



HAL
open science

Influence of joint constraints on lower limb kinematics estimation from skin markers using global optimization

Sonia Duprey, Laurence Cheze, Raphaël Dumas

► To cite this version:

Sonia Duprey, Laurence Cheze, Raphaël Dumas. Influence of joint constraints on lower limb kinematics estimation from skin markers using global optimization. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 2010, 43 (14), pp. 2858-2862. 10.1016/j.jbiomech.2010.06.010 . hal-00990413

HAL Id: hal-00990413

<https://hal.science/hal-00990413>

Submitted on 13 May 2014

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 **Influence of joint constraints on lower limb kinematics estimation from skin markers**
2 **using global optimization**

3

4 Sonia Duprey ^{a*}, Laurence Cheze ^a, Raphaël Dumas ^a

5

6 ^a Université de Lyon, F-69622 Lyon, France

7 INRETS, UMR_T9406, Laboratoire de Biomécanique et Mécanique des Chocs, Bron, France

8 Université Lyon 1, Villeurbanne, France

9

10 * Corresponding author:

11 Sonia Duprey, LBMC, INRETS, 25 av F Mitterrand, F-69675 Bron Cedex, France. Phone:

12 (+33) 4 78 65 68 82 ; Fax: (+33) 4 72 14 23 60; Email: sonia.duprey@univ-lyon1.fr

13

14 **Word count:** 1523 words

15

1 **Abstract** (226 words)

2

3 In order to obtain the lower limb kinematics from skin-based markers, the soft tissue artefact
4 (STA) has to be compensated. Global optimization (GO) methods rely on a predefined
5 kinematic model and attempt to limit STA by minimizing the differences between model
6 predicted and skin-based marker positions. Thus, the reliability of GO methods depends
7 directly on the chosen model, whose influence is not well known yet.

8 This study develops a GO method that allows to easily implement different sets of joint
9 constraints in order to assess their influence on the lower limb kinematics during gait. The
10 segment definition was based on generalized coordinates giving only linear or quadratic joint
11 constraints. Seven sets of joint constraints were assessed, corresponding to different kinematic
12 models at the ankle, knee and hip: SSS, USS, PSS, SHS, SPS, UHS and PPS (where S, U and
13 H stand for spherical, universal and hinge joint and P for parallel mechanism). GO was
14 applied to gait data from five healthy males.

15 Results showed that the lower limb kinematics, except hip kinematics, knee and ankle
16 flexion-extension, significantly depend on the chosen ankle and knee constraints. The knee
17 parallel mechanism generated some typical knee rotation patterns previously observed in
18 lower limb kinematic studies. Furthermore, only the parallel mechanisms produced joint
19 displacements.

20 Thus, GO using parallel mechanism seems promising. It also offers some perspectives of
21 subject-specific joint constraints.

1 **Introduction**

2

3 To obtain an accurate skeleton kinematics from skin-based markers, the relative motion of
4 soft tissues with regards to the underlying bone (i.e. the soft tissue artefact, STA) has to be
5 compensated. Several methods minimizing STA have been developed (Leardini et al., 2005).
6 Some methods address each segment separately by computing the optimal bone pose from a
7 marker cluster (Söderkvist and Wedin, 1993; Challis, 1995, Cheze et al., 1995), while global
8 optimization (GO) methods address the entire limb, or full body, by minimizing distances
9 between measured and model-determined marker positions (Lu and O'Connor, 1999). GO
10 methods rely on the determination of a predefined kinematic model with specific joint
11 constraints. Therefore, GO results directly depend on the constraint choices.

12 Spherical joints have been classically applied (Lu and O'Connor, 1999; Charlton et al., 2004).
13 Alternatively, models including universal and hinge joints at the ankle and knee were
14 proposed (Reinbolt et al., 2005; Andersen et al., 2009c). Moreover, degree-of-freedom
15 coupling curves were included as knee joint constraints in a registration technique (Sholukha
16 et al. 2006) providing reliable results in terms of joint displacements. However the coupling
17 curves were dependent on the chosen segment axes and Euler angle sequence.

