

1 **Individuals with knee osteoarthritis show few limitations in**
2 **reactive stepping responses after gait perturbations**

3
4 R.J. Boekesteijn ^{1,2}, N.L.W. Keijsers ^{1,2,3}, K. Defoort ⁴, A.C.H. Geurts ², K. Smulders ¹

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

8 ² = Department of Rehabilitation, Donders Institute for Brain Cognition and Behaviour, Radboud

9 University Medical Center, The Netherlands

10 ³ = Department of Sensorimotor Neuroscience, Donders Institute for Brain, Cognition and Behaviour,

11 Radboud University, Nijmegen, The Netherlands.

12 ⁴ = Department of Orthopedic Surgery, Sint Maartenskliniek, Nijmegen

13
14 Correspondence to: Ramon J. Boekesteijn (ramonboekesteyn@gmail.com), department of Research &

15 Innovation, Sint Maartenskliniek, P.O. box 9011, 6500 GM, Nijmegen, the Netherlands.

16

17 **Abstract**

18 *Background:* Knee osteoarthritis (OA) causes structural joint damage. The resultant symptoms can
19 impair the ability to recover from unexpected gait perturbations, contributing to an increased fall risk.
20 This study compared reactive stepping responses to gait perturbations between individuals with knee
21 OA and healthy individuals.

22 *Methods:* Kinematic data of 35 individuals with end-stage knee OA, and 32 healthy individuals
23 in the same age range were obtained during perturbed walking on a treadmill at 1.0 m/s. Participants
24 received anteroposterior (trip or slip) or mediolateral perturbations during the stance phase. Changes
25 from baseline in margin of stability (MoS), step length, step time, and step width during the first two
26 steps after perturbation were compared between groups using a linear regression model. Extrapolated
27 center of mass (XCoM) excursion was descriptively analyzed.

28 *Findings:* After all perturbation modes, XCoM trajectories overlapped between individuals with
29 knee OA and healthy individuals. Participants predominantly responded to mediolateral perturbations
30 by adjusting their step width, and to anteroposterior perturbations by adjusting step length and step
31 time. None of the perturbation modes yielded between-group differences in changes in MoS and step
32 width during the first two steps after perturbation. Small between-group differences were observed for
33 step length (i.e. 2 cm) of the second step after trip and slip perturbation, and for step time (i.e. 0.02 s)
34 of the second step after slip perturbations.

35 *Interpretation:* Despite considerable pain and damage to the knee joint, individuals with knee OA
36 showed comparable reactive stepping responses after gait perturbations to healthy participants.

37

38 **Keywords:** osteoarthritis, gait stability, perturbations, arthroplasty

39 1. Introduction

40 Knee osteoarthritis (OA) is a debilitating joint disease characterized by degradation of
41 articular cartilage and structural damage to the knee joint (1). Common symptoms of knee OA include
42 pain, stiffness, knee instability, muscle weakness, and fatigue. In addition, knee OA may lead to
43 afferent and efferent neural deficits, expressed by reduced vibratory sense (2), reduced proprioception
44 (3), and poorer control over muscle force generation (4). These symptoms could lead to impaired
45 stability during walking in individuals with knee OA (5). Indeed, observational studies suggest that
46 individuals with knee OA are 25-54% more likely to experience a fall compared to those without knee
47 OA (6-10).

48 Stable gait can be defined as “gait that does not lead to falls in spite of perturbations” (11).
49 The application of unexpected, external perturbations to challenge gait stability has become a common
50 method to study dynamic balance control in humans (12-17). To ensure adequate recovery from such
51 external perturbations, the body’s extrapolated center of mass (XCoM) – which is the center of mass
52 (CoM) position plus its velocity vector divided by the inverted pendulum’s eigenfrequency (18) –
53 needs to be controlled with respect to the limits of a continuously changing base of support (BoS). This
54 process relies on the integration of diverse sensory inputs into an adequate motor response. Dynamic
55 balance control is believed to be actively regulated, particularly in the mediolateral (ML) direction
56 (19), whereas in the anteroposterior (AP) direction, it may be relatively less controlled (20) due to
57 exploitation of passive system dynamics (21). Three main mechanisms can be used to actively regulate
58 AP and ML gait stability during walking: 1) foot placement, 2) changing the position of the center of
59 pressure under the stance foot, and 3) modulating the body’s angular momentum (22). Among the
60 three mechanisms, foot placement is considered the most dominant (23).

61 To study the effects of knee OA on gait stability, responses to AP (24-27) and ML (25, 28, 29)
62 gait perturbations have previously been compared between individuals with knee OA and healthy
63 participants. Overall these studies showed mixed results, with some showing effects of knee OA on
64 perturbation responses (24-27) and others finding no such effects (28, 29). Outcomes of these studies
65 included muscle activation (including quadriceps, hamstrings, calf muscles) (25, 28, 29), lower-

66 extremity kinematics (24-29), lower-extremity kinetics (24), and step characteristics (24, 26, 27).
67 However, none of the studies investigated gait stability as the relationship between CoM state and foot
68 placement. Furthermore, because stability measures vary with differences in gait speed (30, 31), and
69 gait speed of individuals with knee OA is lower compared to healthy individuals (32), gait speed
70 should be considered as a confounder in these comparisons. Unfortunately, none of the previous
71 studies (24-29) controlled for gait speed in their experiments.

72 In this study, we examined reactive balance responses to ML and AP perturbations in
73 individuals with knee OA, and compared them to responses of healthy peers walking at a predefined,
74 fixed speed. We hypothesized that, compared to healthy participants, individuals with knee OA would
75 show larger XCoM excursions after perturbation, leading to a lower MoS in the first step after both
76 ML and AP perturbations.

