

1 Title: What are the best indicators of myoelectric manifestation of fatigue?

2 Authors: Elvige Ornella Fegni Ndam^{1,2*}, Étienne Goubault^{1,2}, Béatrice Moyen-Sylvestre^{1,2},
3 Julie N. Côté³, Jason Bouffard⁴, Fabien Dal Maso^{1,2}

4 Affiliations:

5 ¹School of Kinesiology and Physical Activity Science, Université de Montreal, Montreal, QC,
6 Canada

7 ²Centre Interdisciplinaire de Recherche sur le Cerveau et l'Apprentissage, Montreal, Canada

8 ³Department of Kinesiology and Physical Education, McGill University, Montreal, Canada

9 ⁴Department of Kinesiology, Université Laval, Quebec, Canada

10 *Corresponding author

11 **Abstract**

12 The myoelectric manifestation of fatigue (MMF) is predominantly assessed using median
13 frequency and amplitude of electromyographic (EMG) signals. However, EMG has complex
14 features so that fractals, correlation, entropy, and chaos MMF indicators were introduced to
15 detect alteration of EMG features caused by muscle fatigue that may not be detected by linear
16 indicators. The aim of this study was to determine the best MMF indicators. Twenty-four
17 participants were equipped with EMG sensors on 9 shoulder muscles and performed a
18 repetitive pointing task. They reported their rate of perceived exertion every 30 seconds and
19 were stopped when they reached 8 or higher on the CR10 Borg scale. Partial least square
20 regression was used to predict perceived exertion through 15 MMF indicators. In addition, the
21 proportion of participants with a significant change between task initiation and termination
22 was determined for each MMF indicator and muscle. The PLSR model explained 73% of the
23 perceived exertion variance. Median frequency, mobility, spectral entropy, fuzzy entropy, and
24 Higuchi fractal dimension had the greatest importance to predict perceived exertion and
25 changed for 83.5% participants on average between task initiation and termination for the
26 anterior and medial deltoids. The amplitude, activity, approximate, sample, and multiscale
27 entropy, degree of multifractality, percent determinism and recurrent, correlation dimension,
28 and largest Lyapunov exponent analysis MMF indicators were not efficient to assess MMF.
29 Mobility, spectral entropy, fuzzy entropy, and Higuchi fractal dimension should be further
30 considered to assess muscle fatigue and their combination with median frequency may further

31 **NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**
improve the assessment of muscle fatigue.

- 1 **Keywords:** Electromyography; Repetitive pointing task, Perception of effort, Time-frequency
- 2 analysis, Complexity, Non-linear analysis.

1 1 **Introduction**

2 Muscle fatigue is defined as a transient decrease in the capacity to perform physical actions
3 [1]. Since muscle fatigue is not a physical variable by itself, its assessment requires the
4 identification of indicators based on measurable physical variables such as force, kinematics,
5 or electromyography (EMG) [2–4]. Myoelectric manifestations of fatigue (MMF) [5,6],
6 measured from EMG signals, have numerous advantages such as non-invasiveness,
7 applicability in situ [7], real-time monitoring [8], and ability to monitor fatigue of a particular
8 muscle [9]. Considering that wearable sensors are now common in the workplace [10–12],
9 high standard of data processing is required to extract accurate MMF information from EMG
10 signal and better prevent work-related musculoskeletal disorders due to muscle fatigue
11 [11,13].

12 A consensual approach to assess MMF is the Joint Analysis of Spectrum and Amplitude
13 (JASA) method [14]. As the name would suggest, JASA is a computational technique that
14 accounts for both the spectrum and amplitude of EMG signal. According to this method,
15 muscle fatigue is characterized by a power spectrum shift toward lower frequency and
16 amplitude increase of EMG signals. The shift of power spectrum toward lower frequency,
17 measured via the median frequency [15,16], is attributable to the increase in motor unit
18 synchronization [17,18] and the decrease of muscle fibers conduction velocity [6,17] possibly
19 triggered by altered distribution of H⁺ and K⁺ ions across the sarcolemma [19] and muscle
20 membrane excitability that increase the duration of intracellular action potentials [20].
21 Regarding amplitude increase, measured by the EMG activation level, it is attributable to the
22 reduction of motor units firing rate and their increased synchronization [20,21]. However,
23 changes in EMG activation level may not systematically reflect muscle fatigue, but rather
24 strategies of motor unit rotation triggered by sensations related to general fatigue [22,23].
25 Indeed, some studies have reported a decrease of EMG activation level with fatigue during
26 low load fatiguing manual handling tasks [24] or no change during repetitive static arm
27 abductions [25] and repetitive work in butchers [26]. Consequently, the JASA method may
28 provide false negative results considering that the EMG activation level does not
29 systematically increase in the presence of muscle fatigue.

30 Linear indicators, such as median frequency and activation level, are based on the assumption
31 that EMG signal is a Gaussian random process [27,28], which may have limitations to assess
32 MMF. Indeed, EMG signals, as well as other neurophysiological signals such as
33 electroencephalogram and electrocardiogram [29,30], have complex properties [31–34]. The

1 complexity of the EMG signal is attributed to the mechanisms underlying its generation that
2 contain some non-linear or chaotic features [35,36]. As a result, in recent years, several
3 complexity-based EMG indicators have been introduced [37–41] in order to detect alteration
4 of EMG features caused by muscle fatigue that may not be detected by linear indicators. In a
5 recent literature review, Rampichini et al., [28] classified four groups of complexity-based
6 MMF indicators, namely, fractal and self-similarity, correlation, entropy, and deterministic
7 chaos. The fractal and self-similarity group includes fractal dimension [42] and degree of
8 multifractality. During sustained isometric contractions, fractal dimension was found to
9 decrease with fatigue [18,43–45] while the degree of multifractality increased during
10 fatiguing static and dynamic contractions and was a more sensitive MMF than median
11 frequency [40,46–48]. Moreover Marri and Swaminathan., [49] demonstrated that the
12 performance of multifractal indicators were more suitable for sEMG signals as compared to
13 monofractal fractal dimension indicators such as Higuchi fractal dimension, in their study of
14 the classification of muscular non-fatigue and fatigue conditions using EMG and fractal
15 algorithms. The correlation group includes correlation dimension and recurrence
16 quantification analysis. The latter was shown to increase with muscle fatigue during biceps
17 brachii contractions [33,50,51]. Coelho et al., [34] and Ito et al.,[52] even showed that
18 recurrence quantification analysis was better at detecting muscle fatigue than frequency-based
19 indicators. Although there is no evidence to date that correlation dimension is a relevant
20 indicator of MMF, Wang et al., [28] suggested that it may be a good candidate to assess
21 muscle fatigue. The entropy group includes sample entropy, fuzzy entropy, spectral entropy,
22 approximate entropy, and multiscale entropy that all have showed to decrease during fatiguing
23 isometric [53–55] and dynamic contractions [48,56]. Particularly, fuzzy and multiscale
24 entropy were found to have a superior robustness and performance to assess MMF than
25 frequency-based [54] and approximate and sample entropy indicator [57,58]. Finally, the
26 chaotic properties of a non-linear system can be assessed through the largest Lyapunov
27 exponent [59] that was shown to decrease during a fatiguing task involving the low back
28 muscles [60]. However, as stated by Rampichini et al., [28], future standardized fatiguing
29 protocols are needed to confirm whether the largest Lyapunov exponent could be an
30 appropriate indicator to assess MMF. Taken together, the literature on the identification of
31 muscle fatigue based on EMG signal has shown that complexity-based indicators seemed
32 efficient to detect MMF. Consequently, it is now essential to determine what are the best
33 MMF indicators to assess muscle fatigue during multi-joint movement such as repetitive
34 fatiguing tasks.

1 To this end, an interesting approach is to predict the rate of perceived exertion (RPE), which
2 is known to increase with muscle fatigue [61], from MMF indicators. Interestingly, several
3 studies have also shown a close relationship between the RPE [62] and MMF indicators
4 [24,63–68]. For instance, Goubault et al., [24] used correlation analyses between six MMF
5 indicators and RPE scores assessed using the CR-10 Borg scale [69] during a laboratory
6 simulated manual handling task. They showed that spectral entropy, median frequency, and
7 mobility were the MMF indicators that explained the largest percentage of the RPE variance,
8 with R-square ranging from 11% to 39%. In comparison, activity explained between 17% and
9 21% of the RPE variance, and activation level showed no significant relationship with the
10 RPE [56,70,71]. In a recent study, Ni et al., [68] showed that time, frequency, and time-
11 frequency domains MMF indicators are strongly correlated to RPE. Consequently, predicting
12 RPE through MMF indicators is a relevant experimental paradigm to determine the best
13 EMG-based indicators to assess muscle fatigue.

14 Consequently, the aim of the present study was to determine the best MMF indicators, from
15 15 MMF indicators identified in the literature as potentially relevant to assess muscle fatigue
16 during a repetitive pointing task (RPT) performed with the upper limb. We hypothesized that
17 for the anterior and medial deltoids, which are the muscles showing the largest signs of
18 fatigue during the upper limb repetitive task used in the present studies [72–74], the mobility,
19 median frequency, spectral entropy, fuzzy entropy, multiscale entropy [24,28,41,75,76], and
20 degree of multifractality [40,47,49,53] will have greater importance to predict the evolution of
21 the RPE. In addition, these MMF indicators will significantly change for a large proportion of
22 the participants in the anterior and medial deltoid in comparison to approximate and sample
23 entropy, recurrence quantification analysis, correlation dimension, and the largest Lyapunov
24 exponent [28,40,46,55].

25 2 **Materials and methods**

26 **2.1 Participants**

27 Twenty-four right-handed participants (12 ♀; age: 32.9 ± 8.9 years old; mass: 66.8 ± 10.9 kg;
28 height: 166 ± 9 cm) were recruited among workers exposed to repetitive tasks in a tea
29 packaging factory. To be eligible, participants had to be free of upper-limb disabilities or
30 musculoskeletal disorders at the time of the experiment. All participants read and signed a
31 written informed consent form before any experimental procedure. The experimental protocol
32 was approved by the Université de Montréal's Ethics Committee (#CERC-19-086-D).

1 **2.2 Instrumentation**

2 *EMG recordings.* Participants were equipped with 10 wireless surface EMG electrodes
3 (Trigno EMG Wireless System, Delsys, USA) positioned on specific anatomical landmarks of
4 the right side of the upper limb [77,78]; namely, the anterior, medial, and posterior deltoids,
5 the upper, middle, and lower trapezius, long head of the biceps brachii, lateral head of the
6 triceps brachii and the serratus (Figure 1-A). Before electrode positioning, hair was shaved
7 with a razor and skin was cleaned with alcohol swabs at the electrode sites. EMG signals were
8 recorded at a sampling frequency of 2000 Hz.

