

1 **The effect of functional calibration methods on gait kinematics in**
2 **adolescents with idiopathic rotational deformity of the femur**

3 Ramon J. Boeckesteijn^{1,2}, Myrthe P.F. van de Ven¹, Lise M. Wilders³, Pepijn Bisseling⁴,
4 Brenda E. Groen^{1,2}, Katrijn Smulders¹

5
6 ¹ Department of Research, Sint Maartenskliniek, Nijmegen, The Netherlands.

7 ² Department of Rehabilitation, Donders Institute for Brain, Cognition and Behavior, Radboud
8 University Medical Center, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

9 ³ Department of Rehabilitation, Sint Maartenskliniek, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

10 ⁴ Department of Orthopedic Surgery, Sint Maartenskliniek, Nijmegen, The Netherlands.

11
12 Correspondence to: Ramon J. Boeckesteijn (r.boeckesteijn@maartenskliniek.nl), department of Research
13 & Innovation, Sint Maartenskliniek, P.O. box 9011, 6500 GM, Nijmegen, the Netherlands.

14
15
16 Word count abstract: 257 words
17 Word count main text: 3995 words

18 **Abstract**

19 *Background:* Due to anatomical deviations, assumptions of the conventional calibration method for
20 gait analysis may be violated in individuals with rotational deformities of the femur. We compared
21 functional calibration methods with conventional methods in this group for 1) localization of the hip
22 joint center (HJC) and knee axis orientation, and 2) gait kinematics.

23 *Methods:* Twenty-four adolescents with idiopathic rotational deformity of the femur underwent
24 gait analysis and a CT scan. During standing, distance between HJCs and knee axis orientation were
25 compared between calibration methods, with CT serving as reference for HJC estimation. Gait
26 kinematics were compared using statistical parameter mapping (SPM).

27 *Findings:* Functional calibration methods estimated the HJC closer to the CT reference
28 (26 ± 21 mm more lateral) than the conventional method (38 ± 21 mm more medial). In the full sample,
29 orientation of the knee joint axis was not different between calibration methods, but in adolescents
30 with increased femoral anteversion, the knee was more internally rotated with the functional method
31 ($3.3\pm 6.2^\circ$). During gait, SPM revealed significantly more hip flexion, more internal hip rotation during
32 the stance phase, less knee varus-valgus motion, and larger knee flexion angles when applying the
33 functional calibration method.

34 *Interpretation:* Functional calibration methods better approximated the HJC, and showed a
35 knee axis orientation that was more towards the direction of the deformity. This resulted in less knee
36 joint angle crosstalk during gait. Although differences between calibration methods on gait kinematics
37 were within clinically acceptable limits for the sagittal plane, relatively larger differences on
38 transversal hip kinematics may hold clinical importance.

39

40 **Keywords:** 3D gait analysis, femoral neck anteversion, rotational deformity

41 **1. Introduction**

42 Idiopathic rotational deformity of the femur in adolescents may cause internally or externally
43 rotated gait, which can lead to pain complaints in the hip, knee, or ankle (1). Consequently, these
44 adolescents can be limited in participating in daily-life activities (2), which can be a reason to visit a
45 pediatric orthopedic surgeon. Although these complaints sometimes disappear spontaneously with
46 growth over time, surgical management by a derotational osteotomy may be considered when pain
47 complaints persist and conservative treatment fails.

48 To support clinical decision making regarding surgical procedures in adolescents with a
49 rotational deformity of the femur, a combination of static and dynamic evaluations is optimal (3). The
50 magnitude of a rotational deformity can be defined by femoral anteversion or retroversion, as
51 measured on a computed tomography (CT) scan, or by physical examination. Interestingly, these
52 evaluations pertain to static, unloaded situations – which poorly correlate with gait parameters (3) –
53 while pain complaints often occur during dynamic activities. 3D gait analysis can likely provide
54 relevant insights into aberrant lower extremity biomechanics and identify relevant compensations
55 during walking, but these analyses have been limited to research settings (2-9).

56 A major limitation of 3D gait analysis in adolescents with rotational deformity of the femur is
57 limited accuracy and reproducibility of kinematics in the transversal plane (10). The conventional
58 method to compute 3D kinematics (i.e. Plug-in-Gait) relies on a number of anatomical assumptions
59 and equations (11) which may, by definition, be violated in adolescents with rotational deformity of
60 the femur. To determine the position of the hip joint centers (HJC), the conventional method uses
61 equations with fixed relationships between marker positions on the pelvis, anthropometric
62 measurements (i.e. leg length), and the hip joint center (HJC), which are derived from medical
63 imaging studies in healthy adults (11). However, it is questionable whether these equations are also
64 valid for adolescents (12), in particular for those with deviating anatomy. For the knee joint, rotational
65 deformity of the femur may complicate defining the correct mediolateral knee axis. Errors made in the
66 estimation of the HJC and orientation of the knee axis during calibration can propagate as offsets in
67 hip rotation kinematics, and result in crosstalk of knee flexion towards knee varus-valgus motion

68 during gait (12). Hence, alternative methods may be needed to improve 3D gait analysis in this
69 population.

