Skin Movement Artifacts Affect Calculated Knee Kinematics and Kinetics During Cycling

Jia-Da Li[1)], Mei-Ying Kuo[2)], Tsung-Chi Lin[1)], Yu-Huan Wu[1)], and Tung-Wu Lu[*1,3)]
1) Institute of Biomedical Engineering, National Taiwan University, Taiwan.
2) Department of Physical Therapy, China Medical University, Taiwan.
3) Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, School of Medicine, National Taiwan University, Taiwan.
E-mail: twlu@ntu.edu.tw

Abstract

Effects of soft tissue artifacts (STA) on the calculated kinematic and kinetic variables at the knee during cycling has never been reported and the current study aimed to bridge the gap. Twelve healthy young adults cycled on an ergometer with instrumented pedals mimicking rehabilitation conditions. The subject wore 30 skin markers on the pelvis-leg apparatus while the marker trajectories were measured using a motion capture system, and the knee was imaged at 60 Hz by a bi-plane fluoroscopy system. Joint kinematic and kinetic variables were calculated using skin markers and bone data separately, the later being the gold standard. The results showed that using skin marker data the knee joint angles, shear forces and moments were underestimated and translations were overestimated. However, these effects were relatively small in the sagittal plane. The results will be helpful for the interpretation of results in future skin marker based cycling studies.

1. Introduction

Cycling has played an important role in transportation, recreation, and sport in our daily lives. Generally, biomechanics of the lower limb joints during cycling exercises has mostly been studied using skin marker-based motion analysis techniques and is subject to soft tissue artifacts (STA). However, no study has reported a complete assessment of the effects of STA on the calculated joint center motions, angles, shear forces, and moments at the knee during this activity. The current study aimed to evaluate *in vivo* the STA effects on these calculated variables by integrating 3D fluoroscopy and stereophotogrammetry. It was hypothesized that STA would significantly affect these calculated variables.

2. Methods

2.1. Subjects

Twelve healthy young adults (age: 22.5±2.1 years, height: 172.5±2.1 cm, mass: 64.8±10.4 kg) participated in the current study with informed written consent, as approved by the Institutional Research Board.

2.2. Experimental procedure

Each subject wore 30 skin markers on the pelvis and the right lower limb, and performed cycling on an ergometer. The pedals of the ergometer were instrumented with 6-component load-cells for measuring pedal reaction forces during cycling. The 3D marker trajectories were measured using a 12-camera motion capture system at a sampling rate of 120Hz (Vicon Motion Systems Ltd., UK). The knee was also imaged simultaneously at 60 Hz by a bi-plane dynamic fluoroscopy system (ALLURA XPER FD, Philips). The knees of the subjects were also CT scanned and used to construct CT-based bone models.

2.3. Data analysis

The subject-specific, CT-based bone models were registered to the fluoroscopy images using a volumetric model-based fluoroscopy-to-CT registration method [1], giving poses of the femur and tibia, and the knee joint center positions. During subject calibration without skin movement, bone coordinate systems were defined for the thigh and shank based on the registered poses of the femur and tibia following the ISB convention and position of skin markers relative to bone coordinate system were taken as virtual bone markers (VBM). The results from the VBM were taken as the gold standard. The knee joint center (KJC) was defined as the mid-point of the trans-epicondylar axis in the anatomical position, and its movement in the shank coordinate system as the knee joint center translation. Inertial properties for each body segment were obtained using an optimization method [2].

2.4. Statistical analysis

Descriptive statistics data was reported for maximum differences throughout analyzed cycle between the results obtained from skin marker and VBM, as well as root mean square of errors (RMSE). To compare the results from skin markers and VBM, a paired t-test was used for each time instances of the whole cycle for each of the variables. A significant level of 0.05 was set for all tests.

3. Results

3.1. Rotations and translations

Skin markers underestimated significantly the knee flexion angles at knee flexed 104.8°-35.21° and 21.92°-84.46°), the maximum difference being 8.68°(2.34°) with a RMSE of 5.02°(1.58°) (Fig. 1a, Table 1). The abduction angles were also underestimated significantly at knee flexed 104.8°-25.59° and 78.91°-104.8°, the maximum difference being 7.02°(3.48°)

with a RMSE of 4.42°(2.76°). Internal rotation angles were no significance found in a crank cycle.

Compared to the gold standard, the posterior translations of the KJC calculated from skin markers were significantly overestimated at knee flexed 83.81°-18.62° and 21.92°-84.46° (Fig 1b, Table 1), with a maximum difference of 8.23 (2.72) mm and a RMSE of 4.83 (2.23) mm. Distal translations of the KJC was also significantly overestimated at knee flexed 104.8°-26.3° and 13.27°-104.8°, the maximum error being 14.96 (5.15) mm with a RMSE of 10.02 (4.00) mm. Lateral translations of the KJC was significantly underestimated at knee flexed 104.8°-93.14° and 91.87°-104.8°, the maximum error being 7.25 (2.67) mm with a RMSE of 4.31 (2.40) mm.