18 Coupled degrees-of-freedom can also be modelled by spatial parallel mechanisms (Feikes et
19 al., 2003; Di Gregorio et al., 2007) that directly take into account anatomical structures (i.e.
20 articular surfaces as sphere-on-plane contacts and ligaments as constant lengths). The
21 corresponding joint constraints have not been included in GO methods so far.

22

23 The aim of the current study is to develop a GO method that allows to easily implement
24 different sets of joint constraints, in order to assess their influence on the lower limb
25 kinematics during gait. Different sets of joint constraints were evaluated, corresponding to

1 different kinematic models at the ankle, knee and hip joints: SSS, USS, PSS, SHS, SPS, UHS
2 and PPS (where S, U and H stand for spherical, universal and hinge joint and P for parallel
3 mechanism).

4
5

6 **Global optimization methods** (*see appendices A, B, C for more details*)

7

8 *Parameter set*

9 GO was performed using generalized coordinates (Dumas and Cheze, 2007) consisting, for
10 each segment i , of two position vectors (the proximal P_i and distal D_i endpoints) and two
11 unitary direction vectors (\mathbf{u}_i and \mathbf{w}_i):

$$12 \quad \mathbf{Q}_i = [\mathbf{u}_i \quad \mathbf{r}_{P_i} \quad \mathbf{r}_{D_i} \quad \mathbf{w}_i]^T \quad (1)$$

13 with $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ for the foot, shank, thigh, and pelvis, respectively.

14

15 These parameters were designed to stand for non-orthogonal directions: inertial (for inverse
16 dynamics purpose), anatomical (i.e., from joint centre to joint centre) and functional (i.e.,
17 mean axis of rotation). Particularly, \mathbf{r}_{D2} and \mathbf{r}_{P2} are the ankle and knee joint centres while \mathbf{w}_2
18 and \mathbf{w}_3 are the ankle and knee flexion-extension axes. In addition, any position \mathbf{r} of a point
19 (marker or virtual) and any direction \mathbf{n} embedded in the segment i can be straightforwardly
20 deduced from \mathbf{Q}_i through a constant interpolation matrix \mathbf{N}_i (Garcia de Jalon et al., 1986;
21 Dumas and Cheze, 2007). As 12 parameters represent the 6 degrees of freedom of the
22 segment, rigid body constraints have to be considered in addition to the joint constraints.

23

24

25

1 *Objective function*

2

3 The objective function to minimize is the sum of the square distances between measured and
4 model-determined marker positions:

5
$$f = \sum_{i=1}^4 \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} (\mathbf{r}_{M_i^j} - \mathbf{N}_i^{M_i^j} \mathbf{Q}_i)^2 \quad (2)$$

6 with M_i^j the j^{th} marker (out of m_i) embedded in segment i , $\mathbf{r}_{M_i^j}$ its measured position and $\mathbf{N}_i^{M_i^j}$
7 the corresponding interpolation matrix.

8

9

10 *Joint constraints*

11

12 For the spherical model, the joint constraints at the ankle, knee and hip are:

13
$$\mathbf{r}_{D_{i+1}} - \mathbf{r}_{P_i} = 0 \quad (i = 1, 2) \text{ and } \mathbf{N}_4^{V_4} \mathbf{Q}_4 - \mathbf{r}_{P_3} = 0 \quad (3)$$

14 with V_4^1 a virtual point (i.e., hip joint centre) embedded in the pelvis segment and $\mathbf{N}_4^{V_4}$ the
15 corresponding interpolation matrix.