9 *Repetitive pointing task (RPT).* Two cylindrical touch-sensitive sensors (length: 6 cm, radius:
10 0.5 cm, Quantum Research Group Ltd, Hamble, UK) were used as proximal and distal targets
11 for the RPT (Figure 1-B and C). The sensors were placed at shoulder height in front of the
12 participant's midline and at 30% (proximal target) and 100% (distal target) of the chest-arm
13 distance. When participants touched the sensors, they delivered auditory feedback that helped
14 participants to synchronize with the metronome as well as a transistor-transistor logic pulse
15 recorded at 2000 Hz using Nexus software (Vicon, Oxford, UK).

16 *Force.* A unidirectional S-shape load cell (363-D3-300-20P3, InterTechnology Inc., Don
17 Mills, Ontario, Canada) was used to measure the maximal voluntary isometric upward force
18 of the right shoulder. The load cell was attached to a fixed horizontal bar located above the
19 RPT setup (Figure 1-B).

20 **2.3 Experimental protocol**

21 Participants performed a maximal voluntary isometric contraction (MVIC) before and after
22 the RPT described earlier. The MVIC consisted of performing a 3-sec upward maximum
23 contraction against a fixed bar with the arm flexed at 90°. Verbal encouragement was given to
24 participants.

25 The RPT consisted of alternatively pointing the proximal and distal targets with the index
26 finger with the arm constrained to move in a horizontal plane, at a rhythm of one flexion-
27 extension cycle per two seconds [79] with the aid of an external metronome. To this end,
28 participants stood upright with the right arm in horizontal plane and the feet parallel at
29 shoulder width. To ensure that participants maintained their arm horizontal, a mesh barrier
30 was placed under the elbow trajectory. Participants' left arm rested on the side of the body.
31 This task has been shown to fatigue the anterior and medial deltoid [72–74]. Every
32 30 seconds, participants reported their RPE using the CR-10 Borg scale (RPE) [62] without

1 interrupting the RPT movement. Additionally, every 2 minutes, the RPT was interrupted so
2 that participants could perform a MVIC as described above. Immediately after the MVIC,
3 participants resumed the RPT without resting. Participants were asked to “perform the task for
4 as long as possible”. They were stopped as soon as they reached a score of 8 or higher on the
5 RPE scale but were not aware of this stoppage criteria.

6 This figure includes material that was not allowed for preprint. Please, contact the
7 corresponding author to request access to this figure.

8 Figure 1. (A) Participant equipped with EMG’s sensors (black rectangle boxes). (B) Picture of
9 the MVIC setup. (C) Schematic top view of the RPT. Note that data collected from reflective
10 markers are not used in the present study and results obtained from inertial measurements
11 units sensors (orange rectangle boxes) were presented in a previous study [80].

12 **2.4 Data preprocessing**

13 Data processing was performed using Matlab R2019a (The MathWorks Inc., Natick, MA,
14 USA). EMG data were filtered using a 2nd order Butterworth zero-lag 10-400 Hz bandpass
15 filter. Data were then zero-aligned by subtracting the mean signal value and resampled to
16 1000 Hz to reduce computation time. For the calculation on each indicator, each participant's
17 data was segmented into flexion-extension cycles. Each indicator described below was
18 calculated for the 5 cycles preceding each RPE for the PLSR analysis, and for the first 10
19 (RPT initiation) and last 10 (RPT termination) for the analysis of the proportion of change of
20 MMF indicators among participants.

21 **2.4.1 Data processing: linear MMF indicators**

22 *Median frequency* was calculated using the following formula:

$$23 \int_0^{MDF} TFR(t) = \int_{MDF}^{\infty} TFR(t) = \frac{1}{2} \int_1^{\infty} TFR(t) \quad Eq. 1$$

24 *TFR* is the power spectral density calculated in the time-frequency resolution; the time-
25 frequency analysis was performed by applying a continuous Morlet wavelet transform (wave
26 number: 7, frequency range: 1 to 400 Hz in 1 Hz steps) to the pre-processed EMG signals [81]
27 (WavCrossSpec Matlab package), t is a time instant.

28 *Spectral entropy* was computed as follow [24]:

$$29 SpecEn(t) = -\frac{1}{\log(L)} \cdot \sum_{t=1}^n TFR(t) \cdot \log [TFR(t)] \quad Eq. 2$$

1 where, L is the number of spectral components in the EMG spectrum, TFR is a power spectral
2 density calculated in time-frequency, t is a time instant, n is the number of seconds in the trial.
3 *Activation levels* were obtained from 9 Hz low-pass filtering of the full-wave rectified EMG
4 signals normalized by the maximum voluntary muscle activation [24] obtained using the
5 average of the maximum 2-sec non-consecutive window across all MVIC tests.

$$6 \quad \text{Activation level} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{x_1}^{x_2} y_0 \quad \text{Eq. 3}$$

7 where x_1 and x_2 represent the muscle activation segment, N represents the number of
8 elements between x_1 and x_2 , and y_0 represents the normalized EMG envelop of the signal.

9 *Activity* is the measure of the variance (σ_0) of the signal [56,70,71].

10 *Mobility* is defined as the root square of the ratio between the variance of the first derivative
11 of the signal and the variance of the signal [24,56,70,71]. The first-time derivative of the
12 EMG signal was calculated on the entire signal using the following equation:

$$13 \quad EMG'(t) = \frac{EMG(t+1) - EMG(t)}{dt} \quad \text{Eq. 4}$$

14 The variance of the first-time derivative of the EMG signal and the variance of the EMG
15 signal were then calculated on each muscle activation segment, before calculating the root
16 square of the ratio between both.

$$17 \quad \text{Mobility} = \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_1^{x_2}}{\sigma_0^{x_1}}} \quad \text{Eq. 5}$$

18 where $\sigma_1^{x_2}$ represents the variance of the first derivative of the EMG signal for muscle
19 activation segment between x_1 and x_2 , and $\sigma_0^{x_2}$ is the variance of the EMG signal for muscle
20 activation segment between x_1 and x_2 .

21 **2.4.2 Data processing: Non-linear MMF indicators**

22 **2.4.2.1 Fractals Self-Similarity**

23 *Higuchi fractal dimension (HFD)* was computed using the algorithm proposed by Higuchi
24 (1988). Briefly, EMG is analyzed in time, as a sequence of samples $x(1), x(2), \dots, x(N)$, and k
25 new self-similar time series X_k^m constructed as [42,82]:

$$26 \quad X_k^m: x(m), x(m+k), x(m+2k) \dots x(m + \text{int} \left[\frac{N-m}{k} \right] k) \quad \text{Eq. 6}$$

1 for the initial time $m = 1, 2, \dots, k$; the time interval $k = 2, \dots, k_{max}$ [82]; and $Int[r]$ the integer
 2 part of a real number r . Then, the length of every $L_m(k)$ is calculated for each time series or
 3 curves X_k^m as:

$$4 \quad L_m(k) = \frac{1}{k} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{int\left[\frac{N-m}{k}\right]} |x(m+ik) - x(m+(i-1)k)| \right) \frac{N-1}{int\left[\frac{N-m}{k}\right]k} \right] \quad Eq. 7$$

5 and is averaged for all m , therefore forming an average value of a curve length $L(k)$ for each
 6 $k=2, \dots, k_{max}$ such as:

$$7 \quad L(k) = \frac{\sum_{m=1}^k L_m(k)}{k} \quad Eq. 8$$

8 Finally, *HFD* is evaluated as the slope of the best-fit form of $\ln(L(k))$ vs. $\ln(1/k)$:

$$9 \quad HFD = \frac{\ln(L(k))}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{k}\right)} \quad Eq. 9$$

10 *HFD* was calculated using the Higuchi FD Matlab function [83] using $k_{max} = 8$.

11 *Degree of multifractality (DOM)* was calculated from the *multifractal detrended fluctuation*
 12 *analysis (MFDFA)* [40,47]. For an EMG signal $\{x(t), t = 1, 2, \dots, N\}$, *MFDFA* analysis first
 13 involves a random walk construction in this form [84]:

$$14 \quad Y(t) = \sum_{i=1}^t x(i) \quad Eq. 10$$

15 where $\{Y(t), t = 1, 2, \dots, N\}$. Next, a moving average function is computed in a moving
 16 window
 17 represented as:

$$18 \quad \tilde{y}(t) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=-[(n-1)\theta]}^{[(n-1)(1-\theta)]} y(t-k) \quad Eq. 11$$

19 where n is window size, $[(n-1)(1-\theta)]$ is largest integer not greater than x , $[(n-1)\theta]$ is
 20 smallest integer not smaller than x , and θ is a position parameter with value varying in
 21 between 0 and 1. After three more steps consisting on detrending the signal series to get the
 22 residual, then dividing the residual series into M disjoint segment with same size n , where
 23 $M = \frac{N}{n} - 1$, and finally determining the q^{th} order overall fluctuation function, the power law
 24 can be determined by varying the segment size n for fluctuation function as:

$$25 \quad F_q(n) = n^{h(q)} \quad Eq. 12$$

26 The multifractal scaling exponent is given as:

$$27 \quad \tau_{(q)} = qh(q) - D \quad Eq. 13$$

1 where D is the fractal dimension of geometric support of multifractal measure [85]. The
 2 singularity strength function and multifractal spectrum are obtained using Legendre transform
 3 [86] and represented as respectively followed:

$$4 \quad \alpha(q) = \frac{d\tau(q)}{dq} \quad \text{Eq. 14}$$

$$5 \quad f(q) = q\alpha - \tau(q) \quad \text{Eq. 15}$$

6 Finally, the degree of multifractality is measured as the distance between maximum exponent
 7 and minimum exponent in multifractal spectrum:

$$8 \quad DOM = \alpha_{max} - \alpha_{min} \quad \text{Eq. 16}$$

9 For *MFDF* computation, the MF DFA1 MATLAB function was used with a scale q varying
 10 between -10 and 10 with increments of 0.1, and m varying between 2^2 and 2^{12} with
 11 increments of $2^{0.1}$ as input parameters [40,47].

12 **2.4.2.2 Entropy**

13 *Approximate entropy* was computed as follow:

$$14 \quad ApEn(m, r, N) = \frac{1}{N-m} \sum_{i=1}^{N-m} \ln \left(\frac{C_i^m(r)}{C_i^{m+1}(r)} \right) \quad \text{Eq. 17}$$

15 where the embedding dimension $m = 2$, the distance threshold $r = 0.25$ [58], N the number of
 16 sample in the time series, and $C_i^m(r)$ the number of vector $u(i)$ within the distance r from the
 17 template vector $u(i)$ computed as:

$$18 \quad C_i^m(r) = (N - m + 1)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N-m+1} H(r - |d(u(i), u(j))|) \quad \text{Eq. 18}$$

19 with $H()$ being the Heaviside step function where H is 1 if $(r - |d(u(i), u(j))|) \geq 0$ and 0
 20 otherwise. For the computation, the ApEn Matlab function [87] was used with the mentioned
 21 above parameters as input.