70 As an alternative for the conventional calibration method, functional calibration methods have
71 been developed to be less dependent on marker placement and anthropometric measurements. With
72 functional methods, the relative motion between two segments is the basis for a mathematically
73 derived optimal location of the HJC and knee joint axis. For example, the symmetrical center of
74 rotation estimation (SCoRe) (13) and symmetrical axes of rotation approach (SARA) (14) can be used
75 to estimate the HJC and knee joint axis respectively. These methods assume the hip to be a ball-and
76 socket joint with a fixed point of rotation, whereas the knee is modeled as a one degree of freedom
77 hinge joint. In addition to a standing calibration, functional calibration trials are required to estimate
78 the HJC and knee joint axis. These trials necessitate sufficient range of motion (RoM) of the knee and
79 hip (15, 16), which has raised some concerns with respect to application of functional methods in
80 clinical populations with restricted RoM, such as cerebral palsy (16). For adolescents with idiopathic
81 rotational deformity of the femur, who do not have such limitations in active RoM, these functional
82 calibration methods can potentially be an easily available option to improve gait analysis, but their
83 performance compared to the conventional method still has to be evaluated.

84 In this study, we investigated the differences between conventional and functional calibration
85 methods (i.e. SCoRe and SARA) in 1) localization of the HJC and orientation of the knee axis, and 2)
86 gait kinematics in adolescents with rotational deformity of the femur. It was hypothesized that
87 functional calibration methods would lead to a more accurate HJC estimation and a better definition of
88 the knee joint axis, resulting in less crosstalk compared to conventional calibration methods.

89

90 **2. Methods**

91 *2.1 Participants*

92 Twenty-four adolescents (4 male, 20 female) with pain complaints due to a suspected idiopathic
93 rotational deformity of the femur were included in this study. This sample was derived from a larger

94 study evaluating 1) the value of gait analysis compared to CT and physical examination in adolescents
95 with rotational deformity of the femur and/or tibia, and 2) the effects of a derotational osteotomy on
96 pain and physical function. Patients were recruited from the outpatient pediatric orthopedic clinic of
97 the Sint Maartenskliniek. Inclusion criteria were: 1) aged between 12-21 years old, 2) uni- or bilateral
98 clinically deviating rotation of the hip in extension as measured with a goniometer (endorotation: male
99 $<25^\circ$ or $>65^\circ$, female $<15^\circ$ or $>60^\circ$; exorotation: $<25^\circ$ or $>65^\circ$), 3) self-reported pain complaints in the
100 leg related with rotational deviation. Patients were excluded from this study in case of presence of
101 neuromuscular deficits impairing gait (incl. cerebral palsy), congenital malformation of the foot,
102 mediolateral knee instability (i.e. $>15^\circ$ varus or valgus RoM), deformity of the leg in the frontal plane
103 as primary clinical problem, any other impairment causing gait or balance problems. The study was
104 exempt from medical ethical review by the CMO Arnhem/Nijmegen (2019-5884), as it was not
105 subject to the Medical Research Involving Human Subjects Act (WMO). All study procedures were
106 conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki, and written informed consent was obtained
107 from all participants, and their parents or guardians when required, prior to testing.

108

109 2.2 Gait analysis

110 Three-dimensional gait analysis was performed in the overground gait lab of the Sint Maartenskliniek
111 Nijmegen. Kinematic data were collected using a ten camera motion capture system (*Vicon, Oxford,*
112 *UK*) at a sample frequency of 100 Hz. Kinetic data was collected using two force plates (*Kistler*
113 *Instruments, Hampshire, UK*; sample frequency = 1000 Hz) that were embedded in a 12m walkway.
114 Passive reflective markers were attached to participants by an experienced lab technician. Marker
115 placement on the anatomical landmarks was in accordance with the Vicon Lower Body marker set
116 (11). For the standing calibration, additional markers were placed on the medial epicondyles and
117 medial malleoli, in order to outline the anatomical knee and ankle axes. Thigh and tibia markers were
118 subsequently moved anteriorly or posteriorly – if necessary – to align the Vicon knee and ankle axes
119 with the anatomical transepicondylar and transmalleolar axes. For the functional calibration, additional
120 markers were placed on the distal 1/3 of the femur and the proximal 1/3 of the tibia. Functional

121 calibration trials consisted of hip RoM trials (i.e. active hip flexion, ab/adduction, extension, and
122 circumduction (3 repetitions each)), and knee RoM trials (i.e. active knee lifts (5 repetitions)). Gait
123 trials were collected after all calibration procedures. Participants were instructed to walk at a self-
124 selected, comfortable speed. Five correct trials in which the subject hit each force plate with one foot
125 were collected.

