

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 (<https://cris.unibo.it/>)*

***When citing, please refer to the published version.***

**KINEMATIC MODELS OF LOWER LIMB JOINTS FOR  
MUSCULO-SKELETAL MODELLING AND OPTIMIZATION IN GAIT ANALYSIS**

Alberto Leardini <sup>1</sup>, Claudio Belvedere <sup>1</sup>, Fabrizio Nardini <sup>2</sup>,  
Nicola Sancisi <sup>2</sup>, Michele Conconi <sup>2</sup>, Vincenzo Parenti-Castelli <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Laboratory of Movement Analysis and Functional-Clinical Evaluation of Prostheses, Istituto  
Ortopedico Rizzoli, Bologna, Italy

<sup>2</sup> DIN—Department of Industrial Engineering, Health Sciences and Technologies,  
Interdepartmental Centre for Industrial Research (HST–ICIR), Università degli Studi di Bologna,  
Viale del Risorgimento 2, 40136 Bologna, Italy

SUBMISSION to the **Journal of Biomechanics (special issue on STA)** in December 2016

Word count: 5840 / Table: 1

**Corresponding author:**

Claudio Belvedere, Ph.D.

Laboratory of Movement Analysis and Functional - Clinical Evaluation of Prostheses

Centro di Ricerca Codivilla-Putti

Istituto Ortopedico Rizzoli

Via di Barbiano 1/10, 40136 - Bologna, ITALY

Tel: +39 051 6366570

Fax: +39 051 6366561

Email: belvedere@ior.it

**Keywords:** Motion analysis, soft-tissue artefact, musculoskeletal modelling, multibody kinematic  
optimization models.

**Author Contributions Statement:** Each author has been involved either in the study design, or in  
the performance of the analysis, or in data interpretation, or in the manuscript drafting. All authors  
have read and approved the final submitted manuscript.

## 27 **ABSTRACT**

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

46

## 47 1. INTRODUCTION

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

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 or global optimization techniques using joint models. The latter is here referred to as multibody kinematics optimization (MKO). From another perspective, many studies have defined biomechanical models able to reproduce joint kinematics that have been applied to MKO approaches. The present is the first review paper where both these series of studies are presented 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 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 on their possible advantages and disadvantages, for anyone then to be able to choose the most 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.

## **2. GAIT ANALYSIS WITH JOINT CONSTRAINTS FOR MKO BASED TECHNIQUES**

### **2.1 The segmental approach**

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; Manal *et al.*, 2000; Stagni *et al.*, 2005; Cockcroft *et al.*, 2016), although the major effect, i.e. the rigid displacement of the entire cluster, cannot be removed. At the beginning of more thorough investigations, a pure segmental approach looked at this problem considering single segments separately (single-body optimization), addressing marker cluster deformation and displacement independently from other body segments. Least-squares algorithms (Veldpaus *et al.*, 1988), single-value-decomposition (SVD) (Soderkvist and Wedin, 1993) and the so-called solidification (Cheze *et al.*, 1995) procedures were proposed to reduce STA on analytical bases. A little later, the pliant-

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

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

124 artefact: knowing that it is subject specific, it is first isolated and then subtracted from the overall  
125 motion collected in the raw measurements. On the other hand, for these techniques to be applied, a  
126 supplementary exercise is required by the subject, and time-consuming additional analyses must be  
127 performed after data collection. These techniques are also based on the assumptions that STA is  
128 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)  
131 movements of the marker clusters contribute to the overall amount of STA error much less than  
132 rigid (i.e. translation and rotation) movements, supported also by a study on running (Dumas *et al.*,  
133 2015). These papers concluded that skin marker optimisation, based on isolated segments, which  
134 can only minimise non-rigid motion components, is superfluous, and that procedures designed to  
135 account for cluster rigid translation and rotation are required to correctly represent body segments  
136 motion. It has also been shown that STA is very subject-specific and any custom definition of a  
137 model of the artefact is impractical. The use of optimal estimation of bone poses in isolated body  
138 segments (single-body optimization) is questioned by these evidences, which also suggest the  
139 introduction of thorough overall lower limb models and joint constraints. This will be largely  
140 discussed below.

## 141 **2.2 Multi-body kinematics optimisation - An historical perspective**

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



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

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

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

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

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

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 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 unrealistic current graphical representations of three-dimensional motion of the lower limbs, particularly critical in computer-based simulations for medical educational purposes. An iterative registration method was proposed, which implied a kinematics chain with best physiological kinematic representations of the main six joints of the lower limbs, each having known specific 3D 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 motion according to the corresponding flexion/extension DoF from gait analysis. A secondary 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 kinematics at the knees and ankles were achieved. The latter enabled by modelled joint rotations 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 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 *et al.*, 2015; Ojeda *et al.*, 2016; Clement *et al.*, 2017). The most comprehensive study (Duprey *et al.*, 2010) tested the performances of a number of different sets of models of the lower limb joints, and assessed their influence on the overall kinematics, although a gold-standard was not available. Despite few concerns in terms of possible worse pose estimation results (Stagni *et al.*, 2009; 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 models could be used to estimate the forces exchanged at the anatomical structures (D'Angeli *et al.*,