16

17 For the universal joint at the ankle, the joint constraints are:

18
$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{r}_{D_2} - \mathbf{r}_{P_1} = 0 \\ \mathbf{w}_2 \bullet \mathbf{N}_1^{n_1} \mathbf{Q}_1 - \cos \theta_A = 0 \end{cases}, \quad (4)$$

19 with θ_A the angle defining the relative orientation of the two functional joint axes, \mathbf{n}_1^1 an axis
20 (i.e., subtalar) embedded in the foot segment and $\mathbf{N}_1^{n_1}$ the corresponding interpolation matrix.

21

22 For the hinge model at the knee, the joint constraints are:

$$1 \quad \begin{cases} \mathbf{r}_{D_3} - \mathbf{r}_{P_2} = 0 \\ \mathbf{w}_3 \bullet (\mathbf{r}_{P_2} - \mathbf{r}_{D_2}) - L_2 \cos \theta_K^1 = 0, \\ \mathbf{w}_3 \bullet \mathbf{u}_2 - \cos \theta_K^2 = 0 \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

2 with θ_K^1 and θ_K^2 two angles defining the orientation of the joint axes and L_2 the shank
3 segment length.

4

5 For the parallel mechanism at the ankle (Di Gregorio et al., 2007), the joint constraints are:

$$6 \quad \begin{cases} (\mathbf{N}_1^{V_1^1} \mathbf{Q}_1 - \mathbf{N}_2^{V_2^1} \mathbf{Q}_2) \bullet \mathbf{N}_2^{n_1^1} \mathbf{Q}_2 - d_A^1 = 0 \\ (\mathbf{N}_1^{V_1^2} \mathbf{Q}_1 - \mathbf{N}_2^{V_2^2} \mathbf{Q}_2) \bullet \mathbf{N}_2^{n_2^2} \mathbf{Q}_2 - d_A^2 = 0 \\ (\mathbf{N}_2^{V_2^3} \mathbf{Q}_2 - \mathbf{N}_1^{V_1^3} \mathbf{Q}_1)^2 - (d_A^3)^2 = 0 \\ (\mathbf{N}_2^{V_2^4} \mathbf{Q}_2 - \mathbf{N}_1^{V_1^4} \mathbf{Q}_1)^2 - (d_A^4)^2 = 0 \\ (\mathbf{N}_2^{V_2^5} \mathbf{Q}_2 - \mathbf{N}_1^{V_1^5} \mathbf{Q}_1) \bullet \mathbf{N}_1^{n_1^2} \mathbf{Q}_1 - d_A^5 = 0 \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

7 These constraints represent the tibia/talus sphere-on-plane medial and lateral contacts (sphere
8 centres V_1^1 , V_1^2 and radii d_A^1 , d_A^2 , contact plane points V_2^1 , V_2^2 and normals \mathbf{n}_2^1 , \mathbf{n}_2^2), the
9 calcaneum-tibia, calcaneum-fibula ligaments (origins V_2^3 , V_2^4 insertions V_1^3 , V_1^4 and lengths
10 d_A^3 , d_A^4) and the fibula/talus sphere-on-plane contact (centre V_2^5 and radius d_A^5 , contact plane
11 point V_1^5 and normal \mathbf{n}_1^2).

12

13 For the parallel mechanism at the knee (Feikes et al., 2003), the joint constraints are:

$$14 \quad \begin{cases} (\mathbf{N}_3^{V_3^1} \mathbf{Q}_3 - \mathbf{N}_2^{V_2^6} \mathbf{Q}_2) \bullet \mathbf{N}_2^{n_2^3} \mathbf{Q}_2 - d_K^1 = 0 \\ (\mathbf{N}_3^{V_3^2} \mathbf{Q}_3 - \mathbf{N}_2^{V_2^7} \mathbf{Q}_2) \bullet \mathbf{N}_2^{n_2^4} \mathbf{Q}_2 - d_K^2 = 0 \\ (\mathbf{N}_3^{V_3^3} \mathbf{Q}_3 - \mathbf{N}_2^{V_2^8} \mathbf{Q}_2)^2 - (d_K^3)^2 = 0 \\ (\mathbf{N}_3^{V_3^4} \mathbf{Q}_3 - \mathbf{N}_2^{V_2^9} \mathbf{Q}_2)^2 - (d_K^4)^2 = 0 \\ (\mathbf{N}_3^{V_3^5} \mathbf{Q}_3 - \mathbf{N}_2^{V_2^{10}} \mathbf{Q}_2)^2 - (d_K^5)^2 = 0 \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