126

127 *2.3 CT scan*

128 Low-dose CT scans were made in a supine position according to the standard protocols of our
129 hospital. Transversal slices (thickness = 3 mm) were made of the hip (caput femoris, collum, and
130 trochanter), knee (femoral condyles and tibia plateau) and ankle (level of crural joint).

131

132 *2.4 Data analysis*

133 *2.4.1 Standing calibration and active range of motion trials*

134 Three-dimensional marker data were processed in Vicon Nexus 2.9.2. Calibration trials were
135 separately processed using 1) the conventional method, and 2) using functional methods as
136 implemented in Vicon Nexus, including SCoRe and SARA along with optimal common shaping
137 technique (17) (see Fig. 1 for a schematic representation). Subsequently, the distance between HJCs,
138 and the knee axis orientation relative to the pelvis coordinative system were derived from the standing
139 calibration trials. In order to verify that our participants achieved sufficient RoM during the functional
140 calibration trials, RoM of the knee and hip were derived from the functional calibration trials.

141

142 *2.4.2 Gait*

143 Marker data of the gait trials were interpolated, and data were filtered using a Woltring filter (MSE =
144 20). Gait events were detected by force plates and the position of the heel and toe markers, and were
145 manually verified. Each gait trial was subsequently processed twice: using 1) input from the

146 conventional calibration method, and 2) input from the functional calibration method (Fig. 1). Knee
147 and hip kinematics were calculated, which were subsequently normalized to the duration of a stride.
148 Only data of the most affected leg (i.e. the one with the most severe pain and/or radiological
149 deformity) was included in the analysis. From the kinematics, the following discrete parameters were
150 derived: 1) mean hip rotation during the stance phase, 2) knee varus-valgus RoM, and 3) maximum
151 knee flexion. Data analysis was performed using custom written Matlab scripts.

152

153 *2.4.3 CT scan*

154 Rotation of the femur (e.g. anteversion or retroversion) was defined as the angle between the line from
155 the center of rotation of the caput femoris through the middle of the collum femoris, and a line along
156 the posterior condyles of the distal femur, which was measured by a radiologist (AS) and an
157 orthopedic surgeon (PB). If differences between raters were higher than 3°, inter-observer consensus
158 was sought. For differences lower than 3°, the mean of both raters was taken. Subsequently, the
159 distance between the center of rotation of the left and right caput femoris was calculated (RB, PB). If
160 differences between raters were higher than 3 mm, inter-observer agreement was sought. For
161 differences lower than 3 mm, the mean of both raters was taken.

162

163 *2.4.4 Statistical analysis*

164 To estimate validity of the HJC localization, the distance between HJCs based on the CT scan
165 (reference), those derived from the conventional calibration method, and functional calibration method
166 were compared. A repeated ANOVA with post-hoc paired t-tests was used to compare these
167 modalities. Differences in knee axis orientation during standing were compared between conventional
168 and functional calibration methods using a paired t-test ($\alpha = 0.05$).

169 Knee and hip kinematics were compared between conventional and functional calibration
170 methods using one-dimensional statistical parameter mapping (SPM) (18) implemented in the SPM1D

171 Matlab package. After testing for normality, a dependent sample t-test was conducted (SPM(t), $\alpha =$
172 0.05). In addition, mean differences over the gait cycle with 95% and 99% CIs were plotted to obtain
173 better insights in the effect sizes. Discrete parameters (i.e. mean hip rotation during the stance phase,
174 maximum knee flexion, knee varus-valgus RoM) were compared between methods using a linear
175 mixed model, with calibration method (functional vs. conventional) as fixed effect and participant ID
176 as a random effect. Effects were reported as mean differences with 95% CI, with alpha set at 0.05.
177 Statistical tests were conducted in RStudio 3.6.1. using the lme4 package.

178 As our sample was unbalanced in the distribution of the direction of rotational deformity of the
179 femur (i.e. 22 adolescents with femoral anteversion versus 2 adolescents with retroversion), and the
180 effects of the calibration method could potentially be opposite for these subgroups, we performed a
181 post-hoc analysis, repeating all steps mentioned above, in which we removed the adolescents with
182 increased femoral retroversion from the analysis.

183

184 **3. Results**

185 *3.1 Patient characteristics and range of motion during functional calibrations*

186 Mean age was 15 ± 2 years, height 1.68 ± 0.06 m, weight 57.6 ± 13.0 kg, and BMI 20.2 ± 3.8 kg/m².
187 Median femoral anteversion angle on CT was 34.6° (range: $-26.7 - 63.2$). Two adolescents presented
188 with increased femoral retroversion (i.e. -26.7 and -6.8°), whereas the other twenty-two had increased
189 femoral anteversion. During the functional calibration trials, active RoM of the hip was $63 \pm 20^\circ$ in the
190 sagittal and $41 \pm 13^\circ$ in the frontal plane (Table 1). Furthermore, a RoM of $112 \pm 17^\circ$ was obtained for
191 the knee in the sagittal plane during active knee lifts.

