



HAL
open science

COMPARISON OF TENDON TENSIONS ESTIMATED FROM TWO BIOMECHANICAL MODELS OF THE THUMB

Laurent Vigouroux, Mathieu Domalain, Eric Berton

► **To cite this version:**

Laurent Vigouroux, Mathieu Domalain, Eric Berton. COMPARISON OF TENDON TENSIONS ESTIMATED FROM TWO BIOMECHANICAL MODELS OF THE THUMB. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 2009. hal-03390080

HAL Id: hal-03390080

<https://hal.science/hal-03390080>

Submitted on 21 Oct 2021

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 *Journal of biomechanics*: Short Communication

2 1651 words (from the Introduction through the end of discussion)

3

4 **COMPARISON OF TENDON TENSIONS ESTIMATED FROM TWO**
5 **BIOMECHANICAL MODELS OF THE THUMB**

6

7 Laurent VIGOUROUX¹; Mathieu DOMALAIN¹; Eric BERTON¹

8

9 ¹Movement Sciences Institute, Etienne Jules Marey, UMR 6233, Mediterranean University,
10 Marseille, France.

11

12

13

14

15 Corresponding author:

16 Laurent VIGOUROUX

17 Address: U.M.R. 6233 Institut des Sciences du Mouvement,
18 Faculté des Sciences du Sport,
19 Case postale 910,
20 163, avenue de Luminy
21 F-13288 Marseille Cedex 09 France

22 Phone: +33 (0)4 91 17 04 22

23 Fax: +33 (0)4 91 17 22 52

24 Email: laurent.vigouroux@univmed.fr

25

26 **Keywords:** Biomechanical model, thumb, muscle tendon tension; pulp and key pinch, hand

27

28

29 **Abstract (208 words):**

30 Despite the paramount function of the thumb in daily life, thumb biomechanical models have
31 been little developed and studied. Moreover, only two studies provided quantitative
32 anthropometric data of tendon moment arms. To investigate thumb tendon tensions,
33 biomechanicians and clinicians have to know the performances and the limits of these two
34 data sets. The aim of this study was thus to compare the results of these two models and
35 evaluate their performances in regard to prior electromyographic measurements (EMG).
36 Thumb posture was recorded during the classical key pinch and pulp pinch grips. Various
37 fingertip forces applied at the distal segment were simulated in a range including extension,
38 adduction, flexion, abduction. Input data of thumb postures and fingertip forces were used to
39 compute tendon tensions with both models. Tendon tensions obtained using these two models
40 were then compared and correlated to EMG measurements provided in the literature.
41 The results showed that both model predicted relevant muscle coordination for five of the
42 nine muscles modelled. Opponent and abductor longus muscle coordinations were badly
43 estimated by both models. Each model was sensible to kinematic errors but not in same
44 proportion. This study pointed out the advantages/limits of the two models in order to use
45 them more appropriately for clinical and/or research purposes.

46

47 **1. Introduction**

48 To improve hand pathology treatments and surgical techniques, surgeons and
49 clinicians need biomechanical models to know the tensions exerted in the muscle tendons (An
50 *et al.*, 1983; Harding *et al.*, 1993). Despite the primary importance of thumb functions in
51 daily life, thumb modelling has been less studied and used in the literature (Valero-Cuevas *et*
52 *al.*, 2003) than the other fingers (Sancho-Bru *et al.*, 2001; Vigouroux *et al.*, 2008). This
53 deficiency is particularly due to the difficult kinematic analysis of the trapezio-metacarpal
54 joint (TMC) where the proximal segment (*trapezium* bone) is hidden by muscles/soft tissues
55 and is hardly identifiable (Hollister *et al.*, 1992).

56 Additionally, only Smutz *et al.* (1998) and Chao *et al.* (1989) provided usable anthropometric
57 data of tendon moment arms for thumb modelling. Because of the different measurement
58 techniques (tendon excursion vs geometric method) and the use of different specimens,
59 discordances between the two sets of anthropometric data are expected. Moreover,
60 mechanical equilibrium resolution also differs as the moment arms were provided in different
61 reference systems (corresponding to different kinematic analysis methods).

62 The performances of the two models (Smutz' model, SM vs Chao' model, CM) have never
63 been evaluated or compared in the literature. That leads to improper use of these models
64 without ensure reliable results. The aim of this study was thus to establish recommendations
65 for users of thumb models by comparing the results of the two existing models starting from
66 identical input data.

