

1 **Real-world gait and turning in individuals scheduled for total** 2 **knee arthroplasty**

3 R.J. Boekesteijn^{1,2}, N.L.W. Keijsers^{1,2,3}, K. Defoort⁴, M. Mancini⁵, F.J. Bruning¹,
4 M. El-Gohary⁶, A.C.H. Geurts², K. Smulders¹

5

6

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

8 ² = Department of Rehabilitation, Donders Institute for Brain Cognition and Behaviour, Radboud
9 University Medical Center, The Netherlands

10 ³ = Department of Sensorimotor Neuroscience, Donders Institute for Brain, Cognition and Behaviour,
11 Radboud University, Nijmegen, The Netherlands.

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

13 ⁵ = Department of Neurology, School of Medicine, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland

14 ⁶ = APDM Wearable Technologies, a Clario company, Portland, Oregon

15

16 Correspondence to: R.J. Boekesteijn, (ramonboekesteijn@gmail.com), department of Research, Sint
17 Maartenskliniek, P.O. box 9011, 6500 GM, Nijmegen, the Netherlands

18 **Abstract**

19

20 *Objective:* To compare real-world gait and turning between individuals scheduled for total knee
21 arthroplasty (TKA) and healthy controls, using continuous monitoring with inertial measurement units
22 (IMUs).

23 *Design:* Real-world gait and turning data were collected for 5-7 days in individuals scheduled
24 for TKA (n=34) and healthy controls in the same age range (n=32) using IMUs on the feet and lower
25 back. Gait and turning parameters were compared between groups using a linear regression model.
26 Data was further analyzed by stratification of gait bouts based on bout length, and turns based on
27 turning angle and turning direction.

28 *Results:* Dominant real-world gait speed was 0.21 m/s lower in individuals scheduled for TKA
29 compared to healthy controls. The between-group difference in gait speed was -0.10 m/s for bouts
30 containing 0-10 strides and -0.15 m/s for bouts with 160+ strides. Stride time was 0.05 s higher in
31 individuals scheduled for TKA. Step time asymmetry was not different between the groups. Regarding
32 walking activity, individuals scheduled for TKA walked 72 strides/hour less than healthy controls, and
33 maximum bout length was 316 strides shorter. Irrespective of the size of the turn, turning velocity was
34 lower in individuals scheduled for TKA. Turning velocity did not differ between turns over the
35 affected leg compared to the unaffected leg.

36 *Conclusion:* Individuals scheduled for TKA showed specific walking and turning limitations in the
37 real-world. Parameters derived from IMUs reflected a rich profile of real-world mobility measures
38 indicative of walking limitation of individuals scheduled for TKA, which may provide a relevant
39 outcome dimension for future studies.

40

41 **Keywords:** remote monitoring, gait, turning, inertial sensors, knee osteoarthritis, knee arthroplasty

42 **Introduction**

43 Individuals with knee osteoarthritis (OA) have difficulty walking, illustrated by reduced gait
44 capacity compared to their healthy peers (1, 2). Gait capacity, defined as what people ‘*can do*’, is
45 essential for activities of daily living and to participate in society (3). These limitations in gait capacity
46 can translate to a lower gait performance, i.e. to what people ‘*actually do*’ in the real-world, including
47 a lower walking activity (4, 5). As walking itself may counteract functional decline (6-9), low walking
48 activity could lead to further worsening of gait capacity in individuals with knee OA. Given this
49 apparent vicious circle between limitations in gait capacity and walking activity, mitigating walking
50 limitations is of great importance to individuals with knee OA (10) and constitutes a reason to consider
51 total knee arthroplasty (TKA) (11, 12). Insights about the extent of walking limitation is therefore
52 relevant for individuals with knee OA opting for TKA.

53 A drawback of measuring of gait capacity is that it not necessarily corresponds with measures
54 of gait performance (13, 14). With assessment of gait capacity usually being conducted in gait
55 laboratories or other relatively controlled settings, its ecological validity may be limited (15, 16).
56 Furthermore, data collection is typically restricted to a few short bouts of straight-ahead walking. This
57 does not align with the fact that individuals with knee OA often report problems with longer bout
58 durations, when pain becomes the dominating factor. Also, the focus on only straight-ahead gait does
59 not match with real-world walking, when changes in direction are very common (17). Moreover,
60 turning during walking has been associated with fall risk, which is increased in individuals with OA
61 (18).

