessary to estimate the relevant model parameters. Controversy exists also on the algorithms for solving these medium- and large-scale human movement optimization problems 457 458 (Koh et al., 2009), but this would require a dedicated paper. The exact single role of these contributions in the overall reliability of the techniques is not well known yet. For this reason, it is 459 also difficult to assess the definite value of these techniques. Nevertheless, with respect to simple 460

461 lower pairs, anatomical constraints (such as rigid or deformable parallel mechanisms and stiffness 462 matrices) seem to offer results with more physiological motion at the joints, and also have potential 463 for the inclusion of subject-specific joint constraints.

To date, in the perspective of STA compensation, the results of anatomical constraints and S are 464 comparable. In fact, the joints of the lower limb show a nearly spherical motion; therefore, an 465 accurately identified S could represent a good alternative to anatomical constraints for applications 466 that do not require a detailed and anatomically coherent description of the musculoskeletal 467 apparatus, such as for example clinical gait analyses in joint arthritis patients. It is expected, 468 however, that anatomical constraints will lead to better results, once a simple experimental 469 470 procedure will be developed to identify the model parameters. Moreover, only models that feature a direct representation of anatomical structures (i.e. ligaments and articular surfaces), such as rigid 471 472 and deformable mechanisms, make it possible to obtain estimation of the forces in these single 473 structures, thus extending the analysis from a purely kinematic to a complete musculoskeletal dynamic model. Personalization and, more generally, the identification of the joint parameters on 474 475 the single subject under analysis is therefore a critical aspect, in particular for more advanced joint 476 models. A number of techniques exist to identify these model parameters, which are closely related to the relevant joint model. However, new procedures have to be defined to identify advanced 477 478 models in an even more accurate and straightforward way. Among them, predictive procedures able 479 to estimate the subject motion from simple and non-invasive measurements (such as imaging data) (Conconi et al., 2015) may represent a promising tool for the identification of patient-specific 480 anatomical constraint models (Conconi et al., 2016). 481

In spite of the number of joint and lower limb models proposed, STA is still not totally compensated, and MKO accuracy could be largely improved to reconstruct the spatial movements of the main segments of the lower limb during gait. Future investigations should focus on models that represent joint physiological behaviour with improved accuracy. Moreover, whereas large efforts were spent on the knee joint, only little attention has been devoted to the ankle joint so far. Because the accuracy of ankle models also influence the estimation of knee motion (Duprey *et al.*,
2010) and, as a consequence, also of the whole lower limb motion, in the future more attention
should be devoted to this joint.

490

491 ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was supported by the Italian Ministry of Economy and Finance, Programme "5 permille".

494

495 CONFLICT OF INTEREST

496 All authors declare not to have any personal or commercial relationships related to this work that

497 would lead to a conflict of interest.

499 **REFERENCES**

- Adouni, M., Shirazi-Adl, A., Shirazi, R., 2012. Computational biodynamics of human knee joint in
 gait: From muscle forces to cartilage stresses. J. Biomech 45, 2149-2156.
- 502 Akbarshahi, M., Schache, A.G., Fernandez, J.W., Baker, R., Banks, S., and Pandy, M.G. 2010.
- Non-invasive assessment of soft-tissue artifact and its effect on knee joint kinematics during
 functional activity. J.Biomech. 43, 1292-1301.
- Alexander, E.J. and Andriacchi, T.P. 2001. Correcting for deformation in skin-based marker
 systems. J.Biomech. 34, 355-361.
- Andersen, M.S., Benoit, D.L., Damsgaard, M., Ramsey, D.K., and Rasmussen, J. 2010. Do
 kinematic models reduce the effects of soft tissue artefacts in skin marker-based motion
 analysis? An in vivo study of knee kinematics. J.Biomech. 43, 268-273.
- Andriacchi, T.P., Alexander, E.J., Toney, M.K., Dyrby, C., and Sum, J. 1998. A point cluster
 method for in vivo motion analysis: applied to a study of knee kinematics. J.Biomech.Eng 120,
 743-749.
- Ball, K.A. and Pierrynowski, M.R. 1998. Modeling of the pliant surfaces of the thigh and leg during
 gait. In Proceedings of SPIE-The International Society for Optical Engineering, BiOS'98International Biomedical Optics Symposium.
- Benoit, D.L., Ramsey, D.K., Lamontagne, M., Xu, L., Wretenberg, P., Renström, P., 2006. Effect
 of skin movement artifact on knee kinematics during gait and cutting motions measured in vivo.
 Gait. Posture. 24, 152–164.
- Benoit, D.L., Ramsey, D.K., Lamontagne, M., Xu, L., Wretenberg, P., Renström, P., 2007. In vivo
 knee kinematics during gait reveals new rotation profiles and smaller translations. Clin. Orthop.
 Relat. Res. 454, 81–88.
- Benoit, D.L., Damsgaard, M., and Andersen, M.S. 2015. Surface marker cluster translation,
 rotation, scaling and deformation: Their contribution to soft tissue artefact and impact on knee
 joint kinematics. J.Biomech. 48, 2124-2129.