77

78 **2. Methods**

79 *2.1 Participants*

80 This study was part of a longitudinal study investigating real-life and challenging gait skills in
81 individuals scheduled for total knee arthroplasty (TKA) (<https://osf.io/64ejm>). Real-world gait data of
82 this study has been published as preprint (33). Thirty-five individuals with end-stage knee OA,
83 scheduled for cruciate retaining TKA, and thirty-two healthy controls (HC) participated in this study.
84 Individuals with knee OA, who were candidates for posterior cruciate retaining TKA at the Sint
85 Maartenskliniek Nijmegen, were screened by a research nurse for eligibility. Eligibility criteria
86 included: 1) symptomatic and radiological knee OA (i.e. Kellgren-Lawrence grade > 2), 2) intact
87 posterior cruciate ligament, 3) correctable or <10° rigid varus or valgus deformity of the knee, and 4)
88 stable health (ASA-score ≤ 3), 5) aged between 40-80 years. Healthy participants were recruited from
89 the community, in the same age range and with similar sex distribution as the group of individuals
90 with knee OA. Healthy participants were matched to the individuals with knee OA that received the
91 Journey II CR implant (Smith & Nephew, Memphis, TN, USA) based on age and sex (which was the

92 case for 32 out of 35 participants), allowing a maximum age difference of 5 years. Healthy participants
93 had no diagnosis of knee OA and had no self-reported pain complaints in the lower-extremities.
94 Exclusion criteria for both groups were: 1) BMI > 35 kg/m², 2) moderate to severe knee, hip or ankle
95 pain defined as an average score >4 on items 3-6 of the Short Brief Pain Inventory; excluding the knee
96 indexed for TKA, 3) previous knee, hip, or ankle joint replacement, 4) any other musculoskeletal,
97 neurological, or uncorrected visual disorder impairing gait or balance. Informed consent was obtained
98 from all participants prior to the experiments. Ethical approval was obtained from the CMO
99 Arnhem/Nijmegen (2019-5824). All study methods were carried out in accordance with the
100 Declaration of Helsinki.

101

102 *2.2. Clinical assessments*

103 AP X-rays, available through regular clinical care, were scored by KD using the Kellgren and
104 Lawrence grades (34). Anthropometric characteristics (height, body mass, and BMI) were obtained on
105 the same day as the gait assessment. For individuals with knee OA, this was on average 1.8 months
106 (IQR = 1.5) before TKA. All participants reported pain scores during activity and rest using a numeric
107 rating scale (NRS). In addition, the Knee injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score – Physical Function
108 shortform (KOOS-PS) (35) and the clinical and functional score of the Knee Society Score (KSS) (36)
109 were obtained for individuals with knee OA. Fall history was assessed by asking the participants if
110 they had experienced a fall during the 3 months preceding the study visit (37). If participants reported
111 they had fallen, the number of falls was recorded.

112

113 *2.3 Equipment*

114 Participants walked on an instrumented split-belt treadmill (GRAIL, Motek Medical BV, The
115 Netherlands) that was surrounded by a 180° semi-cylindrical screen with a virtual environment. For
116 safety reasons, all participants wore a safety harness when walking on the treadmill. Participants were
117 equipped with twenty-three reflective markers, following the Vicon Lower Body model (38), with

118 additional markers placed on C7, and bilaterally on the acromion process, humeral lateral epicondyle,
119 and the ulnar styloid process. These additional markers were used to account for trunk and arm
120 movements in the CoM estimation (39). Marker data were acquired using a ten-camera motion capture
121 system (Vicon, Oxford, UK).

122

123 *2.4 Procedures*

124 Participants were first familiarized with the experimental set-up, including walking on the
125 treadmill with virtual environment. Subsequently, comfortable walking speed was determined using
126 the protocol described in Hak *et al.* (40), which started at a speed of 0.5 m/s with increments or
127 decrements of 0.05 m/s. The perturbation protocol consisted of two separate sequences with ML and
128 AP perturbations (Figure 1C). These sequences consisted of a block of perturbations of approximately
129 3 minutes, which was repeated twice with 2 minutes of rest in between. During these sequences,
130 walking speed was fixed at 1.0 m/s, which was based on the mean overground comfortable walking
131 speed of individuals with knee OA (e.g. 0.97 m/s; SD = 0.17 (41)) as well as by pilot testing.

132 Perturbations consisted of 4.5 cm platform translations in 0.5 s (ML) or a change in belt speed
133 with a speed difference of 0.6 m/s in 0.5 s (AP). For ML perturbations the platform always returned to
134 the middle, neutral position 5 seconds after initial perturbation, which was necessary as total platform
135 movement was limited to 5 cm at each side. Perturbations were triggered by heel contact and delivered
136 during the stance phase (Figure 1B).

137 There were four different perturbation modes for each sequence (ML vs. AP), depending on
138 side (i.e. affected vs. unaffected in patients and left vs. right in healthy participants) and direction (i.e.
139 inward vs. outward in ML perturbations, and slip vs. trip in AP perturbations; Figure 1A). The
140 definition of side in healthy participants was matched to the affected side of an individual with TKA
141 with similar sex and age. Each of 4 perturbation modes were repeated twice within a block, resulting
142 in a total of 8 perturbations per block (Figure 1C). The order of perturbations was fixed, but concealed

143 to the participants. To prevent carry-over effects, the duration between two consecutive perturbations
144 was at least 7 seconds. The exact interval between perturbations varied in order to prevent anticipation.

145

146 *2.5 Outcomes and data analysis*

147 Data were processed in Octave 6.3.0 and figures were prepared in Python 3.8.3. Marker data were
148 filtered using a 2nd order low-pass Butterworth filter with a cut-off frequency of 10 Hz. Gait events
149 were detected using the velocity-based algorithm described by Zeni Jr. *et al.* (42). From marker data,
150 the CoM position was determined using the methods described by Tisserand *et al.* (39). Subsequently,
151 the XCoM was calculated based on the inverted pendulum model, using the formula presented by Hof
152 *et al.* (18):

$$XCoM = CoM + \frac{vCoM + vBelt}{\text{sqrt}\left(\frac{g}{l}\right)}$$

153 where XCoM is the body's extrapolated center of mass, CoM the CoM position, vCoM the CoM velocity, vBelt the belt speed
154 (1.0 m/s for the anteroposterior direction), g the gravitational acceleration (9.81 m/s²), and l is defined as the pendulum
155 height (height of the CoM).