1 These constraints represent the femur/tibia sphere-on-plane medial and lateral contacts
2 (sphere centres V_3^1, V_3^2 and radii d_K^1, d_K^2 , contact plane points V_2^6, V_2^7 and normals $\mathbf{n}_2^3, \mathbf{n}_2^4$) and
3 the anterior cruciate, posterior cruciate and medial collateral ligaments (origins V_3^3, V_3^4, V_3^5
4 insertions V_2^8, V_2^9, V_2^{10} and lengths d_K^3, d_K^4, d_K^5).

5

6 *Model construction and initial guess*

7

8 The construction of the lower limb kinematic models corresponds to the determination of the
9 constants (i.e. interpolation matrices \mathbf{N} , angles θ , lengths L and distances d) from static
10 calibration, functional methods and literature data (Di Gregorio et al., 2007; Feikes et al.,
11 2003).

12 In the optimization process, the initial values of the parameters are obtained by constructing at
13 each frame the position vectors \mathbf{r}_{Pi} and \mathbf{r}_{Di} and direction vectors \mathbf{u}_i and \mathbf{w}_i from the skin-based
14 markers (Dumas and Cheze, 2007; see also Appendix A).

15

16

17 *Application*

18

19 Five healthy male subjects (age: 28.8 ± 4.8 years; height: 1.74 ± 0.09 m; mass: 76.5 ± 13.5 kg)
20 participated in this study. The trajectories of 32 skin-based markers on the right lower limb
21 were recorded at 100 Hz. The parameters \mathbf{Q}_i were obtained by minimization of the objective
22 function f under constraints (i.e., rigid body and different sets of kinematic constraints) with
23 the use of the « *fmincon* » Matlab function (Mathworks, USA). Then, the classical segment
24 coordinate systems were deduced from the \mathbf{Q}_i parameters (Dumas and Cheze, 2007) and the

1 joint angles and displacements were computed (Wu et al. 2002; see also Appendix C). RMS
2 differences were computed for each curve and averaged for the 5 subjects.

3

4 **Results**

5

6 *Constraint influence*

7 The hip kinematics was not much affected by ankle and knee constraint variations (Fig. 1,
8 Table 1): all models provided similar patterns and amplitudes for the hip flexion-extension
9 and abduction-adduction, and the dispersion of the internal-external rotations remained low.

10 The knee flexion-extension curves did not vary across models: a single pattern could be
11 observed and the dispersion was low. The patterns of the abduction-adduction, internal-
12 external rotation and displacement curves appeared to depend on the applied knee constraint
13 (Fig. 2), but not on the ankle constraint. However, ankle constraints caused a dispersion of the
14 internal-external rotations (Table 1).

15 The ankle flexion-extension curves showed a similar pattern for all models with a slight
16 dispersion (Fig. 3). The ankle abduction-adduction, internal-external rotation and
17 displacement curves varied whenever the ankle or knee constraint was modified (Tables 1 and
18 2), except for the PPS and PSS models which provided similar rotation patterns and, for some
19 subjects, similar displacement patterns.

20

21 *Comparison with in-vivo (intra-cortical pins) data from the literature*

22 The hip kinematics reproduced typical patterns (the authors were not aware of any hip *in-vivo*
23 data).

24 The knee flexion-extension biphasic pattern (Lafortune et al., 1992; Benoit et al., 2006;
25 Andersen et al., 2009a) was obtained for all models. Abduction-adduction of limited

1 amplitude and internal rotation occurring twice during the stance phase (at heel strike and toe-
2 off) was found when the model included a knee parallel mechanism. Furthermore, only the
3 knee parallel mechanism could reproduce the femoral rollback.