- 525 Bergamini, E., Pillet, H., Hausselle, J., Thoreux, P., Guerard, S., Camomilla, V., Cappozzo, A., and
- 526 Skalli, W. 2011. Tibio-femoral joint constraints for bone pose estimation during movement 527 using multi-body optimization. Gait.Posture. 33, 706-711.
- Blankevoort, L., Huiskes, R., and de Lange, A. 1990. Helical axes of passive knee joint motions.
 J.Biomech. 23, 1219-1229.
- Cappello, A., Cappozzo, A., La Palombara, P.F., Lucchetti, L., and Leardini, A. 1997. Multiple
 anatomical landmark calibration for optimal bone pose estimation. Human Movement Science
 16, 259-274.
- Cappello, A., Stagni, R., Fantozzi, S., and Leardini, A. 2005. Soft tissue artifact compensation in
 knee kinematics by double anatomical landmark calibration: performance of a novel method
 during selected motor tasks. IEEE Trans.Biomed.Eng 52, 992-998.
- Cappozzo, A., Catani, F., Della Croce, U., and Leardini, A. 1995. Position and orientation in space
 of bones during movement: anatomical frame definition and determination.
 Clin.Biomech.(Bristol., Avon.) 10, 171-178.
- Cappozzo, A., Catani, F., Leardini, A., Benedetti, M.G., and Della Croce, U. 1996. Position and
 orientation in space of bones during movement: experimental artefacts. Clin.Biomech.(Bristol.,
 Avon.) 11, 90-100.
- 542 Cappozzo, A., Della Croce, U., Leardini, A., and Chiari, L. 2005. Human movement analysis using
 543 stereophotogrammetry. Part 1: theoretical background. Gait.Posture. 21, 186-196.
- Cerveri, P., Pedotti, A., and Ferrigno, G. 2005. Kinematical models to reduce the effect of skin
 artifacts on marker-based human motion estimation. J.Biomech. 38, 2228-2236.
- Charlton, I.W., Tate, P., Smyth, P., and Roren, L. 2004. Repeatability of an optimised lower body
 model. Gait.Posture. 20, 213-221.
- 548 Cheze, L., Fregly, B.J., and Dimnet, J. 1995. A solidification procedure to facilitate kinematic
- analyses based on video system data. J.Biomech. 28, 879-884.