62 Inertial measurement units (IMUs) have facilitated research into real-world mobility, enabling
63 unobtrusive and continuous recording of gait and turning performance. In contrast to elderly and
64 neurological populations (13, 19-26), studies evaluating real-world gait and turning in individuals with
65 knee OA are scarce (27-29). Of these studies, only Chapman *et al.* (27) compared individuals
66 scheduled for TKA with a healthy control group. However, only knee kinematics were evaluated in
67 this study (27). Moreover, in this study, the data from different gait bouts were collapsed into one

68 mean value, while the capture of gait during multiple days also enables to differentiate between short
69 and longer walking periods (20, 22-24, 30).

70 The aim of this study was to compare real-world gait and turning between individuals with
71 knee OA, who are scheduled for TKA, and healthy individuals. We hypothesized that individuals
72 scheduled for TKA would show poorer real-world gait and turning metrics compared to healthy
73 individuals in the same age range. Capitalizing on the rich data set capturing multiple days of activity
74 for each individual, we also explored the role of gait bout length on between-group differences in gait
75 performance.

76

77 **Methods**

78 *Participants*

79 Thirty-four individuals scheduled for TKA and thirty-two healthy individuals participated in
80 this study. This study was part of a longitudinal study investigating real-life and challenging gait skills
81 in individuals receiving posterior cruciate retaining TKA (<https://osf.io/ec6nf/>). This study was
82 powered to detect differences in real-world gait speed between individuals 1 year after TKA compared
83 to healthy participants. As the difference in real-world gait speed between these groups is likely higher
84 before than 1 year after TKA, we expected to have sufficient power for the current study. Individuals,
85 aged 40-80 years, who were candidates for posterior cruciate-retaining TKA at the Sint
86 Maartenskliniek were screened for eligibility by a research nurse. Eligibility criteria included: 1)
87 symptomatic and radiographic knee OA (i.e. Kellgren-Lawrence grade ≥ 2), 2) intact posterior cruciate
88 ligament, 3) correctable or $<10^\circ$ rigid varus or valgus deformity of the knee, and 4) stable health
89 (ASA-score ≤ 3). Healthy participants did not have a diagnosis of knee OA, and were recruited from
90 the community, striving for a similar distribution of age and sex as our study group with individuals
91 scheduled for TKA. Participants were excluded based on the following criteria: 1) BMI $> 35 \text{ kg/m}^2$, 2)
92 moderate to severe knee, hip or ankle pain defined as an average score >4 on items 3-6 of the Short
93 Brief Pain Inventory; excluding the knee indexed for TKA, 3) previous knee, hip, or ankle joint

94 replacement, 4) any other musculoskeletal, neurological, or uncorrected visual disorder impairing gait
95 or balance. This study was approved by the CMO Arnhem Nijmegen (2019-5824). All participants
96 provided written informed consent and all procedures were in accordance with the Declaration of
97 Helsinki. This sub-analysis was pre-registered on OSF (<https://osf.io/dawv6>).

98

99 *Data collection*

100 *Clinical assessment*

101 Anterior-posterior X-rays of the knee were obtained through regular care and were graded by
102 an experienced orthopedic surgeon (KD) using the Kellgren and Lawrence classification system (31).
103 Anthropometric measurements, including height, body mass, and BMI were obtained pre-operatively,
104 which was 1.8 months (IQR = 1.5) before TKA. Both for individuals scheduled for TKA and healthy
105 controls, pain scores during activity and rest over the last week were obtained using a numeric rating
106 scale (NRS), with a range 0-10 with higher scores indicating higher pain ratings. For individuals
107 scheduled for TKA, the Knee injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score – Physical Function shortform
108 (KOOS-PS) (32) and Knee Society Score (KSS) (33) were also obtained. KOOS-PS scores were
109 transformed to a 0-100 scale with a score of 100 representing no difficulty. For the KSS, only the
110 clinical and functional score were obtained (both on a 0-100 scale) with 100 representing best
111 function.