22 *Sample entropy* can be defined mathematically by:

$$23 \quad SampEn(m, r, N) = -\ln \left(\frac{B_{m+1}^m(r)}{B_m(r)} \right) \quad \text{Eq. 19}$$

24 with $B_m(r)$ defined as:

$$25 \quad B_m(r) = \frac{1}{N-m} \sum_{i=1}^{N-m} C_i^m(r) \quad \text{Eq. 20}$$

26 where $B_m(r)$ is the number of matches of length m and $B_{m+1}^m(r)$ as the subset of $B_m(r)$ that
 27 also matches for length $m+1$. Here the embedding dimension m is equal to 2 and the tolerance

1 $r = 0.25$ [55,56] and N the number of sample in the time series. For the computation, the
2 SampEn Matlab function [88] was used with the mentioned above parameters as input.

3 *Fuzzy Entropy* was computed as follow [28,54,55]:

$$4 \quad \text{FuzzyEn}(m, n, r, N) = -\ln\left(\frac{C^{m+1}(r)}{C^m(r)}\right) \quad \text{Eq. 21}$$

5 where N is the number of samples in the time series, $C^m(r)$ is the average of $C_i^m(r)$
6 calculated as:

$$7 \quad C_i^m(r) = (N - m + 1)^{-1} \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^{N-m+1} \Omega(d_{ij}^m, r) \quad \text{Eq. 22}$$

8 with

$$9 \quad \Omega(d_{ij}^m, n, r) = \exp(-(d_{ij}^m)^n / r) \quad \text{Eq. 23}$$

10 using an embedding dimension $m = 2$, a power factor $n = 2$ and a tolerance $r = 0.25$
11 [54,55,58]. For the computation, the FuzzyEn Matlab function [89] was used with the
12 mentioned above parameters as input.

13 *Multiscale Sample Entropy* was calculated using the rapid refined composite multiscale
14 sample entropy algorithm (R2CMSE) [53].

$$15 \quad R2CMSE(x, m, r, \tau) = -\ln\left(\frac{\bar{n}_{m+1}^{(\tau)}}{\bar{n}_m^{(\tau)}}\right) \quad \text{Eq. 24}$$

16 with $\bar{n}_{k,i,m}^{(\tau)}$ the number of vector-matching pairs defined as:

$$17 \quad \bar{n}_{k,i,m}^{(\tau)} = \frac{1}{N-m} \bar{n}_{k,i,m}^{(\tau)} \quad \text{Eq. 25}$$

18 where N is the number of sample in the time series, the embedding dimension $m = 2$, a
19 tolerance $r = 0.25$, and a time scale factor $\tau = 20$ [53,90]. For the computation, the R2CMSE
20 Matlab function [53] was used with the mentioned above parameters as input.

21

22 **2.4.2.3 Correlation**

23 *Recurrence Quantification Analysis (RQA)* was performed using the percent of determinism
24 method (%DET) which quantifies the amount of rule-obeying structures present within any
25 physiological signal, and the percent of recurrence (%REC) which quantifies signal
26 correlations in higher dimensional space [28,91].

$$27 \quad RQA(\%DET) = \frac{\sum_{l=\text{min}}^N l \cdot P(l)}{\sum_{i,j}^N R_{i,j}} \quad \text{Eq. 26}$$

$$1 \quad \%REC(\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^N R_{i,j}(\varepsilon) \quad Eq. 27$$

2 where $P(l)$ is the frequency distribution of diagonal lines, with length l an integer number, and
 3 $R_{i,j}$ the Euclidian distance matrix created from the phase space and transformed into a
 4 recurrence plot, using a time delay $\tau = 4ms$ [33,51], an embedding dimension $d = 15$ [51], and
 5 a threshold value $r = 2$ [92]. For the RQA computation, the `RPplot` Matlab function [92] was
 6 first used with the mentioned above parameters as input, before using the `recu_RQA` Matlab
 7 function with $I = 1$.

8 *Correlation dimension* is a measure of the amount of correlation contained in a signal
 9 connected to the fractal dimension. Its estimation requires the calculation of the correlation
 10 integral $C(r)$, which is the mean probability that the states of the dynamical systems at two
 11 different times are close, i.e., within a sphere of radius r in the space of the phases [28]. Given
 12 a time series $g(k)$, the phase space is reconstructed by the vectors:

$$13 \quad G(k) = [h(k), g(k + \tau), \dots, g(k + m - 1)\tau]^T \quad Eq. 28$$

14 with m the embedding dimension and τ a delay. The correlation integral is then estimated by
 15 the sum:

$$16 \quad C(r) = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^N H(r - |G(i) - G(j)|) \quad Eq. 29$$

17 where N is the number of states, and $H()$ the Heaviside function. If $g(k)$ is the output of a
 18 complex system, when N increases and r decreases, $C(r)$ tends to increase as a power of r ,
 19 $C(r) \sim r^{CD}$. The correlation dimension of the system can then be estimated as the slope of the
 20 straight line of best fit in the linear scaling range region in a plot of $\ln(r)$ versus $\ln r$ [28]. For
 21 the *correlation dimension* computation, the `correlationDimension` Matlab function was used.

22 **2.4.2.4 Chaos**

23 *Largest Lyapunov exponent* can be calculated using the Rosenstein's method as follow
 24 (Rosenstein, Collins, et De Luca 1993; Chakraborty et Parbat 2017; Rampichini et al. 2020):

$$25 \quad d(t) = C e^{\lambda_1 \Delta t} \quad Eq. 30$$

$$26 \quad d_j(i) \approx C_j e^{\lambda_1(i\Delta t)} \quad Eq. 31$$

27 where $d(t)$ is the average divergence at time t , and C is a constant that normalizes the initial
 28 separation. By taking logarithm of both sides of the equation above, we obtain:

$$29 \quad \ln d_j(i) \approx \ln C_j + \lambda_1(i\Delta t) \quad Eq. 32$$

1 It represents a set of approximately parallel lines (for $j=1, 2, \dots, M$), each with a slope roughly
2 proportional to λ_1 . The largest Lyapunov exponent is easily and accurately calculated using a
3 least-squares fit to the “average” line defined by:

$$4 \quad y(i) = \frac{1}{\Delta t} \langle \ln d_j(i) \rangle \quad \text{Eq. 33}$$

5 Where $\langle \rangle$ denotes the average over all values of j . For the *largest Lyapunov exponent*
6 computation, the lyaprosen Matlab function [93] was used with $dt = 0.1$ as input parameter.

7 **2.4.3 Statistical analyses**

8 Firstly, a paired t-test was conducted on the maximum voluntary isometric force to assess the
9 effect of RPT on maximum force.

10 Then, partial least square regression (PLSR) analyses were performed using z-score values of
11 MMF indicators as predictors and z-score values of RPE as response variable. PLSR is
12 particularly suited when the number of predictors is larger than the observations, and when
13 there is multicollinearity among predictors [94,95], which is the case for predicting RPE
14 scores from the combination of 135 input variable (9 muscles * 15 MMF indicators) in this
15 study. To avoid overfitting of the data, the number of latent variables was determined when
16 the absolute error of RPE prediction was minimal [94]. In order to calculate the performance
17 of our approach, the whole data was divided into training and testing sets, and 5-folds cross-
18 validation was used subsequently to reduce the bias due to random sampling of the training
19 and test sets [97,98]. To do so, the whole data set was randomly split into 5 mutually
20 exclusive subsets (folds) i.e., 4-folds included 17 participants used as the training set and 1-
21 fold included 4 participants used as the testing set after excluding three participants because
22 of missing data. For each model, the absolute error of prediction was calculated on
23 denormalized values. The cross-validation accuracy was calculated as the average of the
24 5 individual accuracy measures [99,100]. The variable importance in projection (VIP) was
25 calculated for each model to determine the most relevant MMF indicators to explain variation
26 of RPE. This whole PLSR procedure was repeated 100 times in order to have one hundred
27 partitions of cross-validation, reducing the bias due to random sampling of the training and
28 testing sets [101,102]. Then model performance (i.e., absolute error of prediction) was
29 averaged over the 500 data (100 repetitions * 5-folds). Finally, an unpaired t-test was
30 performed between the VIP values of the median frequency and the activation level and the
31 VIP values of each MMF indicator of each muscle and the to assess the efficiency of the other
32 indicators compared to the JASA indicators.


1 The effect of the RPT for each MMF indicator and muscle was assessed on a participant-
2 specific basis using an unpaired t-tests between the 10 first cycles (RPT initiation) and the last
3 10 cycles (RPT termination) followed by Cohen's *d* effect size computation. We then
4 determined the percentage of participants for which there was a significant change, namely, a
5 significant decrease for the median frequency, mobility, Higuchi fractal dimension,
6 correlation dimension, largest Lyapunov exponent, and spectral, approximate, sample,
7 multiscale, and fuzzy entropy indicators [17,18,56,103–105], and a significant increase for the
8 activation level, activity, degree of multifractality, percent of determinism, and percent of
9 recurrence [5,33,56,84].

10 3 Results

11 3.1 Maximum voluntary isometric force

12 The paired t-test revealed a significant RPT effect ($p < 0.001$) on maximum voluntary
13 isometric force. The MVIC performed immediately after the RPT termination was
14 significantly smaller than the MVIC performed before the RPT initiation (Figure 2).

Maximum voluntary isometric contractions




1
2 Figure 2. Violin plot representation of maximum voluntary isometric force during pre- and
3 post-RPT. On each violin representation, the white dot represents the median, the thick gray
4 bar represents the interquartile range, and the pink area violin-shaped represents the data
5 distribution.

1 3.2 Partial least square models

2 3.2.1 Performance of the partial least square regression to predict RPE

3 Over the 100 iterations, the PLSR model that generated the smallest mean absolute error of
4 prediction of RPE values on the testing set included two latent variables (1.36 ± 0.29 ;
5 Figure 3, right). This model explained 73.36 ± 2.94 % of the variance of the RPE on the
6 training set (Figure 3, left). Although models including more latent variables explained a
7 greater percentage of RPE variance on the training set than the two-latent variable model, the
8 absolute error of prediction on the testing set was greater than for the two-latent variable
9 model indicating an overfitting [106]. Consequently, the VIP results in the next section were
10 computed from the two-latent variable model.




11
12 Figure 3. Violin plot representation of the percentage of RPE explained obtained on the
13 training set (left) and absolute error of prediction obtained on the testing set (right) for the
14 100 iterations of the 5-fold cross-validation of the PLSR analysis. On each violin
15 representation, the white dot represents the median, the thick gray bar represents the
16 interquartile range, and the pink area violin-shaped represents the data distribution.