- Chiari, L., Della Croce, U., Leardini, A., and Cappozzo, A. 2005. Human movement analysis using
 stereophotogrammetry. Part 2: instrumental errors. Gait.Posture. 21, 197-211.
- 552 Clement, J., Dumas, R., Hagemeister, N., and de Guise, J.A. 2015. Soft tissue artifact compensation
- in knee kinematics by multi-body optimization: Performance of subject-specific knee joint
 models. J.Biomech. 48, 3796-3802.
- Clement, J., Dumas, R., Hagemeister, N., and de Guise, J.A. 2017. Can generic knee joint models
 improve the measurement of osteoarthritic knee kinematics during squatting activity?
 Comput.Methods Biomech.Biomed.Engin. 20, 94-103.
- Cockcroft, J., Louw, Q., and Baker, R. 2016. Proximal placement of lateral thigh skin markers
 reduces soft tissue artefact during normal gait using the Conventional Gait Model.
 Comput.Methods Biomech.Biomed.Engin. 19, 1497-1504.
- Conconi, M., Sancisi, N., and Parenti-Castelli, V. 2016. Subject-specific model of knee natural
 motion: a non-invasive approach. In Advances in Robot Kinematics (Edited by Lenarcic J.and
 Merlet J.P.) Springer International Publishing.
- Conconi, M., Leardini, A., and Parenti-Castelli, V. 2015. Joint kinematics from functional
 adaptation: A validation on the tibio-talar articulation. J Biomech 48, 2960-2967.
- D'Angeli, V., Belvedere, C., Ortolani, M., Giannini, S., and Leardini, A. 2013. Load along the
 femur shaft during activities of daily living. J Biomech 46, 2002-2010.
- D'Angeli, V., Belvedere, C., Ortolani, M., Giannini, S., and Leardini, A. 2016. Load along the tibial
 shaft during activities of daily living. J Biomech 47, 1198-1205.
- 570 Della Croce, U., Leardini, A., Chiari, L., and Cappozzo, A. 2005. Human movement analysis using
 571 stereophotogrammetry. Part 4: assessment of anatomical landmark misplacement and its effects
 572 on joint kinematics. Gait.Posture. 21, 226-237.
- 573 Dettwylera, M., Stacoffa, A., Kramers-de Quervaina, I.A., and Stüssia, E. 2004. Modelling of the
- ankle joint complex. Reflections with regards to ankle prostheses. Foot and Ankle Surgery 10,
- 575 109-119.

- 576 Di Gregorio, R. and Parenti-Castelli, V. 2003. A spatial mechanism with higher pairs for modelling
 577 the human knee joint. J.Biomech.Eng 125, 232-237.
- 578 Di Gregorio, R., Parenti-Castelli, V., O'Connor, J.J., and Leardini, A. 2007. Mathematical models
- of passive motion at the human ankle joint by equivalent spatial parallel mechanisms. Med Biol
 Eng Comput. 45, 305-313.
- Dumas, R., Camomilla, V., Bonci, T., Cheze, L., and Cappozzo, A. 2015. What portion of the soft
 tissue artefact requires compensation when estimating joint kinematics? J.Biomech.Eng 137,
 064502.
- Duprey, S., Cheze, L., and Dumas, R. 2010. Influence of joint constraints on lower limb kinematics
 estimation from skin markers using global optimization. J.Biomech. 43, 2858-2862.
- El Habachi, A., Moissenet, F., Duprey, S., Cheze, L., and Dumas, R. 2015. Global sensitivity
- analysis of the joint kinematics during gait to the parameters of a lower limb multi-body model.
 Med.Biol.Eng Comput. 53, 655-667.
- Feikes, J.D., O'Connor, J.J., and Zavatsky, A.B. 2003. A constraint-based approach to modelling
 the mobility of the human knee joint. J Biomech. 36, 125-129.
- 591 Ferrari, A., Benedetti, M.G., Pavan, E., Frigo, C., Bettinelli, D., Rabuffetti, M., Crenna, P., and
- Leardini, A. 2008. Quantitative comparison of five current protocols in gait analysis.Gait.Posture. 28, 207-216.
- Forlani,M., Sancisi,N., and Parenti-Castelli,V. 2015. A three-dimensional ankle kinetostatic model
 to simulate loaded and unladed joint motion. J. Biomech. Eng. 137, 061005.
- Franci, R., Parenti-Castelli, V., Belvedere, C., and Leardini, A. 2009. A new one-DOF fully parallel
 mechanism for modelling passive motion at the human tibiotalar joint. J.Biomech. 42, 14031408.
- Gasparutto, X., Dumas, R., and Jacquelin, E. 2012. Multi-body optimisation with deformable
 ligament constraints: influence of ligament geometry. Comput.Methods
 Biomech.Biomed.Engin. 15 Suppl 1, 191-193.