156

157 To descriptively analyze CoM and XCoM, trajectories were time normalized from the second step
158 before perturbation until the fifth step after perturbation. In addition, CoM position at heel strike
159 before perturbation was subtracted from the entire time series, such that group averages could be
160 taken. The MoS was calculated separately in the ML and the AP direction (Figure 2). For the AP
161 direction, MoS was calculated as the difference between the toe marker and XCoM at heel strike. For
162 the ML direction, MoS was calculated as the minimum of the difference between the ankle marker and
163 XCoM position during stance, which was approximately at the instant of opposite toe-off (18).
164 Positive MoS values indicate instantaneous stability, whereas negative MoS values indicate
165 instantaneous instability. Discrete parameters (MoS, step time, step length, and step width) were
166 calculated for the three steps before each perturbation (i.e. step-2, step-1, and pre) until five steps after
167 perturbation (i.e. post1 – post5). Step length was defined as the difference in AP position of the heel

168 markers between two consecutive heel strikes, plus step time times belt speed. Step width was defined
169 as the difference in ML position of the heel markers between two consecutive heel strikes. For both
170 step length and step width calculations, we accounted for changes in belt speed or platform translation,
171 such that these parameters included the distance from the perturbation. First repetitions of each
172 perturbation mode were removed from analysis, as they may elicit inherently different responses than
173 later repetitions (e.g. due to first trial effect; (43)). In addition, all responses during which the handrail
174 was touched were removed from analysis. Touching of the handrail was visually identified by the
175 investigator.

176

177 *2.6 Statistical analysis*

178 To reduce the risk of type I errors, between-group effects were only tested in the first two steps after
179 perturbation (i.e. post-1 and post-2). For similar reasons, we only compared data of perturbations to
180 the affected leg between groups, as the largest differences could be expected here. The two steps
181 before each perturbation trial (step-2 and step-1) were combined into a baseline score to reduce noise
182 and average out potential asymmetries. For each outcome measure, two separate linear regression
183 models were created, with difference from baseline as the dependent variable ($\Delta Y_{\text{post}1/2}$), group as
184 independent variable, and baseline score (Y_{baseline}) as covariate:

$$185 \quad \text{Model 1: } \Delta Y_{\text{post}1} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 * \text{group} + \beta_2 * Y_{\text{baseline}}$$

$$186 \quad \text{Model 2: } \Delta Y_{\text{post}2} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 * \text{group} + \beta_2 * Y_{\text{baseline}}$$

187 In these models Y was the variable of interest (i.e. MoS, step width, step length, or step time).
188 Between-group differences (i.e. β_1 derived from the models) were reported as mean differences with
189 95% confidence intervals. Furthermore, changes over time (i.e. $\Delta Y_{\text{post}1}$ and $\Delta Y_{\text{post}2}$) were estimated. If
190 there was no significant group effect ($p > 0.05$), the factor group was removed from the statistical
191 model to estimate $\Delta Y_{\text{post}1/2}$ for all participants. XCoM and CoM trajectories were descriptively
192 analyzed. Statistical analysis was performed in RStudio using the stats package (version 4.1.2).

193

194 3. Results

195 Baseline characteristics are provided in Table 1. Individuals with knee OA had a higher body
196 mass, higher BMI, and experienced more pain during activity and rest compared to healthy controls.
197 Comfortable walking speed was -0.21 m/s lower in individuals with knee OA than in healthy controls.
198 Four participants with knee OA (11%) and two healthy participants (6%) reported they had fallen
199 during the preceding 3 months.

200 We had missing data for one individual with knee OA during the ML perturbations, and for 4
201 individuals with knee OA during AP perturbation trials. Reasons for missing data were: unable to
202 complete the task due to pain or physical impairment (ML: n=1; AP: n=2), fear (n=1, AP), and lack of
203 time (n=1, AP). Although these participants did not report any falls in the preceding 3 months, their
204 KOOS-PS (range: 38-54) and NRS pain scores during rest (range: 7-9) and activity (range: 7-9) were
205 worse than the group average. Furthermore, six trials of individuals with knee OA (inward affected
206 (n=3), slip affected (n=1), trip affected (n=2)) were not analyzed as the handrail was touched during
207 the balance recovery response.

208

209 *3.1 Mediolateral gait perturbations*

210 For inward perturbations, there was no direct effect of the perturbation visible on the XCoM
211 trajectory (Figure 3). Between the first and second step after perturbation, the XCoM moved
212 approximately 0.05 m less laterally, whereas XCoM excursion was markedly higher between the
213 second and third step after perturbation. XCoM trajectories overlapped between individuals with knee
214 OA and healthy participants. No between-group differences in stepping responses to inward
215 perturbations were found (Table 2 & Figure 4). In both groups, step width decreased with 0.09 m at
216 step 1 and step 2 compared to baseline. This resulted in a decrease in ML MoS of 0.03 m (95% CI:
217 0.02, 0.04) in the first step, and an increase of 0.01 m (95%: 0.01, 0.02) in the second step compared to
218 baseline. Step time and step length changes after inward perturbations were significant, but small (i.e.

219 0.01 m longer step lengths in the first step after perturbation and 0.01s shorter step times in the second
220 step after perturbation; Table 2).