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

### 231 **2.3 Anatomical significance, accuracy, and personalisation feasibility**

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

249 In literature these MKO methods are rarely proposed together with relevant, thorough and  
250 convincing validation activities (Reinbolt *et al.*, 2005). Some have supported the technique by  
251 analytical simulations (Lu and O'Connor, 1999; Reinbolt *et al.*, 2005), but the random error added  
252 to each marker trajectory separately does facilitate the task to any such algorithm, and the results  
253 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 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 simultaneous knowledge of marker and corresponding skeletal motion during activities as gold-standard. This is however very difficult to be achieved because of the invasiveness of some imaging techniques or of bone pins. Validation studies using fluoroscopy, stereo radiography or bone pins were however proposed. Since these studies were more related to the validation of specific joint constraints, they will be analysed in the next section. Sensitivity of final joint kinematics estimation to multi-body model parameters (El Habachi *et al.*, 2015; Martelli *et al.*, 2015) shall also be investigated further.

264

### 265 **3. LOWER LIMB JOINT MODELS FOR MKO BASED TECHNIQUES**

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 of joint models have been proposed for each of the main articulations of the lower limb (i.e., hip, knee and ankle) leading to different lower limb models according to their combination. These joint models can be validated individually; however, critical issues such as the choice of the constraint type and the identification of the model parameters can still arise when these models are included in MKO, which can result in critical outcomes of the method. Major efforts have been spent in past and recent works to investigate these issues.

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 talo-calcaneal 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) 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 *et al.*, 2004) and the S-R-2R (Reinbolt *et al.*, 2005) to represent the hip, knee and ankle joints respectively (the same order will be used in the following nomenclature), where 2R represents two non-intersecting hinges. A first major result related to the use of the abovementioned pairs, was to 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 motion. For instance, R constrains the joint to rotate about a fixed axis, despite the instantaneous 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 implies that all IHA pass through this point, as well as that joint translation (i.e., the instantaneous 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 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 *et al.*, 1999b). Some studies (Stagni *et al.*, 2009; Andersen *et al.*, 2010) also reports that S (and similarly also R) cannot reproduce joint displacements, defined as the relative displacement between two reference points (often chosen as coincident with the anatomical frame origins) of two different bony segments. However, this latter S limitation should be clarified and mitigated. The problem in this case lies in the identification of S (namely, of the sphere centre  $C_S$ ), not in the type 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 points used to measure these displacements. Studies showed indeed that joint displacements are well represented if  $C_S$  is placed near the point where the IHA converge the most, i.e. the approximate PP (Sancisi *et al.*, 2011; Sancisi *et al.*, 2014). The joint motion appears highly

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

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

328 TABLE 1 HERE

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

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

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



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

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

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

384 kinematic chain featuring the knee only; the deformation is handled by a purely kinematic approach  
385 and is not based on ligament stiffness. This means that ligaments are treated as additional markers  
386 and are allowed to minimally vary their length in order to comply with lower limb movements; the  
387 objective function to be minimized is changed accordingly, in order to add this further constraint to  
388 the one imposed by skin markers. ESM are implemented allowing either no ( $\Delta L_0$ ) (Ottoboni *et al.*,  
389 2010), prescribed ( $\Delta L_\theta$ ) (Bergamini *et al.*, 2011) or minimized ( $\Delta L_{\min}$ ) (Gasparutto *et al.*, 2012)  
390 ligament length variations; N, S and CC constraints are also analysed for comparison. Lowest  
391 RMSEs were obtained using ESM with deformable ligaments and S, which showed similar  
392 performance. Since ESM geometry was not customized, improvements are expected in possible  
393 future personalization. Deformable ligaments showed some improvements with respect to  $\Delta L_0$ , in  
394 particular for the in-external rotation (Table 1). A systematic error on this motion component could  
395 be due to the non-customized model geometry (Richard *et al.*, 2016), which affects rigid models in  
396 particular. Indeed, in-external rotation at full extension shows a high inter-subject variability that  
397 cannot be handled by  $\Delta L_0$  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  
400 since more advanced models require careful parameter identification. Habachi et al. (El Habachi *et*  
401 *al.*, 2015) investigated the influence of these parameters on the kinematics of each joint as  
402 computed by MKO. The lower limb was modelled by a S-ESM-ESMs kinematic chain with fixed-  
403 length ligaments also featuring the patello-femoral joint at the knee (Sancisi and Parenti-Castelli,  
404 2011b). Results showed that some parameters highly influence joints motion, both for simple lower  
405 pairs (S and R) and for advanced models (ESM and ESMs). However, the higher number of  
406 parameters make the latter more likely to be sensitive to parameter variations, as recently observed  
407 elsewhere (Sancisi *et al.*, 2015). Therefore, personalization is considered essential for MKO (El  
408 Habachi *et al.*, 2015).