67 **2. Material and Methods**

68 The thumb was modelled as 4 rigid linked-segments (Buchholz, 1992): the proximal
69 and distal phalanges, the metacarpal bone and the *trapezium* bone. The segments were
70 articulated around three frictionless joints (Fig. 1). The Inter-Phalangeal (IP) joint was

71 modelled as a hinge joint with one degree of freedom (flexion/extension). The metacarpo-
72 phalangeal joint (MP) and the TMC were considered as universal joints with two DoFs in
73 flexion/extension (MPf and TMCf) and in adduction/abduction (MPa and TMCa). The
74 muscles and tendons included in our biomechanical model to actuate the five degrees of
75 freedom are summarized in Table 1.

76 2.1. Posture data

77 To obtain common input data of thumb postures, six participants (mean age: 28.5 ± 4.6
78 yr, height: 180 ± 4.2 cm, mass: 77.6 ± 5.2 kg, hand length: 19.7 ± 0.6 cm) were asked to adopt an
79 index-thumb “pulp pinch” while gripping a 5.5 cm width cylinder and a “key pinch” while
80 gripping a key (Valero-Cuevas *et al.*, 2003). The 3D positioning of the thumb segments was
81 recorded by six cameras (Vicon 624 Motion System, Oxford Metrics, England). Three
82 spherical micro-reflective markers (4 mm diameter) were fixed on the dorsal side of each
83 segment. Three markers, placed on the metacarpal bones were used to define the dorsal hand
84 plane reference system (\mathcal{R}_{dhp}). Starting from the 3D positioning of the segments, joint angles
85 were computed for each model.

86 For both models, IP and MP joint angles were defined as rotation between distal and proximal
87 segments using reference systems placed on the metacarpal bone (\mathcal{R}_{mc}), the proximal phalanx
88 (\mathcal{R}_{pp}) and the distal phalanx (\mathcal{R}_{dp}) (Fig. 1). For SM, TMC angles were defined as the angle
89 between the thumb metacarpal (\mathcal{R}_{mc}) and \mathcal{R}_{dhp} . TMCa corresponded to rotation around the
90 \mathcal{R}_{dhp} z axis while TMCf was a motion around the \mathcal{R}_{dhp} y axis. With SM, adduction and flexion
91 have positive values. For SM, the key pinch was considered as the 0° position for TMCa and
92 TMCf (Smutz *et al.*, 1998). For CM, the TMC joint angles were defined as the rotation
93 between thumb metacarpal (\mathcal{R}_{mc}) and the *trapezium* bone reference system (\mathcal{R}_t). The
94 positioning of \mathcal{R}_t was determined from Chao *et al.* (1989) who reported that \mathcal{R}_t is rotated by

95 46° of flexion, 35° of abduction and 82° of supination with respect to \mathcal{R}_{dhp} . Angles were
96 extracted from the rotation matrix using the Z, Y, X, Euler's sequence (i.e flexion, abduction,
97 supination) with fixed axes situated on the proximal segment (Cooney et al., 1981; Chao et
98 al., 1989). With CM, abduction and flexion have positive values.

99 2.2. Simulated fingertip force

100 Fingertip force was simulated as 1N intensity. Eight directions of fingertip force,
101 varying in 45° step (dorsal, dorsal-lateral, lateral, lateral-palmar, palmar, palmar-medial,
102 medial, medial-dorsal), were studied (Fig. 1). These forces were applied at half the length of
103 the distal phalanx. The simulated fingertip forces and the posture data were used as input data
104 for the external joint moments calculation and the tendon moment arms determination. For
105 TMC, external force moments were computed in \mathcal{R}_{dhp} for SM and in \mathcal{R}_c for CM. Tendon
106 tensions of the nine muscles were estimated for each of the eight simulated fingertip forces
107 and for the two postures. Details of the computing method are presented in *Supplementary*
108 *Material*. Mean results of the six subjects were considered.