221 Similar to inward perturbations, no instantaneous effect of outward perturbations on the
222 XCoM trajectory was observed. Between the first and second step after perturbation, the XCoM
223 travelled approximately 0.05 m more laterally in both groups (Figure 3). XCoM trajectories were
224 comparable between the two groups. There were no between-group differences in stepping responses
225 to outward perturbations (Table 2). On average, step width increased in the first (mean diff = 0.07 m,
226 95% CI: 0.06, 0.08) and second step (mean diff = 0.09 m, 95% CI: 0.08, 0.10) after perturbation. Both
227 for individuals with knee OA and healthy participants, ML MoS was 0.03 m (95% CI: 0.02, 0.03)
228 larger than baseline in the first step after outward perturbation, but was not different from baseline in
229 the second step (mean diff = -0.00 m , 95% CI: -0.01, 0.00). Compared to baseline, step length was
230 0.06 m (95% CI: 0.06, 0.07) shorter in the first step after outward perturbations and 0.07 m (95% CI:
231 0.06, 0.08) in the second step. Step time was shorter in the first (mean diff = -0.02 s, 95% CI: -0.02, -
232 0.03) and second (mean diff = -0.05 s, 95% CI: -0.04, -0.05) step after outward perturbations
233 compared to baseline.

234

235 *3.2 Anteroposterior perturbations*

236 Slip perturbations did not have an immediate effect on the XCoM trajectory. Between the first
237 and second step after perturbation, however, the XCoM moved more anteriorly (Figure 3), with both
238 groups showing overlapping XCoM trajectories. In response to the slip perturbation, participants
239 predominantly changed their step length and step time (Figure 5). In the first step after perturbations,
240 step length was 0.10 m (95% CI: 0.09, 0.10) longer compared to baseline in both groups. Step time
241 was 0.02 s (95% CI: 0.02, 0.02) shorter than baseline in both groups. Compared to baseline, AP MoS
242 was 0.05 m (95%: 0.04, 0.05) lower in the first step, followed by a 0.03 m (95% CI: 0.02, 0.04) higher
243 AP MoS in the second step. Changes in AP MoS after slip perturbations were similar between
244 individuals with knee OA and healthy individuals (Table 3). At the second step after perturbation,

245 there was a significant group effect on changes in step length ($p=0.045$) and step time ($p=0.028$).
246 Individuals with knee OA showed a 0.02 m (95% CI: 0.00, 0.04) larger decrease in step length
247 compared to baseline, and a 0.02 s (95% CI: 0.00, 0.03) larger reduction in step time. Changes from
248 baseline on step width were small and did not differ between the groups (Table 2).

249 Trip perturbations attenuated the forward movement of the XCoM during the first recovery
250 step. Consequently the XCoM was relatively more posterior at the first and second step after
251 perturbation (Figure 3). There were no differences between groups in XCoM trajectory, although the
252 standard deviation of the XCoM trajectory after trip perturbation seemed to be larger in individuals
253 with knee OA. Trip perturbations resulted in a lower step length (mean diff = -0.18 m, 95% CI: -0.19,
254 -0.16) in the first step after perturbation. In the second step after trip perturbation, there was a
255 significant group effect on step length ($p=0.034$). Step length was 0.06 m (95% CI: 0.04, 0.08) higher
256 in healthy individuals compared to baseline, whereas this was 0.04 m (95% CI: 0.02, 0.05) for
257 individuals with knee OA. Compared to baseline, step time was 0.01 s (95% 0.00, 0.02) shorter in the
258 first step after trip perturbations, and 0.04 s (95% CI: 0.02, 0.05) longer in the second step. There were
259 no group effects on AP MoS in the first and second steps after perturbation (Table 3). For both groups,
260 AP MoS was 0.03 m (95% CI: 0.02, 0.04) lower in the first step after trip perturbations, and 0.06 m
261 (95%: 0.05, 0.07) m lower in the second step. Similar to slip perturbations, the effects of trip
262 perturbations on step width were small and did not differ between the groups (Table 3).

263

264 **4. Discussion**

265 In this study we compared reactive stepping responses to ML and AP gait perturbations
266 between individuals with end-stage knee OA and their healthy peers. After inward as well as outward
267 ML perturbations, individuals with knee OA showed very comparable reactive stepping responses to
268 healthy individuals. In both groups, slip perturbations resulted in a lower AP MoS, and longer step
269 lengths with shorter step times during the first step after perturbation. In the second step after slip
270 perturbation, there was a decrease in step length and step time, which was marginally larger in
271 individuals with knee OA than in healthy individuals. Trip perturbations resulted in a lower AP MoS,

272 and shorter steps with shorter step times in the first step after perturbation in both groups. This initial
273 response was followed by longer steps with longer step times in the second step after perturbation,
274 with individuals with knee OA showing a slightly smaller increase in step length.

275 Thus, in contrast to our hypothesis, we did not find convincing evidence for impaired reactive
276 stepping responses to gait perturbations in individuals with end-stage knee OA. None of the
277 perturbation modes resulted in group differences in MoS, which was our main outcome of interest.
278 Although it could be argued that taking relatively faster and shorter steps to regain stability – as we
279 found after AP perturbations – may be indicative of poorer balance control (44), these group
280 differences were very small (i.e. 2 cm for step length and 0.02 s for step time). Two main explanations
281 for minor differences between groups can be postulated. To begin with, individuals with knee OA in
282 our study may not have had gait instability, or had only minor localized impairments that they
283 effectively compensated for. Alternatively, our experimental paradigm may not have been challenging
284 enough to trigger large enough balance threats and elucidate instability in the knee OA group. Both
285 options are discussed below.