- Gasparutto, X., Sancisi, N., Jacquelin, E., Parenti-Castelli, V., and Dumas, R. 2015. Validation of a
 multi-body optimization with knee kinematic models including ligament constraints. J.Biomech.
 48, 1141-1146.
- Gill, H.S. and O'Connor, J.J. 1996. Biarticulating two-dimensional computer model of the human
 patellofemoral joint. Clin.Biomech.(Bristol., Avon.) 11, 81-89.
- Guess, T.M., Liu, H., Bhashyam, S., Thiagarajan, G. 2013. A multibody knee model with discrete
 cartilage prediction of tibio-femoral contact mechanics. Computer Methods in Biomechanics
 and Biomedical Engineering 16, 256-270.
- Kadaba, M.P., Ramakrishnan,H.K., and Wootten, M.E. 1990. Measurement of lower extremity
 kinematics during level walking. J.Orthop.Res. 8, 383-392.
- Klous, M. and Klous, S. 2010. Marker-based reconstruction of the kinematics of a chain of
 segments: a new method that incorporates joint kinematic constraints. J.Biomech.Eng 132,
 074501.
- Koh, B.I., Reinbolt, J.A., George, A.D., Haftka, R.T., and Fregly, B.J. 2009. Limitations of parallel
 global optimization for large-scale human movement problems. Med.Eng Phys. 31, 515-521.
- 617 Leardini, A., Biagi, F., Belvedere, C., and Benedetti, M.G. 2009. Quantitative comparison of
- current models for trunk motion in human movement analysis. Clin.Biomech.(Bristol., Avon.)
 24, 542-550.
- 620 Leardini, A., Biagi, F., Merlo, A., Belvedere, C., and Benedetti, M.G. 2011. Multi-segment trunk
- kinematics during locomotion and elementary exercises. Clin.Biomech.(Bristol., Avon.) 26,562-571.
- Leardini, A., Chiari, L., Della Croce, U., and Cappozzo, A. 2005. Human movement analysis using
 stereophotogrammetry. Part 3. Soft tissue artifact assessment and compensation. Gait.Posture.
 21, 212-225.
- Leardini, A., O'Connor, J.J., Catani, F., and Giannini, S. 1999a. A geometric model of the human
 ankle joint. J.Biomech. 32, 585-591.

- Leardini,A., O'Connor,J.J., Catani,F., and Giannini,S. 1999b. Kinematics of the human ankle
 complex in passive flexion; a single degree of freedom system. J.Biomech. 32, 111-118.
- 630 Lenhart, R.L., Kaiser, J., Smith, C.R., Thelen, D.G. 2015. Prediction and Validation of Load-
- Dependent Behavior of the Tibiofemoral and Patellofemoral Joints During Movement. Annalsof Biomedical Engineering 43, 2675-2685.
- Li, K., Zheng, L., Tashman, S., and Zhang, X. 2012. The inaccuracy of surface-measured modelderived tibiofemoral kinematics. J.Biomech. 45, 2719-2723.
- Lu, T.W. and O'Connor, J.J. 1999. Bone position estimation from skin marker co-ordinates using
 global optimisation with joint constraints. J.Biomech. 32, 129-134.
- Lucchetti, L., Cappozzo, A., Cappello, A., and Della Croce, U. 1998. Skin movement artefact
 assessment and compensation in the estimation of knee-joint kinematics. J Biomech. 31, 977984.
- Manal, K., McClay, I., Stanhope, S., Richards, J., and Galinat, B. 2000. Comparison of surface
 mounted markers and attachment methods in estimating tibial rotations during walking: an in
 vivo study. Gait.Posture. 11, 38-45.
- Martelli, S., Valente, G., Viceconti, M., and Taddei, F. 2015. Sensitivity of a subject-specific
 musculoskeletal model to the uncertainties on the joint axes location. Comput.Methods
 Biomech.Biomed.Engin. 18, 1555-1563.
- Menschik, A. 1974. [Mechanics of the knee-joint. 1 (author's transl)]. Z.Orthop.Ihre Grenzgeb. 112,
 481-495.
- Moissenet, F., Cheze, L., and Dumas, R. 2014. A 3D lower limb musculoskeletal model for
 simultaneous estimation of musculo-tendon, joint contact, ligament and bone forces during gait.
 J.Biomech. 47, 50-58.
- O'Connor, J.J., Lu, T.W., Wilson, D.R., Feikes, J., and Leardini, A. 1998. Review: Diarthrodial
 Joints-Kinematic Pairs, Mechanisms or Flexible Structures? Comput.Methods
 Biomech.Biomed.Engin. 1, 123-150.