17 3.2.2 VIP values for each MMF indicator and muscle

18 The highest VIP value was obtained for the median frequency of the medial deltoid
19 (2.28 ± 0.11) and was significantly higher than the VIP of any other MMF indicator of this
20 muscle (Figure 4). The VIP value of the activation level (1.41 ± 0.18) was significantly lower
21 than the VIP value of the mobility (2.10 ± 0.14), Higuchi fractal dimension (2.03 ± 0.14),
22 spectral entropy (1.89 ± 0.15), and fuzzy entropy (1.77 ± 0.10). All other MMF indicators had

1 significantly lower VIP values than the VIP value of the activation level. The VIP values
2 obtained for the anterior deltoid showed similar pattern for the median frequency
3 (1.77 ± 0.14) that was significantly higher than the VIP value of any other MMF. Then,
4 fractal Higuchi (1.47 ± 0.14), spectral entropy (1.41 ± 0.14) and fuzzy entropy (1.26 ± 0.12)
5 had qualitatively higher VIP values than the activation level but did not reach significance.
6 For the posterior deltoid, activation level (1.73 ± 0.17) had VIP values significantly higher
7 than the VIP values of all indicators except Higuchi fractal dimension (1.74 ± 0.15). For the
8 biceps, the VIP value of the median frequency (1.46 ± 0.12) was significantly smaller than the
9 VIP value of the mobility (1.57 ± 0.13) and the Higuchi fractal dimension (2.13 ± 0.14); the
10 VIP value of the activation level (1.12 ± 0.09) was significantly smaller than the VIP value of
11 the mobility (1.57 ± 0.13), Higuchi fractal dimension (2.13 ± 0.14), spectral entropy
12 (1.44 ± 0.16), approximate entropy (1.31 ± 0.15), and fuzzy entropy (1.35 ± 0.16). For the
13 triceps, the VIP value of the activation level (1.98 ± 0.19) was significantly greater than the
14 VIP value of activity (1.61 ± 0.12), mobility (1.31 ± 0.20), Higuchi fractal dimension
15 (1.48 ± 0.13) and spectral entropy (1.60 ± 0.20). Finally, the MMF indicators of the serratus
16 anterior, upper, middle, and lower trapezius had the lowest VIP values.




1 Figure 4. Violin plot representation of VIP values for all muscles and MMF indicators. On
2 each violin representation, the white dot represents the median, the thick gray bar represents
3 the interquartile range, and the pink area violin-shaped represents the data distribution. An *
4 indicates a significant difference between activation level and a MMF indicator and a †
5 indicates a significant difference between median frequency and a MMF indicator.

6 **3.2.3 Proportion of change of MMF indicators among participants**

7 Figures in supplementary material S1-9 (one figure per muscle) show row values of each
8 MMF indicator for each participant at RPT initiation and termination. Concerning the medial
9 deltoid, the proportion of the participants for whom there was a change between initiation and
10 termination for median frequency, mobility, Higuchi fractal dimension, spectral entropy,
11 fuzzy entropy, and percent of determinism, was 90%, 80%, 90%, 86%, 90% and 81%,
12 respectively. These indicators also showed the strongest effect sizes (Cohen's *d* ranged
13 between 3.5-5.35, the percent of determinism excluded, which had a Cohen's *d* value equal to
14 2.13) (Figure 5). Strong effect sizes were also observed for approximate entropy (Cohen's
15 $d=4$) and activation level (Cohen's $d=3.6$). The degree of multifractality, multiscale entropy,
16 correlation dimension, and Lyapunov exponent changed for only 0% -45% participants with
17 Cohen's *d* effect sizes below 1.1. Concerning the anterior deltoid, the median frequency,
18 activation level, activity, mobility, Higuchi fractal dimension, spectral entropy and fuzzy
19 entropy were the MMF indicators that also showed significant change between RPT initiation
20 and termination for a large proportion of the participants, i.e., 85%, 76%, 74%, 80%, 80%,
21 84%, 65% (Cohens' *d* effect sizes ranged between 2.05-3.16).

22 Other noteworthy results involved median frequency, activation level, mobility, fractal
23 Higuchi, spectral entropy and fuzzy entropy of the triceps that significantly changed for 75%,
24 60%, 67%, 85%, 70%, 70% of the participants respectively (Cohens' *d* effect sizes ranged
25 between 1.9-3.8); the activation level, activity, Higuchi fractal dimension, and spectral
26 entropy of the biceps changed for 80%, 79%, 76%, 76%, (Cohens' *d* effect sizes ranged
27 between 2.26-2.83); the activation level and the activity of the upper trapezius that changed
28 for 62% and 60 of the participants, respectively (Cohens' *d* effect sizes equal to 0.67 and 0.63,
29 respectively); the median frequency, the activation level and the mobility of the serratus
30 anterior changed for 70% of the participants for all the three indicators (Cohens' *d* effect sizes
31 ranged between 1.5-1.8); the activation level and the Higuchi fractal dimension of the
32 posterior deltoid changed for 75% and 70% of the participants (Cohens' *d* effect sizes equal to
33 2.64 and 1.9, respectively); the degree of multifractality, multiscale entropy, percent of

1 recurrence, correlation dimension, and largest Lyapunov exponent changed significantly for
2 less than 45% of participants between RPT initiation and termination with Cohens' *d* effect
3 sizes lower than 0.7; the middle and lower trapezius showed significant changes for less than
4 57% of the participants (Cohen's *d* effect sizes lower than 1.9) for all MMF indicators.



1

2 Figure 5. Heat maps representation of the percentage of participants showing significant effect of time between RPT initiation and termination on
 3 unpaired t-test (left column) and their corresponding Cohen's *d* effect sizes (right column) for each muscle and each MMF indicator.

1 4 **Discussion**

2 The aim of this study was to identify the MMF indicators that best assess muscle fatigue
3 during a repetitive pointing task. To this end, a PLSR method was used to predict the RPE
4 from 15 linear and non-linear MMF indicators. The trained PLSR model explained 73% of the
5 RPE variance. Median frequency, mobility, spectral entropy, fuzzy entropy, and fractal
6 Higuchi had greater VIP values and changed for more than 65% of the participants during the
7 RPT for both the anterior and medial deltoids. Moreover, the degree of multifractality, the
8 multiscale entropy, the correlation dimension, the recurrence quantification analysis, and the
9 largest Lyapunov exponent were the MMF indicators that had the lowest VIP values for the
10 anterior and medial deltoids and did not change for a large proportion of participants.

11 **4.1 Effect of RPT on muscle fatigue**

12 As a decrease in MVIC and an increase in RPE is often used to emphasize muscle fatigue [1-
13 4], the results of this study confirm the presence of muscular fatigue at RPT termination.
14 Indeed, the t-test analysis revealed a significant decrease of the MVIC performed immediately
15 after the completion of the RPT compared to the MVIC performed before the RPT. Also, all
16 participants reached 8 or higher out of 10 at RPE scale at the completion of the RPT, 7
17 corresponding to “very strong” and 10 to “extremely strong (almost max)” perceived exertion
18 [69] to perform the RPT at task termination. Since the task remained the same across the RPT,
19 the increasing perceived exertion, in combination with the decreasing maximum voluntary
20 isometric force indicated that the RPT caused muscle fatigue [107].

21 **4.2 PLSR algorithm to predict RPE**

22 For the first time, the present study used PLSR to predict muscle fatigue through the evolution
23 of RPE and using MMF indicators as predictors during multi-joint movement of the shoulder.
24 This approach allowed to explain 73% of the RPE variance on the training set, with an
25 absolute error of prediction of 1.36 on the testing set. This explained variance is greater than
26 that observed by Goubault et al., [24], Ni et al., [68] and Troiano [43] that used bivariate of
27 multivariate regression models. Indeed, Goubault et al., [24] performed multivariate
28 regression analyses between various MMF indicators and RPE scores during a working task.
29 Their R-square values ranged between 11% and 39%. In the study of Troiano [43], the EMG
30 fractal dimension and the EMG normalized mean frequency explained the RPE changes by
31 52% and 50%, respectively, during isometric contractions of the upper trapezius. In Ni et al.,
32 [68], EMG indicators explained 49% of the RPE variance during dynamic contractions. In the

1 present study, the greater percentage of RPE variance explained can be due to the
2 combination of several MMF indicators together in the PLSR model. In addition, various
3 complex indicators identified as good predictors of muscle fatigue [28], such as fuzzy entropy
4 and Higuchi fractal dimension, were used for the first time in such a model. Interestingly, our
5 PLSR approach not only provided better prediction of RPE, but also physiologically
6 meaningful results. Indeed, the highest VIP values were observed for the anterior and medial
7 deltoids that are the muscles known to fatigue the most during the RPT used in the present
8 study [72,73] and for the median frequency, a commonly well recognized indicator of muscle
9 fatigue [108–113].

10 **4.3 Median frequency, mobility, spectral entropy, fuzzy entropy, and fractal Higuchi** 11 **MMF indicators to assess muscle fatigue**

12 Median frequency was the MMF indicator that had the highest VIP value (2.28) and changed
13 for a very large proportion of the participants (>85%) between RPT initiation and termination
14 in the muscles known to fatigue the most during the RPT used in the present study, i.e.,
15 anterior and medial deltoids [72,73]. This result agrees with Goubault et al., [24], that also
16 found that when correlating six MMF indicators to RPE, mobility and spectral entropy were
17 among the MMF indicators that showed the highest R-square values. Our results are
18 consistent with this recent study as mobility and spectral entropy also showed high VIP values
19 (1.26-1.41) and significantly changed for a large proportion of the participants (80%-86%)
20 between RPT initiation and termination for the anterior and medial deltoids, which reaffirms
21 that these MMF indicators may be relevant to assess muscle fatigue. Concerning chaos,
22 correlation, entropy, and fractals MMF indicators, Higuchi fractal dimension and fuzzy
23 entropy were the only indicators that had high VIP values (1.26-2.03) and changed
24 significantly for a large proportion of the participants (65%-90%) for the anterior and medial
25 deltoids. Higuchi fractal dimension therefore confirms that the fractal dimension is sensitive
26 to intrinsic changes of EMG signals occurring with muscle fatigue [18,49]. As to fuzzy
27 entropy, our results are in line with Xie et al., [54] which stated that it provides an improved
28 evaluation of time series complexity. Considering that median frequency is sensitive to both
29 muscle fiber conduction velocity and motor unit synchronization [17,114], mobility is
30 sensitive to conduction velocity [56], spectral entropy is sensitive to muscle fiber conduction
31 velocity and motor units firing rate [56], and fuzzy entropy and Higuchi fractal dimension are
32 sensitive to the increase of motor unit synchronization [90,104] occurring with muscle
33 fatigue, our results emphasize the need to consider and combine a variety of MMF indicators

1 that are sensitive to all parameters of motor unit behavior affected by fatigue in order to
2 improve its assessment. Noteworthy, median frequency, mobility, spectral entropy, fuzzy
3 entropy, and Higuchi fractal dimension were the only indicators that both showed low VIP
4 values and changed for a moderate proportion of the participants (14%-38%) during RPT
5 initiation and termination for the trapezius muscles, which did not show signs of fatigue
6 during the RPT used in the present study [72–74]. These five indicators may therefore have
7 good specificity to assess muscle fatigue, and future investigations should focus on their
8 combination into a single MMF indicator to maximize the sensitivity and specificity of
9 muscle fatigue assessment.