286 Given that knee OA leads to a reduced number of mechanoreceptors in the knee capsule and
287 ligaments (45), reduced proprioception (3), lower quadriceps strength (1), and pain, it would be
288 expected that individuals with knee OA have poorer stability than healthy older adults. While postural
289 sway during quiet standing was indeed higher in individuals with knee OA (46, 47), and local dynamic
290 stability tended to be lower during unperturbed walking when compared to healthy adults (5), these
291 reported differences were relatively small. Moreover, it is yet unclear if deviations in these type of
292 balance metrics translate to problems with recovery from external perturbations. So far, studies
293 investigating responses to perturbations in individuals with knee OA have shown mixed results (24-
294 29). For example, Schrijvers *et al.* found larger knee flexion angles and increased co-contraction after
295 AP perturbations in individuals with knee OA with self-reported instability (25). Pater *et al.* found a
296 less optimal recovery strategy from trips over an obstacle during overground walking in individuals
297 with mild to moderate knee OA compared to their healthy peers (27), although the number of fallers
298 after perturbation was similar between groups. In contrast, Kumar *et al.* (28) and Baker *et al.* (29)

299 found no effect of moderate to severe knee OA on change in knee muscle activation and knee
300 kinematics after ML gait perturbations (i.e. 5.8 cm and 3 cm, respectively). Interestingly, none of these
301 studies focused on whole body movement. It may thus well be that individuals with knee OA use
302 adaptations in knee joint kinematics and muscle activation to achieve similar reactive stepping
303 responses as healthy individuals. Moreover, to overcome poorer proprioception due to knee OA, the
304 redundancy of afferent input to and processing within the sensorimotor control system can be
305 exploited (28, 48). By using sensory reweighting, individuals with knee OA may rely more on
306 somatosensory information from other, unaffected structures (49). In light of our results, dynamic
307 balance control may thus still be maintained in individuals with knee OA. Our observation that – in
308 this study – fall rates of individuals with knee OA were relatively low and comparable to healthy
309 individuals further supports that individuals with knee OA in this study may not have had gait stability
310 problems.

311 A second explanation for the absence of evident instability in the knee OA group could be that
312 the perturbation was insufficiently destabilizing. That is, the ML and AP MoS values before onset of
313 the perturbations in both study groups were higher than (or close to) the perturbed distance (i.e. 4.5 cm
314 for ML perturbations and 12.5 cm for AP perturbations), indicating that there was already some room
315 to cope with these perturbations at baseline. Since the current perturbations were relatively well
316 tolerated by individuals with knee OA, a larger intensity perturbation with potentially better
317 discriminatory capacity may have been feasible. Despite this point, our perturbation paradigm led to
318 clear adaptations in the gait pattern, suggesting that it did challenge the sensorimotor control system.
319 Moreover, responses to these perturbations seem to be robust, as they were comparable to perturbation
320 responses of healthy young (12, 15, 50, 51) and older adults (15, 50) in previous studies with very
321 similar paradigms. Although it might be expected that these paradigms would result in different
322 responses in groups with evident balance problems, this is not yet confirmed in the literature.

323 This study had a number of limitations that warrant mentioning. First, standardization of
324 walking speed may have led to unnatural walking behavior in some participants as well as differences
325 in experienced difficulty between study groups. Nonetheless, standardization was necessary to

326 separate a potentially confounding influence of walking speed from the effects of knee OA on reactive
327 stepping responses. Moreover, the fixed walking speed was very close to the comfortable walking
328 speed of individuals with knee OA. Secondly, our sample of individuals with unilateral, end-stage
329 knee OA who were scheduled for cruciate retaining total knee arthroplasty may not be representative
330 of all individuals with knee OA. Given that our study group was relatively active, did not have
331 complaints in other joints, and fall rates were low, generalization of our results to the whole knee OA
332 population should be done cautiously.

333

334 **5. Conclusions**

335 Despite considerable knee pain and structural damage to the knee joint, whole-body responses
336 to gait perturbations in individuals with knee OA were not substantially different from healthy
337 individuals. Our results indicate that gait stability in people with knee OA is relatively unimpaired.

338

339 **Acknowledgements**

340 We want to thank Saskia Susan and Jolanda Rubrech for their contribution to patient
341 recruitment and data management, Bart Nienhuis for his contribution to experimental design, and
342 Steven Teerenstra for his advice on statistical analysis.

343

344 **Funding**

345 Smith & Nephew sponsored this study. The funders had no role in the design and conduct of
346 this study.

347

348 **References**

- 349 1. Hoops ML, Rosenblatt NJ, Hurt CP, Crenshaw J, Grabiner MD. Does Lower Extremity
350 Osteoarthritis Exacerbate Risk Factors for Falls in Older Adults? *Women's Health*. 2012;8(6):685-98.
- 351 2. Shakoor N, Agrawal A, Block JA. Reduced lower extremity vibratory perception in
352 osteoarthritis of the knee. *Arthritis Rheum*. 2008;59(1):117-21.
- 353 3. Knoop J, Steultjens MP, van der Leeden M, van der Esch M, Thorstensson CA, Roorda LD, et
354 al. Proprioception in knee osteoarthritis: a narrative review. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage*. 2011;19(4):381-8.
- 355 4. Hortobágyi T, Garry J, Holbert D, Devita P. Aberrations in the control of quadriceps muscle
356 force in patients with knee osteoarthritis. *Arthritis Rheum*. 2004;51(4):562-9.
- 357 5. Mahmoudian A, Bruijn SM, Yakhdani HRF, Meijer OG, Verschueren SMP, van Dieën JH.
358 Phase-dependent changes in local dynamic stability during walking in elderly with and without knee
359 osteoarthritis. *Journal of Biomechanics*. 2016;49(1):80-6.
- 360 6. Ng CT, Tan MP. Osteoarthritis and falls in the older person. *Age and Ageing*. 2013;42(5):561-
361 6.
- 362 7. Prieto-Alhambra D, Nogues X, Javaid MK, Wyman A, Arden NK, Azagra R, et al. An
363 increased rate of falling leads to a rise in fracture risk in postmenopausal women with self-reported
364 osteoarthritis: a prospective multinational cohort study (GLOW). *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases*.
365 2013;72(6):911.
- 366 8. Smith TO, Higson E, Pearson M, Mansfield M. Is there an increased risk of falls and fractures
367 in people with early diagnosed hip and knee osteoarthritis? Data from the Osteoarthritis Initiative. *Int J*
368 *Rheum Dis*. 2018;21(6):1193-201.
- 369 9. van Schoor NM, Dennison E, Castell MV, Cooper C, Edwards MH, Maggi S, et al. Clinical
370 osteoarthritis of the hip and knee and fall risk: The role of low physical functioning and pain
371 medication. *Semin Arthritis Rheum*. 2020;50(3):380-6.
- 372 10. Doré AL, Golightly YM, Mercer VS, Shi XA, Renner JB, Jordan JM, et al. Lower-extremity
373 osteoarthritis and the risk of falls in a community-based longitudinal study of adults with and without
374 osteoarthritis. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken)*. 2015;67(5):633-9.
- 375 11. Bruijn SM, Meijer OG, Beek PJ, van Dieën JH. Assessing the stability of human locomotion:
376 a review of current measures. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface*. 2013;10(83):20120999.