192

193 *3.2 Hip joint center localization and knee joint axis orientation*

194 Estimated distance between the HJCs was significantly different between the three methods ($F(2,46) =$
195 120.8 , $p < 0.001$). HJC distances were 170 ± 13 mm using CT, 132 ± 20 mm using the conventional

196 calibration methods, and 196 ± 21 mm using the functional method (i.e. SCoRe) (Fig. 2). Compared to
197 CT, post-hoc comparisons indicated an underestimation of the HJC distance of 38 mm (95% CI: 30,
198 46; $p < 0.001$) in the conventional calibration method, whereas the functional calibration method
199 overestimated HJC distance with 26 mm (95% CI: 18, 34; $p < 0.001$). Post-hoc removal of the
200 participants with femoral retroversion did not yield different results (Supplementary File 1 – Table 1).

201 Orientation of the knee axis during standing was not significantly different between the
202 functional and conventional calibration method (mean difference = 1.3 deg, 95% CI: -2.7, 5.2 ; $p =$
203 0.513). In both methods, knee axis orientation was directed internally in the majority of participants
204 (Fig. 2). However, removal of the adolescents with retroversion led to a significant difference between
205 the calibration methods on knee axis orientation ($t(21) = 2.684$, $p = 0.014$). In the subgroup with only
206 the adolescents with increased femoral anteversion, the functional calibration method resulted in a
207 knee axis orientation which was 3.3° (95% CI: 0.7, 5.8) more internally rotated compared to the
208 conventional calibration method (Supplementary File 1 - Table 1).

209

210 *3.3 Effect of calibration method on gait kinematics*

211 In the full sample of adolescents with a rotational deformity of the femur, functional calibration
212 methods yielded significantly different hip kinematics compared to the conventional calibration
213 method, as illustrated by SPM analysis (Fig. 3). SPM revealed that the hip was flexed more between 0
214 – 43% and 53 – 100% of the gait cycle using the functional calibration method compared to the
215 conventional method. Over the whole gait cycle, the hip was approximately $4\text{-}5^\circ$ more in adduction
216 with the functional calibration method compared to the conventional method. In the transversal plane,
217 the functional calibration method showed 5-10 degrees more external rotation during the swing phase
218 (61% – 89%). Mean hip rotation during the stance phase was not significantly different between
219 calibration methods (mean diff = 0.6 deg , 95% CI: -0.7, 1.9; $p = 0.367$)

220 Considering the knee joint, SPM revealed that the knee was more flexed over the whole gait
221 cycle (0-100%) using the functional calibration method (Fig. 3). Maximum knee flexion was 2.4 deg

222 (95 % CI: 1.8, 3.0; $p < 0.001$) higher with the functional calibration method compared to the
223 conventional method. Finally, frontal plane knee kinematics were significantly different between the
224 two calibration methods over the whole gait cycle (0-100%), with the functional calibration method
225 placing the knee in valgus and the conventional method placing the knee in varus. Total knee varus-
226 valgus RoM was 6.0 deg (95% CI: 5.3, 6.7; $p < 0.001$) lower using functional calibration methods
227 compared to conventional calibration methods.

228 Post-hoc removal of adolescents with femoral retroversion from the analysis changed our
229 results on the effect of the calibration method on hip and knee kinematics (Supplementary File 1 – Fig.
230 1). First, in adolescents with femoral anteversion, SPM indicated that the functional calibration
231 method yielded significantly higher internal rotation angles during terminal stance (41 – 52%)
232 compared to the conventional calibration method. Mean hip rotation during stance in this subset was
233 2.5° (95% CI: 1.4, 3.5; $p < 0.001$) more internal in the functional compared to the conventional
234 calibration method, whereas this was not significantly different in the full sample. As shown in Fig. 4,
235 adolescents with increased femoral retroversion had more external hip rotation with the functional
236 calibration method compared to the conventional calibration method, which was opposite to the mean
237 effect in adolescents with increased femoral anteversion. Second, SPM results of the sagittal hip and
238 knee kinematics were slightly different in post-hoc analysis compared to analysis of the full sample. In
239 the adolescents with increased femoral anteversion, the hip was flexed more between 0-37%, 58-66%,
240 and 75-100% of the gait cycle when using the functional calibration method compared to conventional
241 calibration method. For the knee, larger flexion angles were obtained between 0-42 % and 51-100%
242 with the functional calibration method compared to the conventional calibration method. Although
243 SPM results of sagittal these knee and hip kinematics were different in the post-hoc analysis, the mean
244 differences remained relatively similar compared to analysis of the full sample (Supplementary File –
245 Fig. 1).

246

247 **4. Discussion**

248 Application of functional calibration methods resulted in more lateral estimation of the HJC location
249 compared to the CT reference, whereas the conventional calibration method positioned the HJC more
250 medially. Only for adolescents with increased femoral anteversion, but not in those with increased
251 femoral retroversion, the knee axis was more internally rotated with functional methods compared to
252 the conventional calibration methods. During gait, functional calibration methods resulted in less knee
253 varus-valgus RoM, and larger knee and hip flexion angles compared to the conventional method.
254 Finally, the hip was more abducted and more externally rotated during the swing phase using the
255 functional calibration methods compared to the conventional method.