- O'Connor, J.J., Shercliff, T.L., Biden, E., and Goodfellow, J.W. 1989. The geometry of the knee in
 the sagittal plane. Proc.Inst.Mech.Eng H. 203, 223-233.
- Ojeda, J., Martínez-Reina, J., and Mayo, J. 2016. The effect of kinematic constraints in the inverse
 dynamics problem in biomechanics. Multibody Syst.Dyn. 37, 291-309.
- Ottoboni, A., Parenti-Castelli, V., Sancisi, N., Belvedere, C., and Leardini, A. 2010. Articular
 surface approximation in equivalent spatial parallel mechanism models of the human knee joint:
 an experiment-based assessment. Proc.Inst.Mech Eng H. 224, 1121-1132.
- Parenti-Castelli, V. and Di Gregorio, R. 2000. Parallel Mechanisms Applied to the Human Knee
 Passive Motion Simulation. In Advances in Robot Kinematics (Edited by Lenarcic J.and
 Stanisic M.M.) Pp. 333-344. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Netherlands.
- Peters, A., Galna, B., Sangeux, M., Morris, M., and Baker, R. 2010. Quantification of soft tissue
 artifact in lower limb human motion analysis: a systematic review. Gait.Posture. 31, 1-8.
- Reinbolt, J.A., Schutte, J.F., Fregly, B.J., Koh, B.I., Haftka, R.T., George, A.D., and Mitchell, K.H.
- 2005. Determination of patient-specific multi-joint kinematic models through two-level
 optimization. J.Biomech. 38, 621-626.
- 669 Reinschmidt, C., van den Bogert, A.J., Nigg, B.M., Lundberg, A., Murphy, N., 1997. Effect of skin
- movement on the analysis of skeletal knee joint motion during running. J. Biomech. 30, 729–
 732.
- Richard, V., Lamberto, G., Lu, T.W., Cappozzo, A., and Dumas, R. 2016. Knee Kinematics
 Estimation Using Multi-Body Optimisation Embedding a Knee Joint Stiffness Matrix: A
 Feasibility Study. PLoS.One. 11, e0157010.
- Ryu, T., Choi, H.S., and Chung, M.K. 2009. Soft tissue artifact compensation using displacement
 dependency between anatomical landmarks and skin markers a preliminary study.
 International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics 39, 152-158.
- Sancisi, N. and Parenti-Castelli, V. 2011a. A new kinematic model of the passive motion of the
 knee inclusive of the patella. J.Mechanisms Robotics 3, 041003.