109 2.3 Model comparison

110 For each muscle, results provided by SM and CM were compared by computing the
111 mean absolute difference between the two models across the conditions (posture and force
112 direction). To evaluate the agreement of model results with electromyography (EMG), we
113 used the experimental results of Valero-Cuevas *et al.* (2003). These authors measured the
114 EMG activity of the nine thumb muscles during dorsal, lateral, palmar and medial forces in
115 key and pulp pinches. We used these results to define the activity of each muscle at four
116 different levels (null, little, median, high). These EMG classifications are presented together
117 with the results of this current study. A non-parametric correlation of Spearman was
118 performed for each muscle to identify a correlation between each model and EMG data. A
119 $p < 0.05$ was considered as a significant correlation. To evaluate the sensibility of each model

120 to kinematics errors, the tendon tensions were also computed with a $+5^\circ$ and -5° error
121 localisation of \mathcal{R}_{dhp} axes. Mean differences between original results and results including error
122 were computed for each model and each muscle.

123 **3. Results and Discussion**

124 The results (Figure 2 and 3) showed that outputs of the two models presented some
125 similarities (FPL, FPB, APB, ADPT and EPB). Moreover, the correlation with EMG results
126 confirmed the muscle coordination estimated by both models in FPL, FPB, APB, EPL and
127 EPB (Table 2). The EMG results of Kaufman *et al.*, (1999) (not presented in the current
128 study) also validated the muscle implication for FPL, FPB, APB and EPL, in key pinch for
129 both models. One of the most important identified limits of both models is that neither was
130 able to predict reliable tendon tension in OPP and APL muscles. Concerning adductor
131 muscles, since ADPO and ADPT were not distinguished in EMG measurements, we
132 correlated the EMG measurements with the sum of the two parts. The significant correlation
133 showed that SM was more appropriate to predict adductor coordination than CM. For EPL
134 muscle, both models were correlated to EMG. However, SM predicted higher forces than CM
135 which results in excessive tendon tensions.

136 The disagreement in tendon tensions estimates between CM and SM are due in part to the
137 anthropometric measurements which may have varied between the two studies. For
138 illustration, Fig. 4 presents the moment arms at TMC joint during key pinch with both SM
139 and CM models expressed in Smutz *et al.* (1998) reference system.

140 Also, each anthropometric set have to be employed with a high attention to the kinematics
141 method recommended by the authors (i.e. TMC angles and moments were identified in \mathcal{R}_t for
142 CM and in \mathcal{R}_{dhp} for SM). The one used in SM (\mathcal{R}_{dhp}) does not represent accurately the
143 functional anatomy of TMC joint as the metacarpal bone is articulated with the *trapezium*

144 bone. On the other hand, the localisation of \mathcal{R}_t using external markers with CM model,
145 includes additional errors as this location is based on non-personalized anthropometric data.
146 This point is highly susceptible to change tendon tensions as the third rotation axis
147 (supination) of TMC joint is not considered as free and thus is not equilibrated by muscle
148 action. Since the supination axes are differently oriented (\mathcal{R}_t vs \mathcal{R}_{dhp} x axis), the “non-
149 equilibrate” part of external force moment is different according to the two models. This
150 implicates a different report of the moments on the other rotation axes. Moreover, the
151 sensibility analysis showed that SM is more subject to kinematics error measurement than
152 CM particularly for ADPO, APL, EPL and EPB. CM may be thus more recommended for
153 studies where difficult kinematics measurement is required (e.g. free hand movement).
154 Another kinematics description was proposed by Giurintano *et al.*, (1995) as the “virtual five
155 linked segments” and may fix these problems. However, no anthropometric measurement of
156 tendon locations was provided in the literature with this reference system and thus tendon
157 tension computing is not possible.

158 As a limitation of Smutz model, it should be noted that the anthropometric data of Smutz *et*
159 *al.* (1998) were not normalized by the subject hand size contrary to Chao *et al.* (1989). This
160 point could be important since moment arm length of FPL at TMC (as an example) varied
161 from 0.65 cm to 0.79 cm (near 18%) with CM for a hand length varying from 18cm to 22cm.
162 Additionally, Smutz *et al.* (1998) published the values of the moment arms for given angular
163 values of Flexion/Extension and Abduction/Adduction, the other degrees of freedom being in
164 a neutral position. These moment arms thus could be slightly different for a combination of
165 Flexion/Extension and Abduction/Adduction.

166 A limit of the present study concerned the method of comparison with EMG data as the EMG
167 measurements were taken from a reference study and were not performed during the current
168 experiment whereas the tested postures, forces and subjects were similar. Also, the uses of

169 external kinematics markers always add imprecision even if high attention has been paid in
170 their placement. In spite of these limits, this study brought new information about the
171 performance of both models in regards to EMG data and kinematic error sensibility. To
172 conclude, this study points out the necessity of new anthropometric measurements of thumb
173 tendon location strongly related to a relevant and *in vivo* reproducible kinematic description
174 (Fowler *et al.*, 2001; Cheze *et al.*, 2001).