256

257 *4.1 Localization of hip joint centers and orientation of knee joint axis*

258 Our finding that the conventional calibration method and functional calibration methods (i.e. SCoRe)
259 were not fully accurate in determining the HJC's is in line with the literature. Multiple studies found
260 that the Davis predictive method (11), which is used in the conventional calibration method, places the
261 HJC approximately 10-15 mm more medial compared to a reference HJC as obtained with dual
262 fluoroscopy (19), 3D ultrasound (20), low-dose X-rays (21), and CT scans (22). For functional
263 calibration methods, three studies reported that SCoRe placed the HJC ~5-10 mm more lateral
264 compared to the reference HJC (19-21). Our findings are in agreement with these studies, although the
265 deviation from the reference was larger in our study (i.e. 19 mm more medial in the conventional
266 calibration method, and 13 mm more lateral with functional calibration methods). In contrast, Assi *et*
267 *al.* did not find significant differences in HJC localization in the mediolateral direction when
268 conventional methods and SCoRe were compared to low-dose X-ray reference (23).

269 We found no differences between the conventional calibration method and functional
270 calibration methods (i.e. SARA) in the orientation of the knee axis during the standing calibration trial,
271 which is also in agreement with previous studies (9, 24, 25). However, post-hoc analysis indicated that
272 the effect of the calibration method on knee axis orientation may be dependent on the direction of the
273 rotational deformity. Our results imply that a functional calibration method including SARA

274 accommodated for more extreme cases of internal and external orientation of the knee axis, whereas in
275 the conventional calibration method the knee axis orientation was oriented in a relatively neutral
276 position between -10 and 10 degrees. Importantly, Sauret *et al.* and Passmore *et al.* showed that both
277 functional models (i.e. SARA) and the conventional calibration method deviated on average 5-10
278 degrees (external) from the actual transepicondylar axis obtained using biplanar radiographs (24) and
279 3D ultrasound measurement (25). Taken together, this suggests that function calibration methods
280 might lead to more accurate estimation of knee axis orientation in adolescents with rotational
281 deformity of the femur, but that both the knee axis derived from functional and conventional
282 calibration methods could still differ from the actual transepicondylar axis.

283

284 *4.2 Effect of calibration method on gait kinematics*

285 During gait, we observed differences in hip and knee kinematics between the functional and
286 conventional calibration method. A part of these kinematic differences can be the direct consequence
287 of differences in HJC localization between the two methods. Using trigonometry, lateral translation of
288 the HJC of ~3 cm compared to the pelvis midline would indeed result in the offset in frontal plane hip
289 kinematics of ~4° towards adduction that we found, when assuming a femoral length of 25% of a
290 participants' height (26). Similarly, lateral translation of the HJC will place the knee joint towards
291 valgus alignment. This may thus explain the shift in kinematics from knee varus to valgus when using
292 the functional calibration methods.

293 The functional calibration methods resulted in lower knee varus-valgus RoM accompanied by
294 a larger maximum knee flexion angle compared to conventional calibration methods, and therefore
295 seemed to reduce crosstalk. Crosstalk is defined as the incorrect measurement of knee flexion as knee
296 varus-valgus movement, due to a suboptimal approximation of the mediolateral knee axis (27-29). In
297 part, this error may arise from improper placement of the knee and thigh marker when using
298 conventional calibration methods. When comparing our results with other literature, knee varus-valgus
299 RoM during gait derived from the functional calibration method was found to be close to fluoroscopy

300 findings in healthy adults, which were 3.4° during a 60 degree flexion task (30), and 5.4° (stance) and
301 6.3° (swing) during walking (31). In our data, a direct result of this lower cross-talk was that higher
302 knee flexion angles were obtained with functional calibration methods compared to the conventional
303 calibration method, although the magnitude of this difference (i.e. 2.4°) can be considered to be
304 marginal. Similarly, the effect of the calibration method on hip flexion angles was small. Hence, this
305 again strengthens the notion that these sagittal plane gait parameters are robust outcomes of gait
306 analysis with clinically acceptable errors (10).