4 The ankle flexion-extension curves reproduced the typical 2-peak pattern (Reinschmidt et al.,
5 1996; 1997). All models roughly produced an initial abduction followed by a slight adduction
6 during stance and internal-external rotations of limited amplitude, as observed in *in-vivo*
7 studies (Reinschmidt et al., 1996; 1997). Besides, only the parallel mechanisms produced
8 joint displacements.

9

10

11 **Discussion and conclusions**

12

13 GO with joint constraints is one of the methods developed for minimizing STA. Its reliability
14 is under controversy (Stagni et al., 2009; Andersen et al., 2009a). Nevertheless, defining a
15 kinematic model is becoming usual in gait analysis (e.g., inverse-forward dynamics,
16 musculoskeletal models) and the constraint choice is essential.

17 In this study, a GO method was developed to implement different sets of joint constraints.
18 The segment definition, based on generalized coordinates (Dumas and Cheze, 2007), allowed
19 to readily implement complex constraints. Besides, the classical segment and joint coordinate
20 systems could easily be deduced.

21 Results showed that the lower limb kinematics, except hip kinematics, knee and ankle
22 flexion-extension, significantly depend on the chosen set of constraints. An appropriate
23 choice, such as the parallel mechanisms, seemed to provide physiologic patterns (i.e., limited
24 abduction-adduction at the knee and femoral rollback). Furthermore, these mechanisms offer
25 the possibility of matching model geometry with MRI data (e.g., by customizing the femur

1 condyles centre and radius) and of adapting the model to pathologies (e.g., by suppressing a
2 ligament constraint). Thus, these mechanisms might be able to provide efficient subject-
3 specific models for clinical applications.

4 A major limitation of this study is the lack of *in-vivo* data. The ability to reproduce inter-
5 subject variability, which is an important criterion in the constraint choice, could not be
6 assessed and subject-by-subject validation could not be performed. Thus, further studies
7 enabling subject-by-subject comparisons would offer interesting perspectives.

8

9

10 **References**

11

12 Andersen, M.S., Benoit, D.L., Damsgaard, M., Ramsey, D.K., Rasmussen, J., 2009a. Do
13 kinematic models reduce the effects of soft tissue artefacts in skin marker-based motion
14 analysis? An in vivo study of knee kinematics. J Biomech, In Press, (available online
15 doi:10.1016/j.jbiomech.2009.08.034).

16

17 Andersen, M. S., Damsgaard, M., Macwilliams, B., Rasmussen, J., 2009b. A computationally
18 efficient optimisation-based method for parameter identification of kinematically determinate
19 and over-determinate biomechanical systems. Comput Methods Biomech Biomed Engin, In
20 Press.

21

22 Andersen, M. S., Damsgaard, M., Rasmussen, J., 2009c. Kinematic analysis of over-
23 determinate biomechanical systems. Comput Methods Biomech Biomed Engin 12(4), 371-84.