10 **4.4 Activation level, activity, approximate, sample, and multiscale entropy, recurrence** 11 **quantification analysis, correlation dimension, and chaos MMF indicators to assess** 12 **muscle fatigue**

13 The activation level was shown to be a part of the two MMF indicators required to assess
14 muscle fatigue according to the JASA method [14]. Firstly, our results showed that the VIP
15 value of activation level of the medial deltoid was 1.41, which was significantly lower than
16 the VIP value of the median frequency, mobility, Higuchi fractal dimension, spectral entropy,
17 and fuzzy entropy for this muscle. Secondly, although the activation level of both the anterior
18 and medial deltoid increased significantly for a large proportion of the participants (76%-
19 80%), which can be interpreted as a MMF [14], the activation level of the posterior deltoid
20 and upper trapezius also increased for a comparable proportion of the participants (75%-76%)
21 between the RPT initiation and termination while they the latter muscles did not show sign of
22 fatigue in previous studies [72,73]. Supporting these results on activation level, muscles act in
23 synergy so that many postural and movement adaptations are induced by muscle fatigue
24 during a RPT [72]. Therefore, the upper trapezius and the posterior deltoid changes in
25 amplitude-based MMF indicators may reflect compensatory mechanisms in response to
26 fatigue in prime mover muscles rather than local fatigue [115,116]. Consequently, a change of
27 activation level may reflect local muscle fatigue for prime mover muscles or compensatory
28 mechanisms in response to fatigue of prime mover muscles for synergistic muscles [72,73].
29 These observations suggest that activation level, and therefore the JASA method, should be
30 used with caution for the assessment of muscle fatigue [6] as it may increase the risk of false
31 positive. Another MMF indicator related to the amplitude of EMG signals is the activity. The
32 VIP value of the activity of the median and anterior deltoids ranged between 0.73-1.61, which
33 is qualitatively smaller than the VIP value of median frequency, mobility, Higuchi fractal

1 dimension, spectral entropy, and fuzzy entropy (1.26-2.28) for these muscles. Similarly to
2 activation level, there were changes in activity for a large proportion of the participants in the
3 upper trapezius (90%), although this muscle is not supposed to fatigue [72,73]. Thus, our
4 results further confirm that amplitude related MMF indicators are not relevant for assessing
5 muscle fatigue.

6 Approximate and sample entropy had moderate VIP values (0.91-1.57), in the anterior and
7 median deltoids and changed for a moderate to large proportion of the participants (52%-
8 76%) between the RPT initiation and termination. To support this latter result, the lack of
9 consistency and monotonicity of approximate entropy causes difficulty in interpreting the
10 signal's complexity and reduced its efficiency to dichotomize fatigue and non-fatigue states
11 [54,88]. Although sample entropy addresses the drawbacks of approximate entropy
12 calculation to assess muscle fatigue [88], our results revealed that this MMF indicator had
13 moderate efficiency to assess muscle fatigue, which may be caused by its high variability to
14 precise parameter selection [117]. Multiscale entropy was therefore introduced to better detect
15 the presence of complexity in time series and overcome the limitations of approximate and
16 sample entropy [57]. Although multiscale entropy was shown more sensitive to muscle
17 fatigue than median frequency [118], our results evidenced that multiscale entropy had
18 significantly smaller VIP values than median frequency and changed for a moderate
19 proportion of the participants (35%-45%) for the anterior and medial deltoids between RPT
20 initiation and termination. Consequently, fuzzy entropy, as previously discussed, is the only
21 entropy-based indicator that may be efficient to assess MMF. Concerning the degree of
22 multifractality, it had very low VIP values (<0.5) and marginally changed ($<10\%$) between
23 the RPT initiation and termination. This result contradicts previous studies that found that this
24 multifractal MMF indicator is more efficient than the median frequency and Higuchi fractal
25 dimension to assess muscle fatigue in dynamic and static conditions [40,46,47,49]. More
26 investigations are therefore required to determine the effectiveness of the degree of
27 multifractality for assessing MMF. As to correlation dimension, percent determinism, and
28 percent of recurrence, they had very low VIP values (0.4-1.2), which agrees with previous
29 evidences that correlation dimension is not sensitive to changes in EMG signal properties
30 caused by fatigue [28]. Although previous studies have shown an effect of muscle fatigue on
31 recurrence quantification analyses, our results are in agreement with the lower performance of
32 this MMF indicator compared to frequency-based and fuzzy entropy indicators [75]. Finally,
33 the largest Lyapunov exponent also had very low VIP values for all muscles (<0.6) and did
34 not change during the RPT for more than 38% of the participants between RPT initiation and

1 termination in median and anterior deltoid. To support this result, Chakraborty et al., [36]
2 found that the largest Lyapunov exponent did not change with fatigue during dynamic
3 contractions of the biceps brachii. Thus, our results confirm that the potential of approximate,
4 sample, and multiscale entropy, degree of multifractality, correlation dimension, and the
5 largest Lyapunov exponent is limited to assess muscle fatigue during low-load repetitive
6 tasks, which question their sensitivity to changes in muscle fiber conduction velocity
7 [5,84,104] and motor unit firing rate [35,56,103] and synchronization [35,104] caused by
8 fatigue.

9 **4.5 Limitations**

10 The first limitation of this study was that, considering the nature of the task which is a multi-
11 joint task performed with the whole dominant upper limb in a standing position, several
12 muscles act as prime mover and stabilizer muscles so that changes of MMF indicators may be
13 caused either by their function or muscle fatigue that make interpretation of amplitude related
14 indicators difficult [115,119]. Another limitation is that the RPE was used as a measure of
15 fatigue, while its evolution can be multifactorial during a fatiguing task. Finally, even though
16 the previous literature has suggested the presence of sex differences in some EMG patterns of
17 fatigue during the performance of the RPT [120], our sample size was too small to develop a
18 sex-specific model.

19 **5 Conclusion**

20 The present study confirmed that median frequency, mobility, and spectral entropy are
21 efficient EMG-based indicators to assess muscle fatigue. Interestingly, our analyses also
22 showed that fuzzy entropy and Higuchi fractal dimension may also be efficient MMF
23 indicators. Therefore, a combination of median frequency, mobility, spectral entropy, fuzzy
24 entropy, and Higuchi fractal dimension should be further considered to assess muscle fatigue
25 compared to the exclusive use of median frequency and activation level. Alternatively,
26 although other MMF indicators such as the multiscale entropy, the degree of multifractality,
27 correlation dimension, the percent of determinism, the percent of recurrence, and the largest
28 Lyapunov exponent were previously used to assess muscle fatigue, they should no further be
29 considered as our analyses showed that they poorly contributed to the prediction of RPE and
30 did not change significantly for a large proportion of the participants during a fatiguing RPT.
31 These results may help to improve the identification of MMF indicators to accurately assess
32 muscle fatigue. In the long term, more accurate methods to identify fatigue-related changes in
33 EMG, combined with other advances such as in workplace wearable sensors, could contribute

1 to the real-time, early detection of injury risk factors, and ultimately, prevention of
2 musculoskeletal disorders caused by muscle fatigue.

3 6 **Acknowledgments**

4 We would like to thank our industrial partner, David's TEA, with a special mention to our
5 contact, R. Butman, for his help in the recruitment.

6 7 **Funding**

7 This study was supported by the Institut Robert-Sauvé en Santé et Sécurité du Travail
8 (IRSST) (2017_0016).

9

1 8 **Bibliography**

- 2 [1] R.M. Enoka, J. Duchateau, Muscle fatigue: what, why and how it influences muscle
3 function: Muscle fatigue, *J. Physiol.* 586 (2008) 11–23.
4 <https://doi.org/10.1113/jphysiol.2007.139477>.
- 5 [2] R. Merletti, A. Rainoldi, D. Farina, Myoelectric Manifestations of Muscle Fatigue, in:
6 R. Merletti, P. Parker (Eds.), *Electromyography*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken,
7 NJ, USA, 2005: pp. 233–258. <https://doi.org/10.1002/0471678384.ch9>.
- 8 [3] D. Farina, Interpretation of the Surface Electromyogram in Dynamic Contractions:,
9 *Exerc. Sport Sci. Rev.* 34 (2006) 121–127. [https://doi.org/10.1249/00003677-](https://doi.org/10.1249/00003677-200607000-00006)
10 [200607000-00006](https://doi.org/10.1249/00003677-200607000-00006).
- 11 [4] A. Adam, C.J. De Luca, Firing rates of motor units in human vastus lateralis muscle
12 during fatiguing isometric contractions, *J. Appl. Physiol.* 99 (2005) 268–280.
13 <https://doi.org/10.1152/jappphysiol.01344.2004>.
- 14 [5] D. Farina, L. Fattorini, F. Felici, G. Filligoi, Nonlinear surface EMG analysis to detect
15 changes of motor unit conduction velocity and synchronization, *J. Appl. Physiol.* 93
16 (2002) 1753–1763. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jappphysiol.00314.2002>.
- 17 [6] M. Cifrek, V. Medved, S. Tonković, S. Ostojić, Surface EMG based muscle fatigue
18 evaluation in biomechanics, *Clin. Biomech.* 24 (2009) 327–340.
19 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2009.01.010>.
- 20 [7] J.V. Basmajian, Research foundations of EMG biofeedback in rehabilitation,
21 *Biofeedback Self-Regul.* 13 (1988) 275–298. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00999085>.
- 22 [8] G. Korol, A. Karniel, I. Melzer, A. Ronen, Y. Edan, H. Stern, R. Riemer, Relation
23 between Perceived Effort and the Electromyographic Signal in Localized Effort
24 Activities of Forearm Muscles, *J. Ergon.* 07 (2017). [https://doi.org/10.4172/2165-](https://doi.org/10.4172/2165-7556.1000.S6-004)
25 [7556.1000.S6-004](https://doi.org/10.4172/2165-7556.1000.S6-004).
- 26 [10] P. Bonato, Wearable Sensors and Systems, *IEEE Eng. Med. Biol. Mag.* 29 (2010) 25–
27 36. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MEMB.2010.936554>.
- 28 [11] S. Kim, M.A. Nussbaum, Performance evaluation of a wearable inertial motion capture
29 system for capturing physical exposures during manual material handling tasks,
30 *Ergonomics.* 56 (2013) 314–326. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00140139.2012.742932>.
- 31 [12] Z. Sedighi Maman, M.A. Alamdar Yazdi, L.A. Cavuoto, F.M. Megahed, A data-driven
32 approach to modeling physical fatigue in the workplace using wearable sensors, *Appl.*
33 *Ergon.* 65 (2017) 515–529. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apergo.2017.02.001>.
- 34 [13] N. Vignais, M. Miezal, G. Bleser, K. Mura, D. Gorecky, F. Marin, Innovative system
35 for real-time ergonomic feedback in industrial manufacturing, *Appl. Ergon.* 44 (2013)
36 566–574. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apergo.2012.11.008>.
- 37 [14] G.M. Hägg, A. Luttmann, M. Jäger, Methodologies for evaluating electromyographic
38 field data in ergonomics, *J. Electromyogr. Kinesiol.* 10 (2000) 301–312.
39 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1050-6411\(00\)00022-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1050-6411(00)00022-5).
- 40 [15] S. Gaudet, J. Tremblay, F. Dal Maso, Evolution of muscular fatigue in periscapular and
41 rotator cuff muscles during isokinetic shoulder rotations, *J. Sports Sci.* 36 (2018) 2121–
42 2128. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2018.1440513>.
- 43 [16] E. Goubault, F. Verdugo, J. Pelletier, C. Traube, M. Begon, F. Dal Maso, Exhausting
44 repetitive piano tasks lead to local forearm manifestation of muscle fatigue and
45 negatively affect musical parameters, *Sci. Rep.* 11 (2021) 8117.
46 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-87403-8>.
- 47 [17] C.J. De Luca, Muoelectrical manifestations of localized muscular fatigue in humans,
48 (1984) 29.