409 Recently, subject-specific constraints have been introduced within MKO (Valente *et al.*, 2015;  
 410 Clement *et al.*, 2015). In particular, subject-specific geometries were used with ESM in the latter  
 411 study. Four different kinematic chains were compared (i.e., N-N-N, S-S-S, S- $\Delta L_{\min}$ -S, S- ${}^c\Delta L_{\min}$ -S,  
 412 where  ${}^c\Delta L_{\min}$  stands for customized minimal ligaments length variation model) and tested against  
 413 quasi-static bi-planar radiographic images during squat. The effect of subject-specific constraints at  
 414 the knee was assessed testing these models on ten healthy and ten osteoarthritic subjects. Results  
 415 showed that personalization improves STA compensation in particular for knee in-external rotation,  
 416 ab-adduction, antero-posterior and proximal-distal displacements both in healthy and osteoarthritic  
 417 subjects (Table 1). As shown in previous studies, RMSEs obtained from both  $\Delta L_{\min}$  and  ${}^c\Delta L_{\min}$  are  
 418 comparable to those from S (Table 1). As discussed above, knee displacements appear null with S  
 419 constraint since in this case  $C_S$  is placed at the joint centre, like in most of MKO related literature.  
 420 Therefore, this approximation does not appear to affect the errors on antero-posterior, proximo-  
 421 distal, medio-lateral displacement reconstructions, since these motion components are usually  
 422 small. However, placing  $C_S$  at the joint centre does not produce a physiological motion.  
 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  
 425 relative motion (Richard *et al.*, 2016). Despite this constraint is not strictly kinematic, it is reported  
 426 here since it is handled in MKO similarly to other kinematic constraints that are not relying on the  
 427 forces applied at the lower limb. The stiffness matrix constraint (K) was compared to N, S and ESM  
 428 models using the joint motion acquired by bi-planar fluoroscopy as gold-standard. The constraint  
 429 imposed by the stiffness matrix was obtained by minimizing joint deformation energy. Two  
 430 subjects were enrolled in this study, and were asked to perform a stair-climbing task. Results  
 431 confirmed the importance of joint kinematic constraints for STA compensation; moreover, K  
 432 proved to be a promising alternative compared to rigid models.  
 433 Finally, the present review focused only on kinematic lower limb joint models, specifically applied  
 434 in MKO and validated for compensation of STA. Of course many other lower limb joint models can

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

440

#### 441 **4. CONCLUDING REMARKS**

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

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.

464 To date, in the perspective of STA compensation, the results of anatomical constraints and S are  
465 comparable. In fact, the joints of the lower limb show a nearly spherical motion; therefore, an  
466 accurately identified S could represent a good alternative to anatomical constraints for applications  
467 that do not require a detailed and anatomically coherent description of the musculoskeletal  
468 apparatus, such as for example clinical gait analyses in joint arthritis patients. It is expected,  
469 however, that anatomical constraints will lead to better results, once a simple experimental  
470 procedure will be developed to identify the model parameters. Moreover, only models that feature a  
471 direct representation of anatomical structures (i.e. ligaments and articular surfaces), such as rigid  
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  
474 dynamic model. Personalization and, more generally, the identification of the joint parameters on  
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  
477 to the relevant joint model. However, new procedures have to be defined to identify advanced  
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)  
480 (Conconi *et al.*, 2015) may represent a promising tool for the identification of patient-specific  
481 anatomical constraint models (Conconi *et al.*, 2016).

482 In spite of the number of joint and lower limb models proposed, STA is still not totally  
483 compensated, and MKO accuracy could be largely improved to reconstruct the spatial movements  
484 of the main segments of the lower limb during gait. Future investigations should focus on models  
485 that represent joint physiological behaviour with improved accuracy. Moreover, whereas large  
486 efforts were spent on the knee joint, only little attention has been devoted to the ankle joint so far.

487 Because the accuracy of ankle models also influence the estimation of knee motion (Duprey *et al.*,  
488 2010) and, as a consequence, also of the whole lower limb motion, in the future more attention  
489 should be devoted to this joint.

490

#### 491 **ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

492 This work was supported by the Italian Ministry of Economy and Finance, Programme “5 per  
493 mille”.

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.