- 377 12. Afschrift M, Pitto L, Aerts W, van Deursen R, Jonkers I, De Groot F. Modulation of gluteus
378 medius activity reflects the potential of the muscle to meet the mechanical demands during perturbed
379 walking. *Scientific Reports*. 2018;8(1):11675.
- 380 13. McCrum C, Karamanidis K, Grendonk L, Zijlstra W, Meijer K. Older adults demonstrate
381 interlimb transfer of reactive gait adaptations to repeated unpredictable gait perturbations.
382 *Geroscience*. 2020;42(1):39-49.
- 383 14. Vlutters M, van Asseldonk EH, van der Kooij H. Center of mass velocity-based predictions in
384 balance recovery following pelvis perturbations during human walking. *J Exp Biol*. 2016;219(Pt
385 10):1514-23.
- 386 15. Roeles S, Rowe PJ, Bruijn SM, Childs CR, Tarfali GD, Steenbrink F, et al. Gait stability in
387 response to platform, belt, and sensory perturbations in young and older adults. *Med Biol Eng*
388 *Comput*. 2018;56(12):2325-35.
- 389 16. van Mierlo M, Ambrosius JJ, Vlutters M, van Asseldonk EHF, van der Kooij H. Recovery
390 from sagittal-plane whole body angular momentum perturbations during walking. *Journal of*
391 *Biomechanics*. 2022;141:111169.
- 392 17. van den Bogaart M, Bruijn SM, van Dieën JH, Meyns P. The effect of anteroposterior
393 perturbations on the control of the center of mass during treadmill walking. *Journal of Biomechanics*.
394 2020;103:109660.
- 395 18. Hof AL, Gazendam MGJ, Sinke WE. The condition for dynamic stability. *Journal of*
396 *Biomechanics*. 2005;38(1):1-8.
- 397 19. O'Connor SM, Kuo AD. Direction-dependent control of balance during walking and standing.
398 *J Neurophysiol*. 2009;102(3):1411-9.
- 399 20. Collins SH, Kuo AD. Two independent contributions to step variability during over-ground
400 human walking. *PLoS One*. 2013;8(8):e73597.
- 401 21. McGeer T. Passive Dynamic Walking. *The International Journal of Robotics Research*.
402 1990;9(2):62-82.
- 403 22. van Leeuwen M, Bruijn S, van Dieën J. Mechanisms that stabilize human walking. *Brazilian*
404 *Journal of Motor Behavior*. 2022;16(5):326-51.

- 405 23. Bruijn SM, van Dieën JH. Control of human gait stability through foot placement. *J R Soc*
406 *Interface*. 2018;15(143).
- 407 24. Ren X, Lutter C, Keibach M, Bruhn S, Yang Q, Bader R, et al. Compensatory Responses
408 During Slip-Induced Perturbation in Patients With Knee Osteoarthritis Compared With Healthy Older
409 Adults: An Increased Risk of Falls? *Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology*. 2022;10.
- 410 25. Schrijvers JC, van den Noort JC, van der Esch M, Harlaar J. Neuromechanical assessment of
411 knee joint instability during perturbed gait in patients with knee osteoarthritis. *Journal of*
412 *Biomechanics*. 2021;118:110325.
- 413 26. Elkarif V, Kandel L, Rand D, Schwartz I, Greenberg A, Portnoy S. Kinematics following gait
414 perturbation in adults with knee osteoarthritis: Scheduled versus not scheduled for knee arthroplasty.
415 *Gait & Posture*. 2020;81:144-52.
- 416 27. Pater ML, Rosenblatt NJ, Grabiner MD. Knee osteoarthritis negatively affects the recovery
417 step following large forward-directed postural perturbations. *Journal of Biomechanics*.
418 2016;49(7):1128-33.
- 419 28. Kumar D, Swanik C, Reisman DS, Rudolph KS. Individuals with medial knee osteoarthritis
420 show neuromuscular adaptation when perturbed during walking despite functional and structural
421 impairments. *Journal of Applied Physiology*. 2013;116(1):13-23.
- 422 29. Baker M, Stanish W, Rutherford D. Walking challenges in moderate knee osteoarthritis: A
423 biomechanical and neuromuscular response to medial walkway surface translations. *Human*
424 *Movement Science*. 2019;68:102542.
- 425 30. McCrum C, Willems P, Karamanidis K, Meijer K. Stability-normalised walking speed: A new
426 approach for human gait perturbation research. *Journal of Biomechanics*. 2019;87:48-53.
- 427 31. Orendurff MS, Segal AD, Klute GK, Berge JS, Rohr ES, Kadel NJ. The effect of walking
428 speed on center of mass displacement. *J Rehabil Res Dev*. 2004;41(6a):829-34.
- 429 32. Boekesteijn RJ, van Gerven J, Geurts ACH, Smulders K. Objective gait assessment in
430 individuals with knee osteoarthritis using inertial sensors: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Gait*
431 *& Posture*. 2022;98:109-20.