175

176 **References**

- 177 An, K.N. Ueba, Y. Chao, E.Y. Cooney, W.P. Linscheid, R.L., 1983. Tendon excursion and
178 moment arm of index finger muscles. *Journal of Biomechanics* 16, 419-425.
- 179 Buchholz, B., 1992. Anthropometric data for describing the kinematics of the human hand.
180 *Ergonomics* 35, 261-273.
- 181 Chao, E.Y. An, K.N. Cooney, W.P. Linscheid, R.L., 1989. Biomechanics of the hand. In:
182 World scientific, Singapore, Chap. 1 and 4.
- 183 Cheze, L. Doriot, N. Eckert, M. Rumelhart, C. Comtet, J.J., 2001. In vivo cinematic study of
184 the trapezometacarpal joint. *Chirurgie de la main* 20, 23-30.
- 185 Cooney, W. Lucca, M. Chao, E. Linscheid, R. 1981. The kinesiology of the thumb
186 trapeziometacarpal joint. *Journal of bone and joint Surgery, American volume* 63,
187 1371-1381.
- 188 Fowler, N.K. Nicol, A.C. Condon, B. Hadley, D. 2001. Method of determination of three-
189 dimensional index finger moment arms and tendon lines of action using high
190 resolution MRI scans. *Journal of Biomechanics* 34, 791-797
- 191 Giurintano, D.J. Hollister, A.M. Buford, W.L. Thompson, D.E. Myers, L.M., 1995. A virtual
192 five-link model of the thumb. *Medical Engineering and Physics* 17, 297-303.
- 193 Harding, D.C. Brandt, K.D. Hillberry, B.M., 1993. Finger joint force minimization in pianists
194 using optimisation techniques. *Journal of Biomechanics* 26, 1403-1412.
- 195 Hollister, A. Buford, W.L. Myers, L.M. Giurintano, D.J. Novick, A., 1992. The axes of
196 rotation of the thumb carpometacarpal joint. *Journal of Orthopaedic Research* 10,
197 454-460.
- 198 Kaufman, K.R. An, K.N. Litchy, W.J. Cooney, W.P. Chao, Y.S., 1999. In-vivo function of
199 the thumb muscles. *Clinical Biomechanics* 14, 141-151.

200 Sancho-Bru, J.L. Perez-Gonzalez, A. Vergara-Monedero, M. Giurintano, D.J., 2001. A 3-D
201 dynamic model of human finger for studying free movements. *Journal of*
202 *Biomechanics* 34, 1491-500.

203 Smutz, W. Kongsayreepong, A. Hughes, R. Niebur, G. Cooney, W. An, K.N., 1998.
204 Mechanical advantage of the thumb muscles. *Journal of Biomechanics* 31, 565-570.

205 Valero-Cuevas, F. Johanson, M.E. Towles, J.D., 2003. Towards a realistic biomechanical
206 model of the thumb : The choice of kinematic description may be more critical than
207 the solution method or the variability/uncertainty of musculoskeletal parameters.
208 *Journal of Biomechanics* 36, 1019-1030.

209 Vigouroux, L. Quaine, F. Colloud, F. Paclet, F. Moutet, F., 2008. Middle and ring fingers are
210 more exposed to pulley rupture than index and little during sport-climbing : a
211 biomechanical explanation. *Clinical Biomechanics* 23, 562-570.

212

213

214 Table 1: Finger muscle tendons acting on the thumb joints. FPL: *flexor pollicis longus*; TET:
215 terminal extensor tendon; FPB: *flexor pollicis brevis*, APB: *abductor pollicis brevis*, ADPO:
216 *adductor pollicis* oblique head; ADPT: *adductor pollicis* tranverse head; EPL: *extensor*
217 *pollicis longus*; OPP: *opponents pollicis*; APL: *abductor pollicis longus*; EPB: *extensor*
218 *pollicis brevis*.

219

Joints	IP	MP	TMC
	FPL	FPL	FPL
	TET	FPB	FPB
		APB	OPP
Muscles		ADPO	APB
and		ADPT	ADPO
Tendons		EPL	ADPT
		EPB	APL
			EPL
			EPB

220

221

222 Table 2: Mean differences between CM and SM model, statistical results of correlation
 223 between both model results and EMG data and mean error implicated by a +/- 5° error of
 224 dorsal hand plane axes localisations. * indicates a significant correlation (p<0.05).