307 In line with our findings on knee joint axis orientation, the calibration method had a significant
308 effect on hip rotation kinematics. Functional calibration methods yielded a different kinematic profile
309 in the transversal plane compared to the conventional calibration method, characterized by more
310 external rotation during swing and 2.5° more internal rotation during stance in the adolescents with
311 femoral anteversion only. Effects of the calibration method on hip rotation kinematics seemed to be
312 opposite in adolescents with increased femoral retroversion, although a larger sample would be needed
313 to further generalize this. Our findings are not in agreement with the study of Passmore *et al.*, who did
314 not find clear differences in hip kinematics between a conventional and functional calibration method
315 (i.e. SARA) (9). This may be explained by the fact that they included a different patient group (incl.
316 adolescents with cerebral palsy) and only used SARA in their functional calibration method.
317 Noteworthy is that in their study, the functional calibration method as well as the conventional
318 calibration method showed offsets from transversal hip kinematics obtained using low-dose X-rays
319 (i.e. both were more external than the reference). This could only partially be explained by a different
320 knee axis definition (i.e. transepicondylar axis vs. condylar knee axis). Clinicians and researchers
321 should thus be careful with interpretation of hip rotation kinematics, in particular as indicator for
322 derotational osteotomy (32, 33), as the effect of the calibration method as well as previous reported
323 measurement error for this parameter (10) may approach values that seem relevant for clinical decision
324 making (33).

325 This study had a number of limitations. First, we had no ‘ground truth’ (i.e. fluoroscopy)
326 available to validate the gait kinematics in this study, and thus cannot directly interpret our results in

327 terms of superiority of one of the two methods with regard to gait kinematics. Secondly, only two
328 patients with femoral retroversion were included in the sample, which limited opportunities for
329 subgroup analysis. This may be worth a future investigation based on our post-hoc analysis. Thirdly,
330 not all adolescents reached the recommended level of RoM for functional calibration trials (i.e. 60° hip
331 flexion, 30° hip ab/adduction (15)). This may have resulted in inaccurate estimations of the HJC and
332 knee joint axis using the functional method, limiting its potential advantage. Finally, the test-retest
333 reliability of the functional method was beyond the scope of this study, but is an important aspect to
334 consider when deciding which calibration method provides better results. Currently, there are some
335 indications in typically developing children that reliability of gait kinematics may improve by using
336 functional calibration methods, but compelling evidence is lacking (34).

337

338 **5. Conclusions**

339 Functional calibration methods resulted in closer approximation of the anatomical HJC and
340 potentially a better orientation of the knee joint axis compared to conventional calibration methods,
341 resulting in less knee joint angle crosstalk during gait. Effects of the calibration method on sagittal
342 knee and hip kinematics were within clinically acceptable limits. However, relatively larger
343 differences between calibration methods in transversal plane hip kinematics may hold clinical
344 relevance, particularly for a population with deformities in this specific plane. Hence, cautious
345 interpretation of this outcome is warranted for adolescents with rotational deformity of the femur.

346

347 **Acknowledgements**

348 We want to thank Arjan Steenbakkers (AS) for their contribution to analysis of the radiographic
349 images, and Lisa van der Wiel for her assistance during the data collection.

350

351 **References**

- 352 1. Gruskay JA, Fragomen AT, Rozbruch SR. Idiopathic Rotational Abnormalities of the Lower
353 Extremities in Children and Adults. *JBJS Reviews*. 2019;7(1).
- 354 2. Mackay J, Thomason P, Sangeux M, Passmore E, Francis K, Graham HK. The impact of
355 symptomatic femoral neck anteversion and tibial torsion on gait, function and participation in children
356 and adolescents. *Gait & Posture*. 2021;86:144-9.
- 357 3. Radler C, Kranzl A, Manner HM, Höglinger M, Ganger R, Grill F. Torsional profile versus
358 gait analysis: Consistency between the anatomic torsion and the resulting gait pattern in patients with
359 rotational malalignment of the lower extremity. *Gait & Posture*. 2010;32(3):405-10.
- 360 4. Bruderer-Hofstetter M, Fenner V, Payne E, Zdenek K, Klima H, Wegener R. Gait deviations
361 and compensations in pediatric patients with increased femoral torsion. *Journal of Orthopaedic*
362 *Research*. 2015;33(2):155-62.
- 363 5. Alexander N, Brunner R, Cip J, Viehweger E, De Pieri E. Increased Femoral Anteversion
364 Does Not Lead to Increased Joint Forces During Gait in a Cohort of Adolescent Patients. *Frontiers in*
365 *Bioengineering and Biotechnology*. 2022;10.
- 366 6. Alexander N, Studer K, Lengnick H, Payne E, Klima H, Wegener R. The impact of increased
367 femoral antetorsion on gait deviations in healthy adolescents. *Journal of Biomechanics*. 2019;86:167-
368 74.
- 369 7. MacWilliams BA, McMulkin ML, Davis RB, Westberry DE, Baird GO, Stevens PM.
370 Biomechanical changes associated with femoral derotational osteotomy. *Gait & Posture*. 2016;49:202-
371 6.
- 372 8. Passmore E, Graham HK, Pandy MG, Sangeux M. Hip- and patellofemoral-joint loading
373 during gait are increased in children with idiopathic torsional deformities. *Gait & Posture*.
374 2018;63:228-35.
- 375 9. Passmore E, Graham HK, Sangeux M. Defining the medial-lateral axis of the femur: Medical
376 imaging, conventional and functional calibration methods lead to differences in hip rotation
377 kinematics for children with torsional deformities. *Journal of Biomechanics*. 2018;69:156-63.
- 378 10. McGinley JL, Baker R, Wolfe R, Morris ME. The reliability of three-dimensional kinematic
379 gait measurements: A systematic review. *Gait & Posture*. 2009;29(3):360-9.