498

## 499 REFERENCES

- 500 Adouni, M., Shirazi-Adl, A., Shirazi, R., 2012. Computational biodynamics of human knee joint in  
501 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.  
503 Non-invasive assessment of soft-tissue artifact and its effect on knee joint kinematics during  
504 functional activity. *J.Biomech.* 43, 1292-1301.
- 505 Alexander, E.J. and Andriacchi, T.P. 2001. Correcting for deformation in skin-based marker  
506 systems. *J.Biomech.* 34, 355-361.
- 507 Andersen, M.S., Benoit, D.L., Damsgaard, M., Ramsey, D.K., and Rasmussen, J. 2010. Do  
508 kinematic models reduce the effects of soft tissue artefacts in skin marker-based motion  
509 analysis? An in vivo study of knee kinematics. *J.Biomech.* 43, 268-273.
- 510 Andriacchi, T.P., Alexander, E.J., Toney, M.K., Dyrby, C., and Sum, J. 1998. A point cluster  
511 method for in vivo motion analysis: applied to a study of knee kinematics. *J.Biomech.Eng* 120,  
512 743-749.
- 513 Ball, K.A. and Pierrynowski, M.R. 1998. Modeling of the pliant surfaces of the thigh and leg during  
514 gait. In *Proceedings of SPIE-The International Society for Optical Engineering, BIOS'98-*  
515 *International Biomedical Optics Symposium.*
- 516 Benoit, D.L., Ramsey, D.K., Lamontagne, M., Xu, L., Wretenberg, P., Renström, P., 2006. Effect  
517 of skin movement artifact on knee kinematics during gait and cutting motions measured in vivo.  
518 *Gait. Posture.* 24, 152–164.
- 519 Benoit, D.L., Ramsey, D.K., Lamontagne, M., Xu, L., Wretenberg, P., Renström, P., 2007. In vivo  
520 knee kinematics during gait reveals new rotation profiles and smaller translations. *Clin. Orthop.*  
521 *Relat. Res.* 454, 81–88.
- 522 Benoit, D.L., Damsgaard, M., and Andersen, M.S. 2015. Surface marker cluster translation,  
523 rotation, scaling and deformation: Their contribution to soft tissue artefact and impact on knee  
524 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.

528 Blankevoort, L., Huiskes, R., and de Lange, A. 1990. Helical axes of passive knee joint motions.  
 529 *J.Biomech*. 23, 1219-1229.

530 Cappello, A., Cappozzo, A., La Palombara, P.F., Lucchetti, L., and Leardini, A. 1997. Multiple  
 531 anatomical landmark calibration for optimal bone pose estimation. *Human Movement Science*  
 532 16, 259-274.

533 Cappello, A., Stagni, R., Fantozzi, S., and Leardini, A. 2005. Soft tissue artifact compensation in  
 534 knee kinematics by double anatomical landmark calibration: performance of a novel method  
 535 during selected motor tasks. *IEEE Trans.Biomed.Eng* 52, 992-998.

536 Cappozzo, A., Catani, F., Della Croce, U., and Leardini, A. 1995. Position and orientation in space  
 537 of bones during movement: anatomical frame definition and determination.  
 538 *Clin.Biomech.(Bristol., Avon.)* 10, 171-178.

539 Cappozzo, A., Catani, F., Leardini, A., Benedetti, M.G., and Della Croce, U. 1996. Position and  
 540 orientation in space of bones during movement: experimental artefacts. *Clin.Biomech.(Bristol.,*  
 541 *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.

544 Cerveri, P., Pedotti, A., and Ferrigno, G. 2005. Kinematical models to reduce the effect of skin  
 545 artifacts on marker-based human motion estimation. *J.Biomech*. 38, 2228-2236.

546 Charlton, I.W., Tate, P., Smyth, P., and Roren, L. 2004. Repeatability of an optimised lower body  
 547 model. *Gait.Posture*. 20, 213-221.

548 Cheze, L., Fregly, B.J., and Dimnet, J. 1995. A solidification procedure to facilitate kinematic  
 549 analyses based on video system data. *J.Biomech*. 28, 879-884.



550 Chiari, L., Della Croce, U., Leardini, A., and Cappozzo, A. 2005. Human movement analysis using  
551 stereophotogrammetry. Part 2: instrumental errors. *Gait.Posture*. 21, 197-211.

552 Clement, J., Dumas, R., Hagemester, N., and de Guise, J.A. 2015. Soft tissue artifact compensation  
553 in knee kinematics by multi-body optimization: Performance of subject-specific knee joint  
554 models. *J.Biomech*. 48, 3796-3802.

555 Clement, J., Dumas, R., Hagemester, N., and de Guise, J.A. 2017. Can generic knee joint models  
556 improve the measurement of osteoarthritic knee kinematics during squatting activity?  
557 *Comput.Methods Biomech.Biomed.Engin*. 20, 94-103.

558 Cockcroft, J., Louw, Q., and Baker, R. 2016. Proximal placement of lateral thigh skin markers  
559 reduces soft tissue artefact during normal gait using the Conventional Gait Model.  
560 *Comput.Methods Biomech.Biomed.Engin*. 19, 1497-1504.

561 Conconi, M., Sancisi, N., and Parenti-Castelli, V. 2016. Subject-specific model of knee natural  
562 motion: a non-invasive approach. In *Advances in Robot Kinematics* (Edited by Lenarcic J.and  
563 Merlet J.P.) Springer International Publishing.

564 Conconi, M., Leardini, A., and Parenti-Castelli, V. 2015. Joint kinematics from functional  
565 adaptation: A validation on the tibio-talar articulation. *J Biomech* 48, 2960-2967.

566 D'Angeli, V., Belvedere, C., Ortolani, M., Giannini, S., and Leardini, A. 2013. Load along the  
567 femur shaft during activities of daily living. *J Biomech* 46, 2002-2010.

568 D'Angeli, V., Belvedere, C., Ortolani, M., Giannini, S., and Leardini, A. 2016. Load along the tibial  
569 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  
574 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  
579 of passive motion at the human ankle joint by equivalent spatial parallel mechanisms. *Med Biol*  
580 *Eng Comput.* 45, 305-313.