- 432 33. Boekesteijn RJ, Keijsers NLW, Defoort K, Mancini M, Bruning FJ, El-Gohary M, et al. Real-
433 world gait and turning in individuals scheduled for total knee arthroplasty. medRxiv.
434 2023:2023.09.13.23295243.
- 435 34. Kellgren JH, Lawrence JS. Radiological assessment of osteo-arthrosis. *Ann Rheum Dis*.
436 1957;16(4):494-502.
- 437 35. Perruccio AV, Stefan Lohmander L, Canizares M, Tennant A, Hawker GA, Conaghan PG, et
438 al. The development of a short measure of physical function for knee OA KOOS-Physical Function
439 Shortform (KOOS-PS) - an OARSI/OMERACT initiative. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage*. 2008;16(5):542-
440 50.
- 441 36. Insall JN, Dorr LD, Scott RD, Scott WN. Rationale of the Knee Society clinical rating system.
442 *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 1989(248):13-4.
- 443 37. Lamb SE, Jørstad-Stein EC, Hauer K, Becker C, on behalf of the Prevention of Falls Network
444 E, Outcomes Consensus G. Development of a Common Outcome Data Set for Fall Injury Prevention
445 Trials: The Prevention of Falls Network Europe Consensus. *Journal of the American Geriatrics*
446 *Society*. 2005;53(9):1618-22.
- 447 38. Davis RB, Öunpuu S, Tyburski D, Gage JR. A gait analysis data collection and reduction
448 technique. *Human Movement Science*. 1991;10(5):575-87.
- 449 39. Tisserand R, Robert T, Dumas R, Chèze L. A simplified marker set to define the center of
450 mass for stability analysis in dynamic situations. *Gait & Posture*. 2016;48:64-7.
- 451 40. Hak L, Houdijk H, Beek PJ, van Dieën JH. Steps to Take to Enhance Gait Stability: The
452 Effect of Stride Frequency, Stride Length, and Walking Speed on Local Dynamic Stability and
453 Margins of Stability. *PLOS ONE*. 2013;8(12):e82842.
- 454 41. Boekesteijn RJ, Smolders JMH, Busch VJFF, Geurts ACH, Smulders K. Independent and
455 sensitive gait parameters for objective evaluation in knee and hip osteoarthritis using wearable sensors.
456 *BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders*. 2021;22(1):242.
- 457 42. Zeni JA, Jr., Richards JG, Higginson JS. Two simple methods for determining gait events
458 during treadmill and overground walking using kinematic data. *Gait Posture*. 2008;27(4):710-4.

- 459 43. McIlroy WE, Maki BE. Adaptive changes to compensatory stepping responses. *Gait &*
460 *Posture*. 1995;3(1):43-50.
- 461 44. Maki BE, McIlroy WE. Control of rapid limb movements for balance recovery: age-related
462 changes and implications for fall prevention. *Age and Ageing*. 2006;35(suppl_2):ii12-ii8.
- 463 45. Çabuk H, Kuşku Çabuk F, Tekin AÇ, Dedeoğlu SS, Çakar M, Büyükkurt CD. Lower numbers
464 of mechanoreceptors in the posterior cruciate ligament and anterior capsule of the osteoarthritic knees.
465 *Knee Surgery, Sports Traumatology, Arthroscopy*. 2017;25(10):3146-54.
- 466 46. Hassan BS, Mockett S, Doherty M. Static postural sway, proprioception, and maximal
467 voluntary quadriceps contraction in patients with knee osteoarthritis and normal control subjects.
468 *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases*. 2001;60(6):612.
- 469 47. Hinman RS, Bennell KL, Metcalf BR, Crossley KM. Balance impairments in individuals with
470 symptomatic knee osteoarthritis: a comparison with matched controls using clinical tests.
471 *Rheumatology*. 2002;41(12):1388-94.
- 472 48. Barry BK, Sturnieks DL. How important are perturbation responses and joint proprioception
473 to knee osteoarthritis? *Journal of Applied Physiology*. 2014;116(1):1-2.
- 474 49. Mahmoudian A, van Dieen JH, Baert IAC, Jonkers I, Bruijn SM, Luyten FP, et al. Changes in
475 proprioceptive weighting during quiet standing in women with early and established knee
476 osteoarthritis compared to healthy controls. *Gait & Posture*. 2016;44:184-8.
- 477 50. McIntosh EI, Zettel JL, Vallis LA. Stepping Responses in Young and Older Adults Following
478 a Perturbation to the Support Surface During Gait. *J Mot Behav*. 2017;49(3):288-98.
- 479 51. Li J, Huang HJ. Small directional treadmill perturbations induce differential gait stability
480 adaptation. *Journal of Neurophysiology*. 2021;127(1):38-55.

481

482

483 **Tables**

484 **Table 1:** Baseline characteristics of both study groups.

Parameter	Knee OA (n=35)	Controls (n=32)	Mean difference [95 % CI]
Age (y)	65 (9)	64 (10)	1 [-4 ; 5]
Sex (M:F)	14:21	13:19	-
Body height (m)	1.73 (0.11)	1.75 (0.07)	-0.02 [-0.06; 0.03]
Body mass (kg)	86 (15)	75 (11)	11 [4; 17]
BMI (kg/m ²)	28.5 (3.3)	24.6 (3.1)	3.9 [2.3; 5.4]
KL score (I:II:III:IV)	0:0:10:25	-	-
KOOS-PS (0-100)	54 (13)	-	-
NRS pain at rest (0-10)	4.1 (2.4)	0.5 (1.0)	3.6 [2.7; 4.5]
NRS pain during activity (0-10)	6.2 (2.0)	0.7 (1.0)	5.5 [4.7; 6.3]
Comfortable walking speed (m/s)	0.95 (0.19)	1.16 (0.19)	-0.21 [-0.30; -0.11]
Number of falls per participant during preceding 3 months (0:1:2:3)	31:3:1:0	30:1:0:1	-

485 *Note:* BMI = body mass index, KL = Kellgren Lawrence, KOOS-PS = Knee Osteoarthritis Outcome Score – Physical
 486 Function Shortform, NRS = numeric rating scale.
 487 KOOS-PS scores were transformed to a 0-100 scale with a score of 100 representing no difficulty. For the KSS, only the
 488 clinical and functional score were obtained, rated on a 0-100 scale with 100 representing best function. For NRS pain ratings,
 489 0 represented no pain and 10 the worst possible pain.