- Sancisi, N. and Parenti-Castelli, V. 2011b. A novel 3D parallel mechanism for the passive motion
 simulation of the patella-femur-tibia complex. Meccanica 46, 207-220.
- Sancisi, N. and Parenti-Castelli, V. 2011c. A sequentially-defined stiffness model of the knee.
 Mechanism and Machine Theory 46, 1920-1928.
- Sancisi, N., Baldisserri, B., Parenti-Castelli, V., Belvedere, C., and Leardini, A. 2014. One-degreeof-freedom spherical model for the passive motion of the human ankle joint. Med.Biol.Eng
 Comput. 52, 363-373.
- Sancisi, N., Nardini, F., Parenti-Castelli, V., Belvedere, C., and Leardini, A. 2015. Variation of the
 ankle motion with the pivot-point position as predicted by a spherical model of the joint. J Mech
 Med Biol 15, 1540039.
- Sancisi, N., Zannoli, D., Parenti-Castelli, V., Belvedere, C., and Leardini, A. 2011. A one-degreeof-freedom spherical mechanism for human knee joint modelling. Proc.Inst.Mech.Eng H. 225,
 725-735.
- Schwartz, M.H. and Rozumalski, A. 2005. A new method for estimating joint parameters from
 motion data. J.Biomech. 38, 107-116.
- Shelburne, K.B., Pandy, M.G., Anderson, F.C., Torry, M.R. 2004. Pattern of anterior cruciate
 ligament force in normal walking. Journal of Biomechanics 37, 797-805.
- 697 Sholukha, V., Leardini, A., Salvia, P., Rooze, M., and Van Sint, J.S. 2006. Double-step registration
- of in vivo stereophotogrammetry with both in vitro 6-DOFs electrogoniometry and CT medical
 imaging. J.Biomech. 39, 2087-2095.
- Soderkvist, I. and Wedin, P.A. 1993. Determining the movements of the skeleton using wellconfigured markers. J.Biomech. 26, 1473-1477.
- Stagni, R., Fantozzi, S., and Cappello, A. 2009. Double calibration vs. global optimisation:
 performance and effectiveness for clinical application. Gait.Posture. 29, 119-122.

- Stagni, R., Fantozzi, S., Cappello, A., and Leardini, A. 2005. Quantification of soft tissue artefact in
 motion analysis by combining 3D fluoroscopy and stereophotogrammetry: a study on two
 subjects. Clin.Biomech.(Bristol., Avon.) 20, 320-329.
- Taylor, W.R., Ehrig, R.M., Duda, G.N., Schell, H., Seebeck, P., and Heller, M.O. 2005. On the
 influence of soft tissue coverage in the determination of bone kinematics using skin markers.
 J.Orthop.Res. 23, 726-734.
- Valente, G., Pitto, L., Stagni, R., and Taddei, F. 2015. Effect of lower-limb joint models on subjectspecific musculoskeletal models and simulations of daily motor activities. J.Biomech. 48, 41984205.
- Valente, G., Pitto, L., Testi, D., Seth, A., Delp, S.L., Stagni, R., Viceconti, M., and Taddei, F. 2014.
- Are subject-specific musculoskeletal models robust to the uncertainties in parameter identification? PLoS.One. 9, e112625.
- Veldpaus, F.E., Woltring, H.J., and Dortmans, L.J. 1988. A least-squares algorithm for the
 equiform transformation from spatial marker co-ordinates. J.Biomech. 21, 45-54.
- Walker, P.S., Rovick, J.S., and Robertson, D.D. 1988. The effects of knee brace hinge design and
 placement on joint mechanics. J Biomech. 21, 965-974.
- Wilson, D.R. and O'Connor, J.J. 1997. A three-dimensional geometric model of the knee for the
 study of joint forces in gait. Gait.Posture. 5, 108-115.
- Wu, G. and Cavanagh, P.R. 1995. ISB recommendations for standardization in the reporting of
 kinematic data. J Biomech. 28, 1257-1261.
- Wu, G., Siegler, S., Allard, P., Kirtley, C., Leardini, A., Rosenbaum, D., Whittle, M., D'Lima, D.D.,
- 725 Cristofolini, L., Witte, H., Schmid, O., Stokes, I., 2002. ISB recommendation on definitions of
- joint coordinate system of various joints for the reporting of human joint motion--part I: ankle,
- hip, and spine. International Society of Biomechanics. J Biomech 35, 543-548.
- 728
- 729