225

Muscle	Mean difference (N)	SM EMG correlation	CM EMG correlation	SM mean 5° error (N)	CM mean 5° error (N)
FPL	0.54 ± 0.50	r=0.89 t=4.75 *	r=0.75 t=2.82 *	0.61±1.06	0.29±0.54
FPB	1.28± 1.12	r=0.87 t=4.24 *	r=0.91 t=5.48 *	0.47±0.98	0.63±0.81
OPP	3.15 ± 2.41	r=-0.07 t=-0.18	r=0.44 t=1.20	1.05±2.37	0.70±0.99
APB	0.70 ± 0.50	r=0.86 t=4.06 *	r=0.85 t=3.97 *	0.74±1.42	0.32±0.67
ADPt	0.73 ± 0.72	r=0.74 t=2.67 *	r=0.51 t=1.45	0.73±1.34	0.47±0.74
ADPo	1.73 ± 1.95			1.53±2.69	0.82±1.39
APL	6.18 ± 4.11	r=0.33 t=0.85	r=-0.11 t=-0.27	3.35±4.15	0.89±1.37
EPL	2.50 ± 1.82	r=0.87 t=4.38 *	r=0.88 t=4.39 *	2.02±2.42	0.69±1.16
EPB	1.08± 1.20	r=0.87 t=4.24 *	r=0.87 t=4.35 *	0.87±1.79	0.49±1.00

226

227

228

229 **Figure Captions**

230 Figure 1: Coordinate systems used to define joint angles, and joint moments. \mathcal{R}_{dhp} was used
231 for Smutz' model and \mathcal{R}_t was used for Chao's model to describe the TMC joint motion. \mathcal{R}_{dhp} x
232 axis was defined to be along the second and third metacarpals. \mathcal{R}_t was defined according to
233 the locations proposed by Chao *et al.* (1989). \mathcal{R}_{mc} was used in both models to define MP joint
234 motion and \mathcal{R}_{pp} was used to define IP motion. Black arrows indicate the direction of simulated
235 forces applied to the middle of the distal phalanx. Palmar force (P) was applied perpendicular
236 to the pulp of the thumb. Dorsal force (D) was applied perpendicular to the nail of the thumb.
237 Medial (M) and Lateral (L) forces were applied perpendicular to the radial and ulnar sides of
238 the thumb respectively. For clarity, dorsal-lateral, lateral-palmar, palmar-medial and medial-
239 dorsal force were not drawn.

240 Figure 2: Thumb tendon tensions (N) provided by Smutz' model (black figures) and Chao's
241 model (grey figures) during application of various directional fingertip forces (dorsal (D),
242 dorsal-lateral (D-L), lateral (L), lateral-palmar (L-P), palmar (P), palmar-medial (P-M),
243 medial (M), medial-dorsal (M-D)) with a key pinch. EMG results taken from Valero-Cuevas
244 *et al.* (2003) are also presented in this figure and classified according to four levels (*null*: no
245 radial line, *little*: one radial line is indicated in the corresponding force direction, *median*: a
246 double radial line is drawn, *high*: a triple radial line is drawn).

247 Figure 3: Thumb tendon tensions (N) provided by Smutz' model (black figures) and Chao's
248 model (grey figures) during application of various directional fingertip forces (dorsal (D),
249 dorsal-lateral (D-L), lateral (L), lateral-palmar (L-P), palmar (P), palmar-medial (P-M),
250 medial (M), medial-dorsal (M-D)) with a pulp pinch. As in figure 2, EMG data taken from
251 Valero-Cuevas *et al.* (2003) are presented in this figure and classified according to four levels
252 (*null*: no radial line, *little*: one radial line is indicated in the corresponding force direction,
253 *median*: a double radial line is drawn, *high*: a triple radial line is drawn).

254 Figure 4: Moment arms lengths (cm) at TMC joint observed with Smutz' model (black solid
255 symbols) and Chao' model (hollow symbols) during key pinch. Moments arms of SM and CM
256 were both expressed in dorsal hand plane reference system with Smutz' movement definition
257 (flexion and adduction had positive values).

258

259 Figure 1


260

261


262

263

264



Key pinch




267 Figure 3

268

269

Pulp pinch



270 Figure 4:

271

272

273