112

113 *Real-world gait and turning assessment*

114 Participants wore 3 IMUs, two of which were embedded in instrumented socks (prototype
115 developed by APDM Wearable Technologies, Portland, OR, USA; similar as in (26)) (Figure 1) and
116 one was placed on the lower back at the sacrolumbar level (Opal v2, APDM Wearable Technologies,
117 Portland, OR, USA). The IMUs in the socks were placed on the dorsum of both feet. Participants
118 started wearing the sensors the day after the clinical assessments were performed. Participants wore
119 the sensors during daytime for a total period of 5-7 days, always including at least one weekend day.

120 Participants were instructed to start wearing the sensors in the morning, when they started performing
121 their daily activities. Battery life of the sensors was approximately 10-12 hours. Sensor batteries were
122 charged overnight. All data was stored on a local memory drive (8 GB) embedded in the sensors.
123 When data collection was completed, sensors were returned via a postal office after which data was
124 transferred to a desktop computer for offline processing.

125

126 *Data processing and analysis*

127 Sensor data were processed using algorithms described in Shah *et al.* (25). Using a time
128 domain approach, alternating periods of movement and stillness – corresponding to stance and swing –
129 were identified from accelerometer and gyroscope signals from the feet to detect potential gait bouts.
130 Individual strides were combined into the same gait bouts as long as the duration between strides was
131 less than 2.5 seconds. Subsequently, all gait bouts containing more than 3 strides were processed via
132 the Mobility Lab algorithm (APDM Wearable Technologies, Portland, OR) to compute spatiotemporal
133 gait parameters for each stride per gait bout (34). This algorithm has shown good concurrent validity
134 and acceptable absolute errors compared to a gold standard pressure mat system (34). In older adults,
135 absolute errors were -0.11 m/s for gait speed (ICC = 0.934) and 0.01 s for stride time (ICC = 0.998).
136 Turns during walking were identified from the gait bouts based on the gyroscope data of the sensor on
137 the lower back, using algorithms described in (35). This algorithm looks for periods where the angular
138 velocity around the vertical axis exceeds 15°/s. The start and end of the turn are defined by the point
139 where the angular velocity around the vertical axis drops below 5°/s. Turns with an angle larger than
140 45° and a duration between 0.5 and 10 seconds were labeled as valid turns. Compared to an optical
141 motion capture system, this algorithm had a sensitivity of 0.90 and specificity of 0.75 (35).

142 For each individual, a normalized frequency distribution of gait speed of all included strides
143 was constructed. From this distribution, the following parameters were determined: real-world gait
144 speed defined as the dominant peak of the distribution, maximum real-world gait speed defined as the
145 95th percentile of frequency distribution., and the interquartile range (IQR) of the distribution. Based

146 on previous studies reporting a bimodal distribution for real-world gait speed (13, 36), we opted for
147 the value at the dominant peak to approximate real-world gait speed. Stride time was calculated as the
148 median of the stride times of all collected strides per participant, as this parameter did not follow a
149 bimodal distribution. Step time asymmetry was defined as the difference in step time between the
150 affected leg and the unaffected leg, divided by the mean value, multiplied by 100%. Parameters
151 reflecting walking activity included the maximum gait bout length of all included gait bouts over all
152 days, the average number of gait bouts per monitored hour, and number of strides per monitored hour.
153 In order to study the effect of gait bout length on gait speed, we first evaluated availability of gait data
154 for bouts of a specific length. This analysis was used to define 6 bins (i.e. 0-10, 11-20, 21-40, 41-80,
155 81-160, and 160+ strides). For each bin, the average gait speed of all gait bouts was taken.

156 For all identified turns per participant, the maximum turning velocity was derived from the
157 transversal angular velocity signal of the IMU on the lower back. For each participant, a frequency
158 distribution of this parameter was constructed. The median of this distribution was chosen to
159 characterize turning velocity. In addition, the number of turns per monitored hour was compared
160 between groups. Turning velocity was analyzed separately for turns over affected and unaffected leg
161 for individuals scheduled for TKA, whereas for healthy controls the average over all turns was used.
162 To better evaluate if group differences in turning velocity might have been due to differences in the
163 size of the turning angle (21), an exploratory analysis was performed by categorizing turns based on
164 turning angles < 90 degrees, 90-180 degrees, or >180 degrees. Post-processing of gait and turning
165 parameters was performed in Python 3.8.3.