730

TABLE CAPTION

Table 1 Mean values and standard deviation of RMSEs of the motion components of the tibio-731 femoral relative motion as found in the MKO related literature: flexion-extension (FE), ab-732 adduction (AA), in-external rotation (IER) and antero-posterior (APT), proximal-distal (PDT), 733 medial-lateral (MLT) displacements are reported. For each article the table shows the joint models 734 used (Joints), the identification method of the joint models geometry (Model tuning), the number of 735 subjects involved (Number of Subjects), the marker set adopted (Marker set), the motor tasks 736 737 performed (Motor Tasks) and the technique used for validation (Validation technique). The symbol "\" stands for empty cell (information, model or parameter not reported in the study). 738

Table 1

		Joints		Model tuning	Number of Subjects	Marker set	Motor Tasks	Validation technique	RMSE tibio-femoral relative motion [mean (±sd)]					
Article	HIP	KNEE	ANKLE	woder tuning	Number of Subjects				FE (deg)	AA (deg)	IER (deg)	MLD (mm)	APD (mm)	PDD (mm)
				Anatomical landmarks	2 subjects with TKR	Two Marker sets: (i) according to CAST	extension against gravity	Single-plane fluoroscopy	5.5 (±3.6)	2.3 (±0.1)	9.4 (±3.1)	4.3 (±4.9)	19.2 (±1.3)	6.5 (±3.0)
Stagni et al. (2009)	S	S	S			protocol; (ii) 4 markers clusters for both	step-up/step-down		6.8 (±0.5)	15.7 (±0.4)	7.9 (±1.6)	3.0 (±3.4)	18.5 (±0.7)	7.5 (±2.9)
						thigh and shank	sit-to-stand/stand-to-sit		8.7 (±0.2)	12.5 (±0.2)	10.8 (±1.9)	5.0 (±5.5)	19.6 (±2.8)	8.3 (±1.8)
		N		Functional optimisation	6	Benoit et al. (2006),(2007)	Level walking	Bone pins	2.8 (±2.6)	3.4 (±3.2)	2.6 (±1.3)			
Andersen et al. (2010)	١	R	١						3.8 (±2.4)	3.4 (±3.2)	2.5 (±1.2)			
		S							3.4 (±2.5)	3.8 (±3.0)	2.6 (±1.3)			
		5 CC (Walker et al. (1988))	2R	Scaled generic model	20 (10 healthy, 10 PCL injured) 10 healthy subjects 10 PCL injured subjects	Vicon Plug-in Gait	Level running	Dynamic stereo radiography	9.1 (±3.2)	2.0 (±1.2)	6.4 (±4.5)	1.9 (±1.2)	7.1 (±3.2)	8.8 (±3.7)
							Stair-ascent		3.3 (±1.1)	2.5 (±1.7)	5.1 (±3.3)	1.5 (±0.8)	6.1 (±2.5)	11.0 (±4.6)
Li et al. (2012)	s						Level running		8.8 (±3.3)	2.4 (±1.5)	6.0 (±3.4)	1.9 (±1.3)	7.6 (±3.5)	9.4 (±3.7)
, <i>,</i>							Stair-ascent		3.9 (±1.2)	2.8 (±1.6)	4.4 (±3.2)	1.6 (±1.0)	5.9 (±2.5)	12.2 (±4.7)