- 380 11. Davis RB, Öunpuu S, Tyburski D, Gage JR. A gait analysis data collection and reduction
381 technique. *Human Movement Science*. 1991;10(5):575-87.
- 382 12. Hara R, McGinley J, Briggs C, Baker R, Sangeux M. Predicting the location of the hip joint
383 centres, impact of age group and sex. *Scientific Reports*. 2016;6(1):37707.
- 384 13. Ehrig RM, Taylor WR, Duda GN, Heller MO. A survey of formal methods for determining
385 the centre of rotation of ball joints. *Journal of Biomechanics*. 2006;39(15):2798-809.
- 386 14. Ehrig RM, Taylor WR, Duda GN, Heller MO. A survey of formal methods for determining
387 functional joint axes. *Journal of Biomechanics*. 2007;40(10):2150-7.
- 388 15. Kainz H, Carty CP, Modenese L, Boyd RN, Lloyd DG. Estimation of the hip joint centre in
389 human motion analysis: A systematic review. *Clinical Biomechanics*. 2015;30(4):319-29.
- 390 16. Leboucher J, Salami F, Öztürk O, Heitzmann DWW, Götze M, Dreher T, et al. Focusing on
391 functional knee parameter determination to develop a better clinical gait analysis protocol. *Gait &*
392 *Posture*. 2021;84:127-36.
- 393 17. Taylor WR, Kornaropoulos EI, Duda GN, Krutzenstein S, Ehrig RM, Arampatzis A, et al.
394 Repeatability and reproducibility of OSSCA, a functional approach for assessing the kinematics of the
395 lower limb. *Gait & Posture*. 2010;32(2):231-6.
- 396 18. Pataky TC. Generalized n-dimensional biomechanical field analysis using statistical
397 parametric mapping. *Journal of Biomechanics*. 2010;43(10):1976-82.
- 398 19. Fiorentino NM, Kutschke MJ, Atkins PR, Foreman KB, Kapron AL, Anderson AE. Accuracy
399 of Functional and Predictive Methods to Calculate the Hip Joint Center in Young Non-pathologic
400 Asymptomatic Adults with Dual Fluoroscopy as a Reference Standard. *Annals of Biomedical*
401 *Engineering*. 2016;44(7):2168-80.
- 402 20. Peters A, Baker R, Morris ME, Sangeux M. A comparison of hip joint centre localisation
403 techniques with 3-DUS for clinical gait analysis in children with cerebral palsy. *Gait & Posture*.
404 2012;36(2):282-6.
- 405 21. Sangeux M, Pillet H, Skalli W. Which method of hip joint centre localisation should be used
406 in gait analysis? *Gait & Posture*. 2014;40(1):20-5.

- 407 22. Andersen MS, Mellon S, Grammatopoulos G, Gill HS. Evaluation of the accuracy of three
408 popular regression equations for hip joint centre estimation using computerised tomography
409 measurements for metal-on-metal hip resurfacing arthroplasty patients. *Gait & Posture*.
410 2013;38(4):1044-7.
- 411 23. Assi A, Sauret C, Massaad A, Bakouny Z, Pillet H, Skalli W, et al. Validation of hip joint
412 center localization methods during gait analysis using 3D EOS imaging in typically developing and
413 cerebral palsy children. *Gait & Posture*. 2016;48:30-5.
- 414 24. Sauret C, Pillet H, Skalli W, Sangeux M. On the use of knee functional calibration to
415 determine the medio-lateral axis of the femur in gait analysis: Comparison with EOS biplanar
416 radiographs as reference. *Gait & Posture*. 2016;50:180-4.
- 417 25. Passmore E, Sangeux M. Defining the medial-lateral axis of an anatomical femur coordinate
418 system using freehand 3D ultrasound imaging. *Gait & Posture*. 2016;45:211-6.
- 419 26. Feldesman MR. Femur/stature ratio and estimates of stature in children. *Am J Phys Anthropol*.
420 1992;87(4):447-59.
- 421 27. Baker R, Finney L, Orr J. A new approach to determine the hip rotation profile from clinical
422 gait analysis data. *Human Movement Science*. 1999;18(5):655-67.
- 423 28. Groen BE, Geurts M, Nienhuis B, Duysens J. Sensitivity of the OLGa and VCM models to
424 erroneous marker placement: Effects on 3D-gait kinematics. *Gait & Posture*. 2012;35(3):517-21.
- 425 29. Kadaba MP, Ramakrishnan HK, Wootten ME. Measurement of lower extremity kinematics
426 during level walking. *Journal of Orthopaedic Research*. 1990;8(3):383-92.
- 427 30. Ishii Y, Terajima K, Terashima S, Koga Y. Three-dimensional kinematics of the human knee
428 with intracortical pin fixation. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 1997(343):144-50.
- 429 31. Postolka B, Schütz P, Fucentese SF, Freeman MAR, Pinskerova V, List R, et al. Tibio-femoral
430 kinematics of the healthy knee joint throughout complete cycles of gait activities. *Journal of*
431 *Biomechanics*. 2020;110:109915.
- 432 32. Ounpuu S, DeLuca P, Davis R, Romness M. Long-term effects of femoral derotation
433 osteotomies: an evaluation using three-dimensional gait analysis. *J Pediatr Orthop*. 2002;22(2):139-45.

