



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 ( $26\pm 21$ mm more lateral) than the conventional method ( $38\pm 21$ 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  $15 \pm 2$  years, height  $1.68 \pm 0.06$  m, weight  $57.6 \pm 13.0$  kg, and BMI  $20.2 \pm 3.8$  kg/m<sup>2</sup>.  
187 Median femoral anteversion angle on CT was  $34.6^\circ$  (range:  $-26.7 - 63.2$ ). Two adolescents presented  
188 with increased femoral retroversion (i.e.  $-26.7$  and  $-6.8^\circ$ ), 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  $170 \pm 13$  mm using CT,  $132 \pm 20$  mm using the conventional

196 calibration methods, and  $196 \pm 21$  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  $3.3^\circ$  (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  $2.5^\circ$  (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 Steenbakkens (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.

<b>Parameter</b>	<b>Adolescents with rotational deformity of femur (n=24)</b>
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
<b>Full sample (n=24)</b>				
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)
<b>Post-hoc analysis (n=22)</b>				
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