							Level running		9.5 (±3.2)	1.5 (±0.7)	6.9 (±5.7)	1.9 (±1.1)	6.6 (±2.9)	8.2 (±3.9)
							Stair-ascent		2.7 (±0.7)	2.3 (±1.8)	5.8 (±3.5)	1.3 (±0.4)	6.2 (±2.7)	9.7 (±4.4)
		N		\ 					1.7 (±0.2)	2.0 (±0.4)	2.9 (±0.3)	3.3 (±0.5)	4.5 (±0.8)	5.0 (±0.6)
		S CC (M/-II)		Anatomical landmarks					1.7 (±0.1)	1.6 (±0.5)	2.4 (±0.1)	1.4 (±0.2)	2.5 (±0.6)	1.8 (±0.3)
asparutto et al. (2015)	1	CC (Walker et al. (1988))	١	3	Reinschmidt et al. (1997)	Level running	Bone nins	1.6 (±0.2)	2.9 (±0.2)	6.0 (±0.4)	1.4 (±0.2)	3.6 (±1.0)	2.2 (±0.2)	
		ΔL_0	`	Optimized geometry from in vitro data			Level running	bone pins	1.8 (±0.4)	1.9 (±0.4)	11.7 (±0.5)	1.6 (±0.0)	2.9 (±0.8)	1.6 (±0.2)
		ΔL _{min}							1.7 (±0.2)	1.6 (±0.5)	2.6 (±0.1)	2.6 (±0.5)	3.8 (±0.5)	1.7 (±0.2)
	ΔL _θ	ΔL _θ							1.7 (±0.2)	2.0 (±0.5)	3.4 (±0.8)	1.8 (±0.3)	2.8 (±0.8)	1.7 (±0.3)
	N	N	N	Subject specific bone models	10 healthy subjects	Mounted on three rigid devices attached on the iliac crest, the femoral condyes and the tibial tuberosity			0.3 (±0.1)	6.7 (±2.8)	5.4 (±3.7)	2.8 (±2.7)	7.4 (±3.6)	12.0 (±3.8)
	S	S	S						0.3 (±0.2)	2.7 (±1.3)	6.0 (±4.2)	1.8 (±0.9)	2.2 (±0.9)	2.4 (±1.2)
	S	^c ∆L _{min}	S						0.3 (±0.2)	2.2 (±1.2)	5.2 (±3.8)	4.3 (±2.4)	3.2 (±2.1)	2.4 (±1.1)
	S	ΔL _{min}	S						0.3 (±0.1)	2.2 (±1.1)	7.3 (±4.9)	2.5 (±1.8)	3.3 (±2.0)	4.0 (±1.2)
Clément et al. (2015)	N	N	N		10 osteoarthritic subjects		Squat B	Bi-planar radiography	0.3 (±0.1)	3.5 (±2.8)	5.7 (±4.2)	4.1 (±1.9)	7.0 (±3.9)	7.0 (±4.8)
	S	S	S						0.3 (±0.1)	5.1 (±1.8)	5.9 (±3.8)	2.8 (±2.0)	2.6 (±1.3)	2.9 (±1.2)
	S	^c AL _{min}	s						0.3 (+0.1)	3.3 (+2.1)	6.0 (+3.9)	4.1 (+2.4)	2.5 (+1.1)	2.7 (+0.9)
	S	ΔL _{min}	s						0.3 (+0.1)	6.4 (+2.3)	5.7 (+4.4)	5.6 (+5.1)	3.9 (+2.0)	4.3 (+1.1)
	-	N	-	١	2	Thigh: 4 markers in the middle + 2 markers	Stair-ascent	Bi-planar fluoroscopy	54 (+0.9)	2 2 (+0 2)	4.8 (+3.3)	1.6 (+0.1)	6 6 (+2 3)	63 (+04)
		S		Anatomical landmarks		at the epycondiles; Shank: tibial tuberosity, fibular head + 2 markers at the malleoli.			4.9 (+1.0)	1.9 (+0.1)	3.9 (+2.0)	1.4 (+0.1)	5.4 (+2.2)	1.5 (+1.1)
Richard et al. (2016)	١	ΔL	١	Geometry from in vitro data					5.8 (+1.3)	5.3 (+2.0)	15.3 (+7.1)	1.2 (+0.1)	3.5 (+1.8)	2.3 (+2.2)
		ĸ		Based on in vitro data					53(+11)	19(+07)	46 (+2 5)	2.6 (+0.2)	3.0 (+0.6)	3.4 (+0.3)
L					1				5.5 (21.2)			2.0 (20.2)	5.0 (20.0)	5.1 (20.5)