- 1 [18] L. Mesin, C. Cescon, M. Gazzoni, R. Merletti, A. Rainoldi, A bi-dimensional index for
2 the selective assessment of myoelectric manifestations of peripheral and central muscle
3 fatigue, *J. Electromyogr. Kinesiol.* 19 (2009) 851–863.
4 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jelekin.2008.08.003>.
- 5 [19] D.T. Kirkendall, Mechanisms of peripheral fatigue, 22 (1990) 444–449.
- 6 [20] N.A. Dimitrova, G.V. Dimitrov, Interpretation of EMG changes with fatigue: facts,
7 pitfalls, and fallacies, *J. Electromyogr. Kinesiol.* 13 (2003) 13–36.
8 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1050-6411\(02\)00083-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1050-6411(02)00083-4).
- 9 [21] M. Patel, N. Makaram, S. Balasubramanian, S. Ramakrishnan, Analysis of Muscle
10 Fatigue Using Electromyography Signals in Gastrocnemius Muscle during Isometric
11 Plantar Flexion, *Int. J. Biosci. Biochem. Bioinforma.* 8 (2018) 100–106.
12 <https://doi.org/10.17706/ijbbb.2018.8.2.100-106>.
- 13 [22] D. Srinivasan, S.E. Mathiassen, Motor variability in occupational health and
14 performance, *Clin. Biomech.* 27 (2012) 979–993.
15 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2012.08.007>.
- 16 [23] T. Luger, T. Bosch, M. Hoozemans, M. de Looze, D. Veeger, Task variation during
17 simulated, repetitive, low-intensity work – influence on manifestation of shoulder
18 muscle fatigue, perceived discomfort and upper-body postures, *Ergonomics.* 58 (2015)
19 1851–1867. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00140139.2015.1043356>.
- 20 [24] E. Goubault, R. Martinez, J. Bouffard, J. Dowling-Medley, M. Begon, F. Dal Maso,
21 Shoulder electromyography-based indicators to assess manifestation of muscle fatigue
22 during laboratory-simulated manual handling task., (2021).
- 23 [25] H. Iridiastadi, M.A. Nussbaum, Muscle fatigue and endurance during repetitive
24 intermittent static efforts: development of prediction models, *Ergonomics.* 49 (2006)
25 344–360. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00140130500475666>.
- 26 [26] P. Madeleine, M. Voigt, S.E. Mathiassen, The size of cycle-to-cycle variability in
27 biomechanical exposure among butchers performing a standardised cutting task,
28 *Ergonomics.* 51 (2008) 1078–1095. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00140130801958659>.
- 29 [27] E.A. Clancy, N. Hogan, Single site electromyograph amplitude estimation, *IEEE Trans.*
30 *Biomed. Eng.* 41 (1994) 159–167. <https://doi.org/10.1109/10.284927>.
- 31 [28] S. Rampichini, T.M. Vieira, P. Castiglioni, G. Merati, Complexity Analysis of Surface
32 Electromyography for Assessing the Myoelectric Manifestation of Muscle Fatigue: A
33 Review, *Entropy.* 22 (2020) 529. <https://doi.org/10.3390/e22050529>.
- 34 [29] Szu-Yu Lin, Chih-I Hung, Hsin-I Wang, Y.-T. Wu, Po-Shan Wang, Extraction of
35 physically fatigue feature in exercise using electromyography, electroencephalography
36 and electrocardiography, in: 2015 11th Int. Conf. Nat. Comput. ICNC, IEEE,
37 Zhangjiajie, China, 2015: pp. 561–566. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICNC.2015.7378050>.
- 38 [30] G. Ouyang, X. Li, C. Dang, D.A. Richards, Using recurrence plot for determinism
39 analysis of EEG recordings in genetic absence epilepsy rats, *Clin. Neurophysiol.* 119
40 (2008) 1747–1755. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2008.04.005>.
- 41 [31] R. Kadefors, E. Kaiser, I. Petersén, Dynamic spectrum analysis of myo-potentials and
42 with special reference to muscle fatigue., (1968). <https://doi.org/Electromyography>,
43 8(1), 39–74.
- 44 [32] G.M. Hagg, Interpretation of EMG spectral alterations and alteration indexes at
45 sustained contraction, *J. Appl. Physiol.* 73 (1992) 1211–1217.
46 <https://doi.org/10.1152/jappl.1992.73.4.1211>.
- 47 [33] C.L. Webber, M.A. Schmidt, J.M. Walsh, Influence of isometric loading on biceps
48 EMG dynamics as assessed by linear and nonlinear tools, *J. Appl. Physiol.* 78 (1995)
49 814–822. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jappl.1995.78.3.814>.

- 1 [34] A.L.V. Coelho, C.A.M. Lima, Assessing fractal dimension methods as feature
2 extractors for EMG signal classification, *Eng. Appl. Artif. Intell.* 36 (2014) 81–98.
3 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engappai.2014.07.009>.
- 4 [35] H. Nieminen, E.P. Takala, Evidence of deterministic chaos in the myoelectric signal,
5 (1996). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.1996.03.001>.
- 6 [36] M. Chakraborty, D. Parbat, Fractals, Chaos and Entropy analysis to obtain Parametric
7 Features of surface Electromyography signals during Dynamic Contraction of Biceps
8 Muscles under Varying Load, (2017) 8.
- 9 [37] L. Wang, Y. Wang, A. Ma, G. Ma, Y. Ye, R. Li, T. Lu, A Comparative Study of EMG
10 Indices in Muscle Fatigue Evaluation Based on Grey Relational Analysis during All-
11 Out Cycling Exercise, *BioMed Res. Int.* 2018 (2018) 1–8.
12 <https://doi.org/10.1155/2018/9341215>.
- 13 [38] M. Albaladejo-Belmonte, M. Tarazona-Motes, F.J. Nohales-Alfonso, M. De-Arriba, J.
14 Alberola-Rubio, J. Garcia-Casado, Characterization of Pelvic Floor Activity in Healthy
15 Subjects and with Chronic Pelvic Pain: Diagnostic Potential of Surface
16 Electromyography, *Sensors.* 21 (2021) 2225. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s21062225>.
- 17 [39] X. Hu, Z. Wang, X. Ren, Classification of surface EMG signal with fractal dimension,
18 *J. Zhejiang Univ. Sci. 6B* (2005) 844–848. <https://doi.org/10.1631/jzus.2005.B0844>.
- 19 [40] M. Talebinejad, A.D.C. Chan, A. Miri, Fatigue estimation using a novel multi-fractal
20 detrended fluctuation analysis-based approach, *J. Electromyogr. Kinesiol.* 20 (2010)
21 433–439. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jelekin.2009.06.002>.
- 22 [41] S.-D. Wu, C.-W. Wu, S.-G. Lin, C.-C. Wang, K.-Y. Lee, Time Series Analysis Using
23 Composite Multiscale Entropy, *Entropy.* 15 (2013) 1069–1084.
24 <https://doi.org/10.3390/e15031069>.
- 25 [42] T. Higuchi, Approach to an irregular time series on the basis of the fractal theory, *Phys.*
26 *Nonlinear Phenom.* 31 (1988) 277–283. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-2789\(88\)90081-](https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-2789(88)90081-4)
27 [4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-2789(88)90081-4).
- 28 [43] A. Troiano, F. Naddeo, E. Sosso, G. Camarota, R. Merletti, L. Mesin, Assessment of
29 force and fatigue in isometric contractions of the upper trapezius muscle by surface
30 EMG signal and perceived exertion scale, *Gait Posture.* 28 (2008) 179–186.
31 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2008.04.002>.
- 32 [44] M. Beretta-Piccoli, G. D’Antona, M. Barbero, B. Fisher, C.M. Dieli-Conwright, R.
33 Clijnsen, C. Cescon, Evaluation of Central and Peripheral Fatigue in the Quadriceps
34 Using Fractal Dimension and Conduction Velocity in Young Females, *PLOS ONE.* 10
35 (2015) e0123921. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0123921>.
- 36 [45] M. Beretta-Piccoli, G. D’Antona, C. Zampella, M. Barbero, R. Clijnsen, C. Cescon,
37 Test-retest reliability of muscle fiber conduction velocity and fractal dimension of
38 surface EMG during isometric contractions, *Physiol. Meas.* 38 (2017) 616–630.
39 <https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6579/aa614c>.
- 40 [46] G. Wang, X. Ren, L. Li, Z. Wang, Multifractal analysis of surface EMG signals for
41 assessing muscle fatigue during static contractions, *J. Zhejiang Univ. -Sci. A.* 8 (2007)
42 910–915. <https://doi.org/10.1631/jzus.2007.A0910>.
- 43 [47] K. Marri, R. Swaminathan, Analysis of Biceps Brachii Muscles in Dynamic
44 Contraction Using sEMG Signals and Multifractal DMA Algorithm, *Int. J. Signal*
45 *Process. Syst.* 4 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.12720/ijsp.4.1.79-85>.
- 46 [48] L. Hernandez, C. Camic, Fatigue-Mediated Loss of Complexity is Contraction-Type
47 Dependent in Vastus Lateralis Electromyographic Signals, *Sports.* 7 (2019) 78.
48 <https://doi.org/10.3390/sports7040078>.
- 49 [49] K. Marri, R. Swaminathan, Classification of Muscular Nonfatigue and Fatigue
50 Conditions Using Surface EMG Signals and Fractal Algorithms, in: Vol. 1 Adv.