434 33. Schwartz MH, Rozumalski A, Novacheck TF. Femoral derotational osteotomy: Surgical
435 indications and outcomes in children with cerebral palsy. *Gait & Posture*. 2014;39(2):778-83.

436 34. Sangeux M. Computation of hip rotation kinematics retrospectively using functional knee
437 calibration during gait. *Gait & Posture*. 2018;63:171-6.

438

439

440 **Tables**

441 **Table 1:** Range of motion of the hip and knee during functional calibration trials.

Parameter	Adolescents with rotational deformity of femur (n=24)
Hip flexion/extension RoM (°)	63 (range: 34 – 130)
Hip ab/adduction RoM (°)	41 (range: 24 – 87)
Knee flexion/extension RoM (°)	112 (range: 68 – 143)

442

443

444 **Figure legends**

445 *Fig. 1:* Simplified and schematic overview of the workflow for conventional and functional calibration
446 methods. *For reasons of simplicity we only mentioned hip joint center (HJC) and knee axis as
447 input/output, as these are the key differences between the two calibration methods.

448 *Fig. 2:* Differences in hip joint center (HJC) localization and orientation of the knee axis during the
449 static, standing calibration. Boxes represent the interquartile range, while the whiskers indicate the
450 upper and lower quartiles. Individual data is showed by scatter overlay, with all measures within a
451 participant connected through lines. The two participants with increased femoral retroversion are
452 highlighted in red.

453 *Fig. 3:* Hip and knee kinematics for the functional (blue) and conventional calibration method (red).
454 Group means and 95% confidence intervals are shown in the top row. The middle row shows the mean
455 differences with the 95% (dark grey) and 99% confidence interval (light grey). Results of statistical
456 parameter mapping (SPM) are displayed in the bottom row. Significant differences between the
457 models are denotated by the grey marked area.

458 *Fig. 4:* Mean differences between the two calibration methods (i.e. functional – conventional) for hip
459 internal/external rotation. Data for the complete group is showed as mean with 95% (dark grey area)
460 and 99% (light grey area). Individual data of the two adolescents with increased femoral retroversion
461 is highlighted in red.

Supplementary File 1 – post-hoc analysis: removal of 2 adolescents with increased femoral retroversion

Table 1: Post-hoc analysis on the effects of calibration method on HJC localization and knee axis orientation.

	CT	Functional calibration	Conventional calibration	Statistical tests
Full sample (n=24)				
Distance between HJCs (mm)	170 (13)	196 (21)	132 (20)	F(2,46) = 120.8, p<0.001
Knee axis orientation (deg)	-	3.4 (10.6)	2.1 (6.2)	t(23) = -0.664, p = 0.513 mean diff = -1.3 deg (-5.2, 2.7)
Post-hoc analysis (n=22)				
Distance between HJCs (mm)	170 (14)	196 (20)	133 (21)	F(2,42) = 130.0, p<0.001
Knee axis orientation (deg)	-	5.8 (6.5)	2.5 (6.3)	t(21) = 2.684, p = 0.014; mean diff = 3.3 deg (0.7, 5.8)

Figure legends

Fig. 1: Hip and knee kinematics for the functional (blue) and conventional method (red) after removal of 2 adolescents with increased femoral retroversion. Group means and 95% confidence intervals are shown in the top row. The middle row shows the mean differences with the 95% (dark grey) and 99% confidence interval (light grey). Results of statistical parameter mapping (SPM) are displayed in the bottom row. Significant differences between the models are denoted by the grey marked area.

Calibration

Conventional calibration method

Functional calibration method

Input/Trials

Anthropometric measurements
Marker data from:
○ Standing trial

Anthropometric measurements
Marker data from:
○ Standing trial
○ Functional calibration trials

Processing method

Static Plug-in-Gait

SCoRe & SARA

*Output**

“conventional” HJC
“conventional” knee axis

“functional” HJC
“functional” knee axis

Gait

*Input /Trials**

“conventional” HJC
“conventional” knee axis
Marker data from gait trials (n=5)

“functional” HJC
“functional” knee axis
Marker data from gait trials (n=5)



Processing method




Dynamic Plug-in-Gait

Output

‘conventional’ 3D kinematics

‘functional’ 3D kinematics





Hip - transversal