581 Dumas, R., Camomilla, V., Bonci, T., Cheze, L., and Cappozzo, A. 2015. What portion of the soft  
582 tissue artefact requires compensation when estimating joint kinematics? *J.Biomech.Eng* 137,  
583 064502.

584 Duprey, S., Cheze, L., and Dumas, R. 2010. Influence of joint constraints on lower limb kinematics  
585 estimation from skin markers using global optimization. *J.Biomech.* 43, 2858-2862.

586 El Habachi, A., Moissenet, F., Duprey, S., Cheze, L., and Dumas, R. 2015. Global sensitivity  
587 analysis of the joint kinematics during gait to the parameters of a lower limb multi-body model.  
588 *Med.Biol.Eng Comput.* 53, 655-667.

589 Feikes, J.D., O'Connor, J.J., and Zavatsky, A.B. 2003. A constraint-based approach to modelling  
590 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  
592 Leardini, A. 2008. Quantitative comparison of five current protocols in gait analysis.  
593 *Gait.Posture.* 28, 207-216.

594 Forlani, M., Sancisi, N., and Parenti-Castelli, V. 2015. A three-dimensional ankle kinetostatic model  
595 to simulate loaded and unladed joint motion. *J. Biomech. Eng.* 137, 061005.

596 Franci, R., Parenti-Castelli, V., Belvedere, C., and Leardini, A. 2009. A new one-DOF fully parallel  
597 mechanism for modelling passive motion at the human tibiotalar joint. *J.Biomech.* 42, 1403-  
598 1408.

599 Gasparutto, X., Dumas, R., and Jacquelin, E. 2012. Multi-body optimisation with deformable  
600 ligament constraints: influence of ligament geometry. *Comput.Methods*  
601 *Biomech.Biomed.Engin.* 15 Suppl 1, 191-193.

602 Gasparutto, X., Sancisi, N., Jacquelin, E., Parenti-Castelli, V., and Dumas, R. 2015. Validation of a  
 603 multi-body optimization with knee kinematic models including ligament constraints. *J.Biomech.*  
 604 48, 1141-1146.

605 Gill, H.S. and O'Connor, J.J. 1996. Biarticulating two-dimensional computer model of the human  
 606 patellofemoral joint. *Clin.Biomech.(Bristol., Avon.)* 11, 81-89.

607 Guess, T.M., Liu, H., Bhashyam, S., Thiagarajan, G. 2013. A multibody knee model with discrete  
 608 cartilage prediction of tibio-femoral contact mechanics. *Computer Methods in Biomechanics*  
 609 *and Biomedical Engineering* 16, 256-270.

610 Kadaba, M.P., Ramakrishnan, H.K., and Wootten, M.E. 1990. Measurement of lower extremity  
 611 kinematics during level walking. *J.Orthop.Res.* 8, 383-392.

612 Klous, M. and Klous, S. 2010. Marker-based reconstruction of the kinematics of a chain of  
 613 segments: a new method that incorporates joint kinematic constraints. *J.Biomech.Eng* 132,  
 614 074501.

615 Koh, B.I., Reinbolt, J.A., George, A.D., Haftka, R.T., and Fregly, B.J. 2009. Limitations of parallel  
 616 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  
 618 current models for trunk motion in human movement analysis. *Clin.Biomech.(Bristol., Avon.)*  
 619 24, 542-550.

620 Leardini, A., Biagi, F., Merlo, A., Belvedere, C., and Benedetti, M.G. 2011. Multi-segment trunk  
 621 kinematics during locomotion and elementary exercises. *Clin.Biomech.(Bristol., Avon.)* 26,  
 622 562-571.

623 Leardini, A., Chiari, L., Della Croce, U., and Cappozzo, A. 2005. Human movement analysis using  
 624 stereophotogrammetry. Part 3. Soft tissue artifact assessment and compensation. *Gait.Posture.*  
 625 21, 212-225.

626 Leardini, A., O'Connor, J.J., Catani, F., and Giannini, S. 1999a. A geometric model of the human  
 627 ankle joint. *J.Biomech.* 32, 585-591.

628 Leardini,A., O'Connor,J.J., Catani,F., and Giannini,S. 1999b. Kinematics of the human ankle  
629 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-  
631 Dependent Behavior of the Tibiofemoral and Patellofemoral Joints During Movement. *Annals*  
632 *of Biomedical Engineering* 43, 2675-2685.

633 Li, K., Zheng, L., Tashman, S., and Zhang, X. 2012. The inaccuracy of surface-measured model-  
634 derived tibiofemoral kinematics. *J.Biomech.* 45, 2719-2723.

635 Lu, T.W. and O'Connor, J.J. 1999. Bone position estimation from skin marker co-ordinates using  
636 global optimisation with joint constraints. *J.Biomech.* 32, 129-134.

637 Lucchetti, L., Cappozzo, A., Cappello, A., and Della Croce, U. 1998. Skin movement artefact  
638 assessment and compensation in the estimation of knee-joint kinematics. *J Biomech.* 31, 977-  
639 984.