Table 2: Output of the linear regression models for ML gait perturbations.

Parameter		<i>Inward affected</i>			<i>Outward affected</i>		
		Group Effect		Estimated delta score	Group Effect		Estimated delta score
		β (95% CI)	P-value		β (95% CI)	P-value	
ML MoS (m)	Post 1	-0.01 (-0.03, 0.01)	0.282	-0.03 (-0.04, -0.02)	-0.00 (-0.01, 0.01)	0.790	0.03 (0.02, 0.03)
	Post 2	0.00 (-0.01, 0.01)	0.579	0.01 (0.01, 0.02)	0.00 (-0.01, 0.01)	0.674	-0.00 (-0.01, 0.00)
Step width (m)	Post 1	-0.00 (-0.02, 0.01)	0.866	-0.09 (-0.10, -0.08)	-0.01 (-0.02, 0.01)	0.263	0.07 (0.06, 0.08)
	Post 2	-0.01 (-0.04, 0.02)	0.565	-0.09 (-0.10, -0.07)	-0.01 (-0.03, 0.01)	0.436	0.09 (0.08, 0.10)
Step length (m)	Post 1	-0.00 (-0.01, 0.01)	0.971	0.01 (0.00, 0.01)	0.00 (-0.01, 0.02)	0.639	-0.06 (-0.07, -0.06)
	Post 2	-0.02 (-0.04, 0.00)	0.096	-0.01 (-0.02, 0.00)	0.02 (-0.05, 0.00)	0.060	-0.07 (-0.08, -0.06)
Step time (s)	Post 1	-0.01 (-0.02, 0.00)	0.091	0.00 (-0.00, 0.01)	0.01 (-0.01, 0.00)	0.130	-0.02 (-0.03, -0.02)
	Post 2	-0.01 (-0.02, 0.01)	0.404	-0.01 (-0.01, -0.00)	-0.01 (-0.03, 0.00)	0.192	-0.05 (-0.05, -0.04)

Data are presented as mean difference (95% CI).

Table 3: Output of the linear regression models for AP gait perturbations.

Parameter		<i>Slip affected</i>			<i>Trip affected</i>		
		Group Effect		Estimated delta score	Group Effect		Estimated delta score
		β (95% CI)	P-value		β (95% CI)	P-value	
AP MoS (m)	Post 1	-0.00 (-0.01, 0.01)	0.762	-0.05 (-0.05, -0.04)	0.01 (-0.01, 0.03)	0.274	-0.03 (-0.04, -0.02)
	Post 2	-0.00 (-0.02, 0.01)	0.616	0.03 (0.02, 0.04)	-0.01 (-0.02, 0.01)	0.355	-0.06 (-0.07, -0.05)
Step width (m)	Post 1	-0.00 (-0.01, 0.01)	0.981	-0.01 (-0.02, -0.01)	-0.00 (-0.01, 0.01)	0.880	0.02 (0.01, 0.02)
	Post 2	-0.00 (-0.02, 0.01)	0.733	0.02 (0.01, 0.02)	-0.01 (-0.02, 0.01)	0.316	0.02 (0.01, 0.02)
Step length (m)	Post 1	0.00 (-0.01, 0.02)	0.710	0.10 (0.09, 0.10)	0.01 (-0.02, 0.05)	0.439	-0.18 (-0.19, -0.16)
	Post 2	-0.02 (-0.05, -0.00)	0.045	HC: -0.04 (-0.06, -0.02) Knee OA: -0.07 (-0.08, -0.05)	-0.02 (-0.05, -0.00)	0.034	HC: 0.06 (0.04, 0.08) Knee OA: 0.04 (0.02, 0.05)
Step time (s)	Post 1	-0.00 (-0.01, 0.01)	0.570	-0.02 (-0.02, -0.02)	-0.01 (-0.02, 0.01)	0.484	-0.01 (-0.02, -0.00)
	Post 2	-0.02 (-0.04, -0.00)	0.028	HC: -0.08 (-0.09, -0.07) Knee OA: -0.10 (-0.11, -0.08)	0.01 (-0.01, 0.03)	0.273	0.04 (0.03, 0.05)

Data are presented as mean difference (95% CI).

Figure legends

Figure 1: Overview of the experimental design. Definitions of the different perturbation modes are provided in panel A. Panel B shows the perturbation profiles for mediolateral and anteroposterior perturbations. $T=0$, indicated by the gray line, corresponds to the heel contact of the perturbed leg. In panel C, the design of the mediolateral and anteroposterior perturbation sequences are shown, with each color representing a unique perturbation mode.

Figure 2: Simplified overview of the definition of the margin of stability in the ML and AP direction. AP MoS was calculated in the forward direction, meaning that AP MoS is positive when XCoM was behind the toe marker.


Figure 3: Trajectories of mean center of mass (CoM) and extrapolated center of mass (XCoM) from two steps before until five steps after gait perturbations. Mean values are indicated by the solid and dotted lines. Shaded areas around the extrapolated XCoM represent the standard deviation. Duration of the perturbation ('pert') is highlighted by the grey area. For mediolateral perturbations, belt displacement is also indicated by a black line within the grey area.

Figure 4: Discrete gait parameters before and after mediolateral gait perturbations. Mean values are indicated by the large white dots, with error bars reflecting the standard deviation. Individual observations are shown with larger transparency. The instance of perturbation is indicated by the black vertical line. Steps before perturbation (i.e. step -2 & step -1) were combined into a baseline score for statistical analysis. *Note:* * significantly different from baseline


Figure 5: Discrete gait parameters before and after anteroposterior gait perturbations.. Mean values are indicated by the large white dots, with error bars reflecting the standard deviation. Individual observations are shown with larger transparency. The instance of perturbation is indicated by the black vertical line. Steps before perturbation (i.e. step -2 & step -1) were combined into a baseline score for statistical analysis. *Note:* * significantly different from baseline, # significantly different between groups.

A)

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.04.23296525>; this version posted October 5, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



B)



C)