- 1 Control Des. Methods Nonlinear Optim. Control Robot. Wind Energy Syst. Aerosp.
2 Appl. Assist. Rehabil. Robot. Assist. Robot. Battery Oil Gas Syst. Bioeng. Appl.
3 Biomed. Neural Syst. Model. Diagn. Healthc. Control Monit. Vibratory Syst. Diagn.
4 Detect. Energy Harvest. Estim. Identif. Fuel Cells Energy Storage Intell. Transp.,
5 American Society of Mechanical Engineers, Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA, 2016: p.
6 V001T10A002. <https://doi.org/10.1115/DSCC2016-9828>.
- 7 [51] F. Del Santo, F. Gelli, R. Mazzocchio, A. Rossi, Recurrence quantification analysis of
8 surface EMG detects changes in motor unit synchronization induced by recurrent
9 inhibition, *Exp. Brain Res.* 178 (2007) 308–315. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-006-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-006-0734-x)
10 [0734-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-006-0734-x).
- 11 [52] K. Ito, Y. Hotta, EMG-based detection of muscle fatigue during low-level isometric
12 contraction by recurrence quantification analysis and monopolar configuration, in:
13 2012 Annu. Int. Conf. IEEE Eng. Med. Biol. Soc., IEEE, San Diego, CA, 2012: pp.
14 4237–4241. <https://doi.org/10.1109/EMBC.2012.6346902>.
- 15 [53] S. Wang, H. Tang, B. Wang, J. Mo, Analysis of fatigue in the biceps brachii by using
16 rapid refined composite multiscale sample entropy, *Biomed. Signal Process. Control.*
17 67 (2021) 102510. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bspc.2021.102510>.
- 18 [54] H.-B. Xie, J.-Y. Guo, Y.-P. Zheng, Fuzzy Approximate Entropy Analysis of Chaotic
19 and Natural Complex Systems: Detecting Muscle Fatigue Using Electromyography
20 Signals, *Ann. Biomed. Eng.* 38 (2010) 1483–1496. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10439-010-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10439-010-9933-5)
21 [9933-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10439-010-9933-5).
- 22 [55] X. Zhu, X. Zhang, X. Tang, X. Gao, X. Chen, Re-Evaluating Electromyogram–Force
23 Relation in Healthy Biceps Brachii Muscles Using Complexity Measures, *Entropy.* 19
24 (2017) 624. <https://doi.org/10.3390/e19110624>.
- 25 [56] P.A. Karthick, N. Makaram, S. Ramakrishnan, Analysis of progression of fatigue
26 conditions in biceps brachii muscles using surface electromyography signals and
27 complexity based features, in: 2014 36th Annu. Int. Conf. IEEE Eng. Med. Biol. Soc.,
28 IEEE, Chicago, IL, 2014: pp. 3276–3279.
29 <https://doi.org/10.1109/EMBC.2014.6944322>.
- 30 [57] M. Costa, A.L. Goldberger, C.-K. Peng, Multiscale Entropy Analysis of Complex
31 Physiologic Time Series, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 89 (2002) 068102.
32 <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.89.068102>.
- 33 [58] W. Chen, J. Zhuang, W. Yu, Z. Wang, Measuring complexity using FuzzyEn, ApEn,
34 and SampEn, *Med. Eng. Phys.* 31 (2009) 61–68.
35 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.medengphy.2008.04.005>.
- 36 [59] M.T. Rosenstein, J.J. Collins, C.J. De Luca, A practical method for calculating largest
37 Lyapunov exponents from small data sets, *Phys. Nonlinear Phenom.* 65 (1993) 117–
38 134. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-2789\(93\)90009-P](https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-2789(93)90009-P).
- 39 [60] R.B. Graham, L.Y. Oikawa, G.B. Ross, Comparing the local dynamic stability of trunk
40 movements between varsity athletes with and without non-specific low back pain, *J.*
41 *Biomech.* 47 (2014) 1459–1464. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2014.01.033>.
- 42 [61] B. Pageaux, Perception of effort in Exercise Science: Definition, measurement and
43 perspectives, *Eur. J. Sport Sci.* 16 (2016) 885–894.
44 <https://doi.org/10.1080/17461391.2016.1188992>.
- 45 [62] G. Borg, Psychophysical bases of perceived exertion, *Med. Sci. Sports Exerc.* 14
46 (1982) 377–381.
- 47 [63] I. Ahmad, J.-Y. Kim, Assessment of Whole Body and Local Muscle Fatigue Using
48 Electromyography and a Perceived Exertion Scale for Squat Lifting, *Int. J. Environ.*
49 *Res. Public. Health.* 15 (2018) 784. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph15040784>.

- 1 [64] C. Cruz-Montecinos, A. Bustamante, M. Candia-González, C. González-Bravo, P.
2 Gallardo-Molina, L.L. Andersen, J. Calatayud, Perceived physical exertion is a good
3 indicator of neuromuscular fatigue for the core muscles, *J. Electromyogr. Kinesiol.* 49
4 (2019) 102360. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jelekin.2019.102360>.
- 5 [65] A. Hummel, T. Läubli, M. Pozzo, P. Schenk, S. Spillmann, A. Klipstein, Relationship
6 between perceived exertion and mean power frequency of the EMG signal from the
7 upper trapezius muscle during isometric shoulder elevation, *Eur. J. Appl. Physiol.* 95
8 (2005) 321–326. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00421-005-0014-7>.
- 9 [66] C.L. Tiggemann, A.L. Korzenowski, M.A. Brentano, M.P. Tartaruga, C.L. Alberton,
10 L.F.M. Krueel, Perceived exertion in different strength exercise loads in sedentary,
11 active, and trained adults, *J. Strength Cond. Res.* 24 (2010) 2032–2041.
12 <https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0b013e3181d32e29>.
- 13 [67] A. Troiano, F. Naddeo, E. Sosso, G. Camarota, R. Merletti, L. Mesin, Assessment of
14 force and fatigue in isometric contractions of the upper trapezius muscle by surface
15 EMG signal and perceived exertion scale, *Gait Posture.* 28 (2008) 179–186.
- 16 [68] W. Ni, Y. Zhang, X. Li, X. Wang, Y. Wu, G. Liu, A Study on the Relationship between
17 RPE and sEMG in Dynamic Contraction Based on the GPR Method, *Electronics.* 11
18 (2022) 691. <https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics11050691>.
- 19 [69] G. Borg, Psychophysical scaling with applications in physical work and the perception
20 of exertion., *Scand. J. Work. Environ. Health.* 16 (1990) 55–58.
21 <https://doi.org/10.5271/sjweh.1815>.
- 22 [70] B. Hjorth, EEG analysis based on time domain properties, *Electroencephalogr. Clin.*
23 *Neurophysiol.* 29 (1970) 306–310. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0013-4694\(70\)90143-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0013-4694(70)90143-4).
- 24 [71] C. Vidaurre, N. Krämer, B. Blankertz, A. Schlögl, Time Domain Parameters as a
25 feature for EEG-based Brain–Computer Interfaces, *Neural Netw.* 22 (2009) 1313–
26 1319. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neunet.2009.07.020>.
- 27 [72] J. Savin, C. Gaudez, M.A. Gilles, V. Padois, P. Bidaud, Evidence of movement
28 variability patterns during a repetitive pointing task until exhaustion, *Appl. Ergon.* 96
29 (2021) 103464. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apergo.2021.103464>.
- 30 [73] J. Bouffard, Z. Weber, L. Pearsall, K. Emery, J.N. Côté, Similar effects of fatigue
31 induced by a repetitive pointing task on local and remote light touch and pain
32 perception in men and women, *PLOS ONE.* 15 (2020) e0244321.
33 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0244321>.
- 34 [74] C. Yang, J. Bouffard, D. Srinivasan, S. Ghayourmanesh, H. Cantú, M. Begon, J.N.
35 Côté, Changes in movement variability and task performance during a fatiguing
36 repetitive pointing task, *J. Biomech.* 76 (2018) 212–219.
37 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2018.05.025>.
- 38 [75] L. Kahl, U.G. Hofmann, Comparison of algorithms to quantify muscle fatigue in upper
39 limb muscles based on sEMG signals, *Med. Eng. Phys.* 38 (2016) 1260–1269.
40 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.medengphy.2016.09.009>.
- 41 [76] T. Hong, X. Zhang, H. Ma, Y. Chen, X. Chen, Fatiguing Effects on the Multi-Scale
42 Entropy of Surface Electromyography in Children with Cerebral Palsy, *Entropy.* 18
43 (2016) 177. <https://doi.org/10.3390/e18050177>.
- 44 [77] G. Wu, F.C.T. van der Helm, H.E.J. (DirkJan) Veeger, M. Makhsous, P. Van Roy, C.
45 Anglin, J. Nagels, A.R. Karduna, K. McQuade, X. Wang, F.W. Werner, B. Buchholz,
46 ISB recommendation on definitions of joint coordinate systems of various joints for the
47 reporting of human joint motion—Part II: shoulder, elbow, wrist and hand, *J. Biomech.*
48 38 (2005) 981–992. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2004.05.042>.
- 49 [78] M. Besomi, P.W. Hodges, E.A. Clancy, J. Van Dieën, F. Hug, M. Lowery, R. Merletti,
50 K. Sjøgaard, T. Wrigley, T. Besier, R.G. Carson, C. Disselhorst-Klug, R.M. Enoka, D.