640 Manal, K., McClay, I., Stanhope, S., Richards, J., and Galinat, B. 2000. Comparison of surface  
641 mounted markers and attachment methods in estimating tibial rotations during walking: an in  
642 vivo study. *Gait.Posture.* 11, 38-45.

643 Martelli, S., Valente, G., Viceconti, M., and Taddei, F. 2015. Sensitivity of a subject-specific  
644 musculoskeletal model to the uncertainties on the joint axes location. *Comput.Methods*  
645 *Biomech.Biomed.Engin.* 18, 1555-1563.

646 Menschik, A. 1974. [Mechanics of the knee-joint. 1 (author's transl)]. *Z.Orthop.Ihre Grenzgeb.* 112,  
647 481-495.

648 Moissenet, F., Cheze, L., and Dumas, R. 2014. A 3D lower limb musculoskeletal model for  
649 simultaneous estimation of musculo-tendon, joint contact, ligament and bone forces during gait.  
650 *J.Biomech.* 47, 50-58.

651 O'Connor, J.J., Lu, T.W., Wilson, D.R., Feikes, J., and Leardini, A. 1998. Review: Diarthrodial  
652 Joints-Kinematic Pairs, Mechanisms or Flexible Structures? *Comput.Methods*  
653 *Biomech.Biomed.Engin.* 1, 123-150.

654 O'Connor, J.J., Shercliff, T.L., Biden, E., and Goodfellow, J.W. 1989. The geometry of the knee in  
655 the sagittal plane. *Proc.Inst.Mech.Eng H.* 203, 223-233.

656 Ojeda, J., Martínez-Reina, J., and Mayo, J. 2016. The effect of kinematic constraints in the inverse  
657 dynamics problem in biomechanics. *Multibody Syst.Dyn.* 37, 291-309.

658 Ottoboni, A., Parenti-Castelli, V., Sancisi, N., Belvedere, C., and Leardini, A. 2010. Articular  
659 surface approximation in equivalent spatial parallel mechanism models of the human knee joint:  
660 an experiment-based assessment. *Proc.Inst.Mech Eng H.* 224, 1121-1132.

661 Parenti-Castelli, V. and Di Gregorio, R. 2000. Parallel Mechanisms Applied to the Human Knee  
662 Passive Motion Simulation. In *Advances in Robot Kinematics* (Edited by Lenarcic J.and  
663 Stanisic M.M.) Pp. 333-344. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Netherlands.

664 Peters, A., Galna, B., Sangeux, M., Morris, M., and Baker, R. 2010. Quantification of soft tissue  
665 artifact in lower limb human motion analysis: a systematic review. *Gait.Posture.* 31, 1-8.

666 Reinbolt, J.A., Schutte, J.F., Fregly, B.J., Koh, B.I., Haftka, R.T., George, A.D., and Mitchell, K.H.  
667 2005. Determination of patient-specific multi-joint kinematic models through two-level  
668 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  
670 movement on the analysis of skeletal knee joint motion during running. *J. Biomech.* 30, 729–  
671 732.

672 Richard, V., Lamberto, G., Lu, T.W., Cappozzo, A., and Dumas, R. 2016. Knee Kinematics  
673 Estimation Using Multi-Body Optimisation Embedding a Knee Joint Stiffness Matrix: A  
674 Feasibility Study. *PLoS.One.* 11, e0157010.

675 Ryu, T., Choi, H.S., and Chung, M.K. 2009. Soft tissue artifact compensation using displacement  
676 dependency between anatomical landmarks and skin markers – a preliminary study.  
677 *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics* 39, 152-158.

678 Sancisi, N. and Parenti-Castelli, V. 2011a. A new kinematic model of the passive motion of the  
679 knee inclusive of the patella. *J.Mechanisms Robotics* 3, 041003.

680 Sancisi, N. and Parenti-Castelli, V. 2011b. A novel 3D parallel mechanism for the passive motion  
681 simulation of the patella-femur-tibia complex. *Meccanica* 46, 207-220.

682 Sancisi, N. and Parenti-Castelli, V. 2011c. A sequentially-defined stiffness model of the knee.  
683 *Mechanism and Machine Theory* 46, 1920-1928.

684 Sancisi, N., Baldisserri, B., Parenti-Castelli, V., Belvedere, C., and Leardini, A. 2014. One-degree-  
685 of-freedom spherical model for the passive motion of the human ankle joint. *Med.Biol.Eng*  
686 *Comput.* 52, 363-373.

687 Sancisi, N., Nardini, F., Parenti-Castelli, V., Belvedere, C., and Leardini, A. 2015. Variation of the  
688 ankle motion with the pivot-point position as predicted by a spherical model of the joint. *J Mech*  
689 *Med Biol* 15, 1540039.

690 Sancisi, N., Zannoli, D., Parenti-Castelli, V., Belvedere, C., and Leardini, A. 2011. A one-degree-  
691 of-freedom spherical mechanism for human knee joint modelling. *Proc.Inst.Mech.Eng H.* 225,  
692 725-735.

693 Schwartz, M.H. and Rozumalski, A. 2005. A new method for estimating joint parameters from  
694 motion data. *J.Biomech.* 38, 107-116.