3.2. Forces and moments

Knee joint forces calculated from skin markers were slightly different from the gold standard for the anterior/posterior, proximal/distal components (maximum error less than 2.97% of the maximum value of the gold standard). Significant differences were found for the medial/lateral force component. Maximum difference was 8.55 (4.98) N and a RMSE of 3.51 (2.32) N (Table 1).

The extensor moments calculated using skin markers were significantly underestimated at knee flexed 104.8°-19.76° and 107.8°-104.8°, the maximum difference being 2.82 (1.20) Nm with a RMSE of 1.27 (0.51) Nm. The abductor moments were significantly underestimated at knee flexed 104.8°-84.46°, the maximum difference being 2.40 (1.24) Nm with a RMSE of 0.94 (0.46) Nm. In contrast to the other two components, the external rotator moments were small (maximum value: 3.35 Nm) and significant difference was found at knee flexed 37.54-22.23°).

4. Discussion

Skin markers underestimated the knee flexion angles mainly due to posterior movement of the markers on the lateral and medial epicondyles during knee flexion. Skin markers also overestimated the distal joint center translations throughout crank cycle except for crank angles from 121°~146°, primarily because the markers on the proximal shank moved distally during knee flexion.

The calculated moments were affected by the KJC position. Therefore, inaccuracies in the KJC positions will lead to inaccurate joint moments. The maximum differences and RMSE in joint moments found in the current study indicate that care should be exercised when interpreting results obtained from skin markers during cycling. Besides, the large variation between the subjects may also suggest that average patterns of the STA and the associated effects may not apply to individual subjects. Subject-specific compensation for the effects of STA is necessary, especially for the interpretation of subtle but significant differences between subject groups in clinical studies.

In conclusion, the current study reported the first data on the STA effects on the calculated knee kinematics and kinetics in healthy young subjects during cycling. The results will be helpful for the interpretation of results in future skin marker based cycling studies, and for developing STA compensation methods for future applications.

Acknowledgement

The authors gratefully acknowledge the financial support from Ministry of Science and Technology, Taiwan (MOST 103-2627-B-002-001-).

References

[1] Lin CC, Lu TW, Wang TM, Hsu CY and Shih TF. Comparisons of Surface vs. Volumetric Model-Based Registration Methods Using Single-Plane vs. Bi-Plane Fluoroscopy in Measuring Spinal Kinematics. *Med Eng Phys* **36**, 267-274, 2014.

[2] Chen SC, Hsieh HJ, Lu TW and Tseng CH. A method for estimating subject-specific body segment inertial parameters in human movement analysis. *Gait & Posture* **33**, 695-700, 2011.



Figure 1. Mean curves of the angles (a) and joint center translations (b) of the knee obtained using skin markers (red dashed lines) and VBM (blue solid lines, gold standard) during a complete cycling cycle. Blue and red areas represent one standard deviation. Ranges marked with asterisks represent significant differences between the means.

Table 1. Means (SD) of the maximum differences and RMSE values of the calculated knee angles, translations, shear forces, and moments across all subjects, also as percentages of the maximum value obtained from VBM.

		Maximum Differences		RMSE	
Angles		(Degree)	(%)	(Degree)	(%)
	Flex/Ext	8.68 (2.34)	8.00 (2.21)	5.02 (1.58)	4.63 (1.49)
	Abd/Add	7.02 (3.48)	47.88 (20.29)	4.42 (2.76)	28.90 (13.54)
	Int/Ext Rot	7.39 (2.53)	75.60 (29.88)	3.77 (1.32)	38.78 (16.11)
Translations		(mm)	(%)	(mm)	(%)
	A/P	8.23 (2.72)	26.89 (13.15)	4.83 (2.23)	16.19 (10.23)
	P/D	14.96 (5.15)	121.43 (149.48)	10.02 (4.00)	82.55 (102.37)
	M/L	7.25 (2.67)	91.72 (45.20)	4.31 (2.40)	53.17 (27.52)
Forces		(N)	(%)	(N)	(%)
	A/P	4.00 (0.90)	2.97 (0.97)	1.54 (0.41)	1.11 (0.29)
	P/D	2.72 (1.02)	1.69 (0.77)	1.02 (0.33)	0.62 (0.21)
	M/L	8.55 (4.98)	37.00 (34.57)	3.51 (2.32)	15.70 (16.64)
Moments		(Nm)	(%)	(Nm)	(%)
	Abd/Add	2.40 (1.24)	20.82 (17.98)	0.94 (0.46)	8.06 (6.48)
	Int/Ext rotator	1.38 (1.33)	36.34 (34.64)	0.59 (0.52)	16.16 (16.48)
	Flex/Ext	2.82 (1.20)	6.09 (2.08)	1.27 (0.51)	2.74 (0.93)