- 1 Falla, D. Farina, S. Gandevia, A. Holobar, M.C. Kiernan, K. McGill, E. Perreault, J.C.
2 Rothwell, K. Tucker, Consensus for experimental design in electromyography (CEDE)
3 project: Amplitude normalization matrix, *J. Electromyogr. Kinesiol.* 53 (2020) 102438.
4 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jelekin.2020.102438>.
- 5 [79] J. Bouffard, C. Yang, M. Begon, J. Côté, Sex differences in kinematic adaptations to
6 muscle fatigue induced by repetitive upper limb movements, *Biol. Sex Differ.* 9 (2018)
7 17. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13293-018-0175-9>.
- 8 [80] B. Moyen-Sylvestre, É. Goubault, M. Begon, J.N. Côté, J. Bouffard, F. Dal Maso,
9 Power Spectrum of Acceleration and Angular Velocity Signals as Indicators of Muscle
10 Fatigue during Upper Limb Low-Load Repetitive Tasks, *Sensors.* 22 (2022) 8008.
11 <https://doi.org/10.3390/s22208008>.
- 12 [81] A. Grinsted, J.C. Moore, S. Jevrejeva, Application of the cross wavelet transform and
13 wavelet coherence to geophysical time series, *Nonlinear Process. Geophys.* 11 (2004)
14 561–566. <https://doi.org/10.5194/npg-11-561-2004>.
- 15 [82] M.B. Čukić, M.M. Platiša, A. Kalauzi, J. Oommen, M.R. Ljubisavljević, The
16 comparison of Higuchi's fractal dimension and Sample Entropy analysis of sEMG:
17 effects of muscle contraction intensity and TMS, (2018) 22.
- 18 [83] J. Monge-Álvarez, Higuchi and Katz fractal dimension measures, (2022).
19 [https://www.mathworks.com/matlabcentral/fileexchange/50290-higuchi-and-katz-](https://www.mathworks.com/matlabcentral/fileexchange/50290-higuchi-and-katz-fractal-dimension-measure)
20 [fractal-dimension-measure](https://www.mathworks.com/matlabcentral/fileexchange/50290-higuchi-and-katz-fractal-dimension-measure).
- 21 [84] M. Talebinejad, A.D.C. Chan, A. Miri, Fatigue estimation using a novel multi-fractal
22 detrended fluctuation analysis-based approach, *J. Electromyogr. Kinesiol.* 20 (2010)
23 433–439. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jelekin.2009.06.002>.
- 24 [85] J.W. Kantelhardt, S.A. Zschiegner, E. Koscielny-Bunde, S. Havlin, A. Bunde, H.E.
25 Stanley, Multifractal detrended fluctuation analysis of nonstationary time series, *Phys. A.*
26 (2002) 28.
- 27 [86] T.C. Halsey, M.H. Jensen, L.P. Kadanoff, I. Procaccia, B.I. Shraiman, Fractal
28 measures and their singularities: The characterization of strange sets, (1986) 11.
- 29 [87] S.M. Pincus, I.M. Gladstone, R.A. Ehrenkranz, A regularity statistic for medical data
30 analysis, *J. Clin. Monit.* 7 (1991) 335–345. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01619355>.
- 31 [88] J.S. Richman, J.R. Moorman, Physiological time-series analysis using approximate
32 entropy and sample entropy, *Am. J. Physiol.-Heart Circ. Physiol.* 278 (2000) H2039–
33 H2049. <https://doi.org/10.1152/ajpheart.2000.278.6.H2039>.
- 34 [89] W. Chen, Z. Wang, H. Xie, W. Yu, Characterization of Surface EMG Signal Based on
35 Fuzzy Entropy, *IEEE Trans. Neural Syst. Rehabil. Eng.* 15 (2007) 266–272.
36 <https://doi.org/10.1109/TNSRE.2007.897025>.
- 37 [90] J.G.A. Cashaback, T. Cluff, J.R. Potvin, Muscle fatigue and contraction intensity
38 modulates the complexity of surface electromyography, *J. Electromyogr. Kinesiol.* 23
39 (2013) 78–83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jelekin.2012.08.004>.
- 40 [91] C.L. Webber, J.P. Zbilut, Dynamical assessment of physiological systems and states
41 using recurrence plot strategies, *J. Appl. Physiol.* 76 (1994) 965–973.
42 <https://doi.org/10.1152/jappl.1994.76.2.965>.
- 43 [92] G. Ouyang, X. Zhu, Z. Ju, H. Liu, Dynamical Characteristics of Surface EMG Signals
44 of Hand Grasps via Recurrence Plot, *IEEE J. Biomed. Health Inform.* 18 (2014) 257–
45 265. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JBHI.2013.2261311>.
- 46 [93] S. Mohammadi, LYAPROSEN: MATLAB function to calculate Lyapunov exponent,
47 (2009).
- 48 [94] H. Abdi, Partial least squares regression and projection on latent structure regression
49 (PLS Regression), *WIREs Comput. Stat.* 2 (2010) 97–106.
50 <https://doi.org/10.1002/wics.51>.

- 1 [95] T. Mehmood, K.H. Liland, L. Snipen, S. Sæbø, A review of variable selection methods
2 in Partial Least Squares Regression, *Chemom. Intell. Lab. Syst.* 118 (2012) 62–69.
3 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemolab.2012.07.010>.
- 4 [96] H. Abdi, Partial least squares regression and projection on latent structure regression
5 (PLS Regression), *WIREs Comput. Stat.* 2 (2010) 97–106.
6 <https://doi.org/10.1002/wics.51>.
- 7 [97] B.G. Marcot, A.M. Hanea, What is an optimal value of k in k-fold cross-validation in
8 discrete Bayesian network analysis?, 36 (2021) 2009–2031.
9 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00180-020-00999-9>.
- 10 [98] T. Fushiki, Estimation of prediction error by using K-fold cross-validation, *Stat.*
11 *Comput.* 21 (2011) 137–146. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11222-009-9153-8>.
- 12 [99] A. Subasi, Classification of EMG signals using combined features and soft computing
13 techniques, *Appl. Soft Comput.* 12 (2012) 2188–2198.
14 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asoc.2012.03.035>.
- 15 [100] A. Alkan, M. Günay, Identification of EMG signals using discriminant analysis and
16 SVM classifier, *Expert Syst. Appl.* 39 (2012) 44–47.
17 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2011.06.043>.
- 18 [101] H. Le, S. Kabbur, L. Pollastrini, Z. Sun, K. Mills, K. Johnson, G. Karypis, W.-S. Hu,
19 Multivariate analysis of cell culture bioprocess data—Lactate consumption as process
20 indicator, *J. Biotechnol.* 162 (2012) 210–223.
21 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiotec.2012.08.021>.
- 22 [102] A. Subasi, Classification of EMG signals using PSO optimized SVM for diagnosis of
23 neuromuscular disorders, *Comput. Biol. Med.* 43 (2013) 576–586.
24 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.combiomed.2013.01.020>.
- 25 [103] J.G.A. Cashaback, T. Cluff, J.R. Potvin, Muscle fatigue and contraction intensity
26 modulates the complexity of surface electromyography, *J. Electromyogr. Kinesiol.* 23
27 (2013) 78–83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jelekin.2012.08.004>.
- 28 [104] M. Navaneethakrishna, P.A. Karthick, S. Ramakrishnan, Analysis of biceps brachii
29 sEMG signal using Multiscale Fuzzy Approximate Entropy, in: 2015 37th Annu. Int.
30 Conf. IEEE Eng. Med. Biol. Soc. EMBC, IEEE, Milan, 2015: pp. 7881–7884.
31 <https://doi.org/10.1109/EMBC.2015.7320219>.
- 32 [105] P. Sbriccoli, F. Felici, A. Rosponi, A. Aliotta, V. Castellano, C. Mazzà, M. Bernardi,
33 M. Marchetti, Exercise induced muscle damage and recovery assessed by means of
34 linear and non-linear sEMG analysis and ultrasonography, *J. Electromyogr. Kinesiol.*
35 11 (2001) 73–83. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1050-6411\(00\)00042-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1050-6411(00)00042-0).
- 36 [106] M.D. Rudolph, O. Miranda-Domínguez, A.O. Cohen, K. Breiner, L. Steinberg, R.J.
37 Bonnie, E.S. Scott, K. Taylor-Thompson, J. Chein, K.C. Fettich, J.A. Richeson, D.V.
38 Dellarco, A. Galván, B.J. Casey, D.A. Fair, At risk of being risky: The relationship
39 between “brain age” under emotional states and risk preference, *Dev. Cogn. Neurosci.*
40 24 (2017) 93–106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2017.01.010>.
- 41 [107] B. Pageaux, S.M. Marcora, V. Rozand, R. Lepers, Mental fatigue induced by prolonged
42 self-regulation does not exacerbate central fatigue during subsequent whole-body
43 endurance exercise, *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* 9 (2015).
44 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2015.00067>.
- 45 [108] S. Gaudet, J. Tremblay, F. Dal Maso, Evolution of muscular fatigue in periscapular and
46 rotator cuff muscles during isokinetic shoulder rotations, *J. Sports Sci.* 36 (2018) 2121–
47 2128. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2018.1440513>.
- 48 [109] P.A. Karthick, N. Makaram, S. Ramakrishnan, Analysis of progression of fatigue
49 conditions in biceps brachii muscles using surface electromyography signals and
50 complexity based features, *Conf. Proc. Annu. Int. Conf. IEEE Eng. Med. Biol. Soc.*

- 1 IEEE Eng. Med. Biol. Soc. Annu. Conf. 2014 (2014) 3276–3279.
2 <https://doi.org/10.1109/EMBC.2014.6944322>.
- 3 [110] G. Korol, A. Karniel, I. Melzer, A. Ronen, Y. Edan, H. Stern, R. Riemer, Relation
4 between perceived effort and the electromyographic signal in localized low-effort
5 activities, *Proc. Hum. Factors Ergon. Soc. Annu. Meet.* 58 (2014) 1077–1081.
6 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1541931214581225>.
- 7 [111] A.C. McDonald, C.T.F. Tse, P.J. Keir, Adaptations to isolated shoulder fatigue during
8 simulated repetitive work. Part II: Recovery, *J. Electromyogr. Kinesiol.* 29 (2016) 42–
9 49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jelekin.2015.05.005>.
- 10 [112] A.C. McDonald, D.M. Mulla, P.J. Keir, Using EMG Amplitude and Frequency to
11 Calculate a Multimuscle Fatigue Score and Evaluate Global Shoulder Fatigue, *Hum.*
12 *Factors.* (2018) 0018720818794604. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018720818794604>.
- 13 [113] R. Merletti, D. Farina, Myoelectric Manifestations of Muscle Fatigue, in: *Wiley*
14 *Encycl. Biomed. Eng., American Cancer Society,* 2006.
15 <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780471740360.ebs1427>.
- 16 [114] L. Mesin, D. Dardanello, A. Rainoldi, G. Boccia, Motor unit firing rates and
17 synchronisation affect the fractal dimension of simulated surface electromyogram
18 during isometric/isotonic contraction of vastus lateralis muscle, *Med. Eng. Phys.* 38
19 (2016) 1530–1533. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.medengphy.2016.09.022>.
- 20 [115] J.R. Fuller, K.V. Lomond, J. Fung, J.N. Côté, Posture-movement changes following
21 repetitive motion-induced shoulder muscle fatigue, *J. Electromyogr. Kinesiol.* 19
22 (2009) 1043–1052. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jelekin.2008.10.009>.
- 23 [116] J.R. Fuller, J. Fung, J.N. Côté, Time-dependent adaptations to posture and movement
24 characteristics during the development of repetitive reaching induced fatigue, *Exp.*
25 *Brain Res.* 211 (2011) 133–143. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-011-2661-8>.
- 26 [117] M.W. Flood, B.R. Jensen, A.-S. Malling, M.M. Lowery, Increased EMG intermuscular
27 coherence and reduced signal complexity in Parkinson’s disease, *Clin. Neurophysiol.*
28 130 (2019) 259–269. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2018.10.023>.
- 29 [118] F. Liao, X. Zhang, C. Cao, I.Y.-J. Hung, Y. Chen, Y.-K. Jan, Effects of Muscle Fatigue
30 and Recovery on Complexity of Surface Electromyography of Biceps Brachii, *Entropy.*
31 23 (2021) 1036. <https://doi.org/10.3390/e23081036>.
- 32 [119] J.N. Côté, A.G. Feldman, P.A. Mathieu, M.F. Levin, Effects of Fatigue on
33 Intermuscular Coordination during Repetitive Hammering, *Motor Control.* 12 (2008)
34 79–92. <https://doi.org/10.1123/mcj.12.2.79>.
- 35 [120] D. Srinivasan, K.E. Sinden, S.E. Mathiassen, J.N. Côté, Gender differences in
36 fatigability and muscle activity responses to a short-cycle repetitive task, *Eur. J. Appl.*
37 *Physiol.* 116 (2016) 2357–2365. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00421-016-3487-7>.
- 38