695 Shelburne, K.B., Pandy, M.G., Anderson, F.C., Torry, M.R. 2004. Pattern of anterior cruciate  
696 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  
698 of in vivo stereophotogrammetry with both in vitro 6-DOFs electrogoniometry and CT medical  
699 imaging. *J.Biomech.* 39, 2087-2095.

700 Soderkvist, I. and Wedin, P.A. 1993. Determining the movements of the skeleton using well-  
701 configured markers. *J.Biomech.* 26, 1473-1477.

702 Stagni, R., Fantozzi, S., and Cappello, A. 2009. Double calibration vs. global optimisation:  
703 performance and effectiveness for clinical application. *Gait.Posture.* 29, 119-122.

704 Stagni, R., Fantozzi, S., Cappello, A., and Leardini, A. 2005. Quantification of soft tissue artefact in  
705 motion analysis by combining 3D fluoroscopy and stereophotogrammetry: a study on two  
706 subjects. *Clin.Biomech.(Bristol., Avon.)* 20, 320-329.

707 Taylor, W.R., Ehrig, R.M., Duda, G.N., Schell, H., Seebeck, P., and Heller, M.O. 2005. On the  
708 influence of soft tissue coverage in the determination of bone kinematics using skin markers.  
709 *J.Orthop.Res.* 23, 726-734.

710 Valente, G., Pitto, L., Stagni, R., and Taddei, F. 2015. Effect of lower-limb joint models on subject-  
711 specific musculoskeletal models and simulations of daily motor activities. *J.Biomech.* 48, 4198-  
712 4205.

713 Valente, G., Pitto, L., Testi, D., Seth, A., Delp, S.L., Stagni, R., Viceconti, M., and Taddei, F. 2014.  
714 Are subject-specific musculoskeletal models robust to the uncertainties in parameter  
715 identification? *PLoS.One.* 9, e112625.

716 Veldpaus, F.E., Woltring, H.J., and Dortmans, L.J. 1988. A least-squares algorithm for the  
717 equiform transformation from spatial marker co-ordinates. *J.Biomech.* 21, 45-54.

718 Walker, P.S., Rovick, J.S., and Robertson, D.D. 1988. The effects of knee brace hinge design and  
719 placement on joint mechanics. *J Biomech.* 21, 965-974.

720 Wilson, D.R. and O'Connor, J.J. 1997. A three-dimensional geometric model of the knee for the  
721 study of joint forces in gait. *Gait.Posture.* 5, 108-115.

722 Wu, G. and Cavanagh, P.R. 1995. ISB recommendations for standardization in the reporting of  
723 kinematic data. *J Biomech.* 28, 1257-1261.

724 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  
726 joint coordinate system of various joints for the reporting of human joint motion--part I: ankle,  
727 hip, and spine. International Society of Biomechanics. *J Biomech* 35, 543-548.

728  
729

730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739

**TABLE CAPTION**

**Table 1** Mean values and standard deviation of RMSEs of the motion components of the tibio-femoral relative motion as found in the MKO related literature: flexion-extension (FE), abduction (AA), in-external rotation (IER) and antero-posterior (APT), proximal-distal (PDT), medial-lateral (MLT) displacements are reported. For each article the table shows the joint models used (Joints), the identification method of the joint models geometry (Model tuning), the number of subjects involved (Number of Subjects), the marker set adopted (Marker set), the motor tasks 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).