24

1 Benoit, D.L., Ramsey, D.K., Lamontagne, M., Xu, L., Wretenberg, P., Renström P., 2006.
2 Effect of skin movement artifact on knee kinematics during gait and cutting motions
3 measured in vivo. *Gait & Posture* 24, 152–164.
4
5 Challis, J.H., 1995. A procedure for determining rigid body transformation parameters. *J*
6 *Biomech* 28(6), 733-7.
7
8 Charlton, I.W., Tate, P., Smyth, P., and Roren, L., 2004. Repeatability of an optimised lower
9 body model. *Gait & Posture* 20, 213–221.
10
11 Cheze, L., Fregly B.J., Dimnet, J., 1995. A solidification procedure to facilitate kinematic
12 analyses based on videa system data. *J Biomech* 28(7), 879-884.
13
14 Di Gregorio, R., Parenti-Castelli, V., O'Connor, J.J., and Leardini, A., 2007. Mathematical
15 models of passive motion at the human ankle joint by equivalent spatial parallel mechanisms.
16 *Med Bio Eng Comput* 45, 305-313.
17
18 Dumas, R., and Cheze, L., 2007. 3D inverse dynamics in non-orthonormal segment
19 coordinate system. *Med Bio Eng Comput* 45, 315-322.
20
21 Feikes, J.D., O'Connor, J.J., and Zavatsky, A.B., 2003. A constraint-based approach to
22 modelling the mobility of the human knee joint. *J Biomech* 36(1), 125-129.
23

1 Franci, R., Parenti-Castelli, V., Belvedere, C., Leardini, A. et al., 2009. A new one-DOF fully
2 parallel mechanism for modeling passive motion at the human tibiotalar joint. *J Biomech*
3 42(10), 1403-1408.
4
5 Garcia de Jalon, J., Unda, J., and Avello, A., 1986. Natural coordinates for the computer
6 analysis of multibody systems. *Computer methods in applied mechanics and engineering*, 56,
7 309-327.
8
9 Lafortune, M.A., Cavanagh, P.R., Sommer III, H.J., Kalenak, A., 1992. Three-dimensional
10 kinematics of the human knee during walking. *J Biomech* 25(4), 347-357.
11
12 Leardini, A., Chiari, L., Della Croce, U., and Cappozzo, A., 2005. Human movement analysis
13 using stereophotogrammetry. Part 3: Soft tissue artifact assessment and compensation. *Gait &*
14 *Posture* 21, 212-225.
15
16 Lu, T.-W., and O'Connor, J.J., 1999. Bone position estimation from skin marker co-ordinates
17 using global optimisation with joint constraints. *J Biomech* 32(2), 129-134.
18
19 Reinbolt, J.A., Schutte, J.F., Fregly, B.J., Koh, B.I., Haftkab, R.T., George, A.D. and
20 Mitchell, K.H., 2005. Determination of patient-specific multi-joint kinematic models through
21 two-level optimization. *J Biomech* 38(3), 621–626.
22
23 Reinschmidt, C., 1996. Three-dimensional tibioalcalneal and tibiofemoral kinematics during
24 human locomotion – measured with external and bone markers. PhD report, University of
25 Calgary, Alberta, Canada.

1
2 Reinschmidt, C., van den Bogert, A. J., Murphy, N., Lundberg, A., Nigg B.M., 1997.
3 Tibiocalcaneal motion during running, measured with external and bone markers. *Clinical*
4 *Biomech* 12(1), 8-16.
5
6 Sholukha, V., Leardini, A., Salvia, P., Rooze, M., Van Sint Jan, S., 2006. Double-step
7 registration of in vivo stereophotogrammetry with both in vitro 6-DOFs electrogoniometry
8 and CT medical imaging. *J Biomech* 39(11), 2087–2095.
9
10 Söderkvist, I., and Wedin, P.A., 1993. Determining the movements of the skeleton using well-
11 configured markers. *J Biomech* 26(12), 1473-1477.
12 Stagni, R., Fantozzi, S., Cappello, A., 2009. Double calibration vs. Global optimisation:
13 Performance and effectiveness for clinical application. *Gait & Posture* 29, 119-122.
14
15 Wu, G., van der Helm, F.C.T., Veeger, H.E.J., Makhsous, M., Van Roy, P., Anglin, C.,
16 Nagels, J., Karduna, A.R., McQuade, K., Wang, X., Werner, F.W., Buccholz, B., 2002. ISB
17 recommendation on definitions of joint coordinate system of various joints for the reporting
18 of human joint motion—part I: ankle, hip, and spine. *J Biomech* 38(5), 981–992.
19
20
21
22