Article	Joints			Model tuning	Number of Subjects	Marker set	Motor Tasks	Validation technique	RMSE tibio-femoral relative motion [mean (±sd)]						
	HIP	KNEE	ANKLE						FE (deg)	AA (deg)	IER (deg)	MLD (mm)	APD (mm)	PDD (mm)	
Stagni et al. (2009)	S	S	S	Anatomical landmarks	2 subjects with TKR	Two Marker sets: (i) according to CAST protocol; (ii) 4 markers clusters for both thigh and shank	extension against gravity step-up/step-down sit-to-stand/stand-to-sit	Single-plane fluoroscopy	5.5 (±3.6) 6.8 (±0.5) 8.7 (±0.2)	2.3 (±0.1) 15.7 (±0.4) 12.5 (±0.2)	9.4 (±3.1) 7.9 (±1.6) 10.8 (±1.9)	4.3 (±4.9) 3.0 (±3.4) 5.0 (±5.5)	19.2 (±1.3) 18.5 (±0.7) 19.6 (±2.8)	6.5 (±3.0) 7.5 (±2.9) 8.3 (±1.8)	
Andersen et al. (2010)	\	N R S	\	Functional optimisation	6	Benoit et al. (2006),(2007)	Level walking	Bone pins	2.8 (±2.6) 3.8 (±2.4) 3.4 (±2.5)	3.4 (±3.2) 3.4 (±3.2) 3.8 (±3.0)	2.6 (±1.3) 2.5 (±1.2) 2.6 (±1.3)				
Li et al. (2012)	S	CC (Walker et al. (1988))	2R	Scaled generic model	20 (10 healthy, 10 PCL injured)	Vicon Plug-in Gait	Level running Stair-ascent	Dynamic stereo radiography	9.1 (±3.2) 3.3 (±1.1)	2.0 (±1.2) 2.5 (±1.7)	6.4 (±4.5) 5.1 (±3.3)	1.9 (±1.2) 1.5 (±0.8)	7.1 (±3.2) 6.1 (±2.5)	8.8 (±3.7) 11.0 (±4.6)	
					10 healthy subjects		Level running Stair-ascent		8.8 (±3.3) 3.9 (±1.2)	2.4 (±1.5) 2.8 (±1.6)	6.0 (±3.4) 4.4 (±3.2)	1.9 (±1.3) 1.6 (±1.0)	7.6 (±3.5) 5.9 (±2.5)	9.4 (±3.7) 12.2 (±4.7)	
					10 PCL injured subjects		Level running Stair-ascent		9.5 (±3.2) 2.7 (±0.7)	1.5 (±0.7) 2.3 (±1.8)	6.9 (±5.7) 5.8 (±3.5)	1.9 (±1.1) 1.3 (±0.4)	6.6 (±2.9) 6.2 (±2.7)	8.2 (±3.9) 9.7 (±4.4)	
									1.7 (±0.2) 1.7 (±0.1) 1.6 (±0.2) 1.8 (±0.4) 1.7 (±0.2) 1.7 (±0.2)	2.0 (±0.4) 1.6 (±0.5) 2.9 (±0.2) 1.9 (±0.4) 1.6 (±0.5) 2.0 (±0.5)	2.9 (±0.3) 2.4 (±0.1) 6.0 (±0.4) 11.7 (±0.5) 2.6 (±0.1) 3.4 (±0.8)	3.3 (±0.5) 1.4 (±0.2) 1.4 (±0.2) 1.6 (±0.0) 2.6 (±0.5) 1.8 (±0.3)	4.5 (±0.8) 2.5 (±0.6) 3.6 (±1.0) 2.9 (±0.8) 3.8 (±0.5) 2.8 (±0.8)	5.0 (±0.6) 1.8 (±0.3) 2.2 (±0.2) 1.6 (±0.2) 1.7 (±0.2) 1.7 (±0.3)	
Gasparutto et al. (2015)	\	N S CC (Walker et al. (1988)) ΔL <sub>0</sub> ΔL <sub>min</sub> ΔL <sub>0</sub>	\	Anatomical landmarks  Optimized geometry from in vitro data	3	Reinschmidt et al. (1997)	Level running	Bone pins							
Clément et al. (2015)	N S S S S	N S S S	N S S S	Subject specific bone models	10 healthy subjects	Mounted on three rigid devices attached on the iliac crest, the femoral condyles and the tibial tuberosity	Squat	Bi-planar radiography	0.3 (±0.1) 0.3 (±0.2) 0.3 (±0.2) 0.3 (±0.1)	6.7 (±2.8) 2.7 (±1.3) 2.2 (±1.2) 2.2 (±1.1)	5.4 (±3.7) 6.0 (±4.2) 5.2 (±3.8) 7.3 (±4.9)	2.8 (±2.7) 1.8 (±0.9) 4.3 (±2.4) 2.5 (±1.8)	7.4 (±3.6) 2.2 (±0.9) 3.2 (±2.1) 3.3 (±2.0)	12.0 (±3.8) 2.4 (±1.2) 2.4 (±1.1) 4.0 (±1.2)	
		N S S S	N S S S		10 osteoarthritic subjects				0.3 (±0.1) 0.3 (±0.1) 0.3 (±0.1) 0.3 (±0.1)	3.5 (±2.8) 5.1 (±1.8) 3.3 (±2.1) 6.4 (±2.3)	5.7 (±4.2) 5.9 (±3.8) 6.0 (±3.9) 5.7 (±4.4)	4.1 (±1.9) 2.8 (±2.0) 4.1 (±2.4) 5.6 (±5.1)	7.0 (±3.9) 2.6 (±1.3) 2.5 (±1.1) 3.9 (±2.0)	7.0 (±4.8) 2.9 (±1.2) 2.7 (±0.9) 4.3 (±1.1)	
Richard et al. (2016)	\	N S ΔL <sub>0</sub> K	\	Anatomical landmarks Geometry from in vitro data Based on in vitro data	2	Thigh: 4 markers in the middle + 2 markers at the epycondyles; Shank: tibial tuberosity, fibular head + 2 markers at the malleoli.	Stair-ascent	Bi-planar fluoroscopy	5.4 (±0.9) 4.9 (±1.0) 5.8 (±1.3) 5.3 (±1.1)	2.2 (±0.2) 1.9 (±0.1) 5.3 (±2.0) 1.9 (±0.7)	4.8 (±3.3) 3.9 (±2.0) 15.3 (±7.1) 4.6 (±2.5)	1.6 (±0.1) 1.4 (±0.1) 1.2 (±0.1) 2.6 (±0.2)	6.6 (±2.3) 5.4 (±2.2) 3.5 (±1.8) 3.0 (±0.6)	6.3 (±0.4) 1.5 (±1.1) 2.3 (±2.2) 3.4 (±0.3)	