166

167 *Statistical analysis*

168 Gait and turning parameters were compared between groups using a linear regression model
169 with the specific gait or turning parameter as dependent variable, group as the between-group factor,
170 and age, sex, and height as covariates. In case model assumptions (i.e. normal distribution of the
171 residuals) were violated, data was log-transformed. Estimates were back transformed by taking the

172 exponent of the estimate. If model assumptions were still not met, groups were compared using the
173 Mann-Whitney U test. Furthermore, to study the effect of gait bout length on gait speed, an
174 independent samples t-test was conducted for each bin that contained at least data from 70% of all
175 participants. When parametric testing was possible, between-group differences were reported as mean
176 differences (i.e. individuals scheduled for TKA - healthy participants) with 95% confidence intervals.
177 Statistical analyses were conducted in RStudio using the stats package (version 4.1.2).

178

179 **Results**

180 *Participant characteristics*

181 Participant characteristics are provided in Table 1. Individuals scheduled for TKA had on
182 average higher body mass and BMI, and experienced more pain during rest and activity compared to
183 healthy controls. Monitored time was similar between the two groups and corresponded to
184 approximately 10-12 hours/day of monitoring per participant. Data of one healthy control could not be
185 analyzed due to an error in one of the sock sensors. Furthermore, for one participant scheduled for
186 TKA turning data was lacking due to a lumbar sensor error.

187

188 *Differences in real-world gait parameters*

189 Distributions of real-world gait speed are provided on an individual level in Figure 2. In most
190 individuals, the data distribution was left-skewed, with a wide range of gait speeds for each
191 participant. The value at the dominant peak was 0.21 m/s ($p < 0.001$) lower in individuals scheduled for
192 TKA compared to healthy controls. Similarly, values at the 95th percentile were 0.17 m/s (95% CI:
193 0.09; 0.25, $p < 0.001$) lower in individuals scheduled for TKA. No difference between the two groups
194 was observed in the IQR of the distribution (Table 2). Furthermore, individuals scheduled for TKA
195 walked with a higher stride time (median diff = 0.05 s, $p = 0.003$) than healthy controls (Figure 3D).
196 Step duration asymmetry was not different between the two groups (mean diff = 0.6 %, 95% CI: -0.9;
197 2.0, $p = 0.426$; Figure 3E).

198 With respect to parameters related to walking activity, maximum gait bout length was lower in
199 individuals scheduled for TKA (median diff = 316 strides, $p = 0.005$; Figure 3F). Although there was
200 no difference in the number of gait bouts per hour (mean diff = -0 bouts/hour, 95% CI = -1; 1, $p =$
201 0.904; Figure 3G), the number of strides per hour was lower in individuals scheduled for TKA
202 compared to healthy controls (median diff = -72 strides, $p < 0.001$; Figure 3H).

203

204 *Differences in real-world turning parameters*

205 For turning velocity, individual data distributions are shown in Figure 2. Velocity was not
206 different between turning over the affected vs. the unaffected leg in individuals scheduled for TKA
207 (mean diff = 1.4 deg/s; 95% CI = -0.0; 2.7, $p=0.053$; Figure 4A). Compared to healthy controls,
208 turning velocity for turns over the affected leg (mean diff = -6.3 deg/s, 95% CI = -11.6; -1.0, $p =$
209 0.020) as well as for turns over the unaffected leg (mean diff = -7.7 deg/s; 95 CI: -12.9; -2.4, $p =$
210 0.005) was lower than in healthy participants. Further exploration of this data revealed that turning
211 velocity increased with larger turning angles. The direction of the group differences was similar for
212 different angle sizes (Figure 4C-E). The number of turns per hour was not different between
213 individuals scheduled for TKA and healthy controls (mean diff = -1.8 turns; 95% CI: -7.2; 3.7, $p =$
214 0.520; Figure 4B).

215

216 *Effect of gait bout length on gait parameters*

217 To determine the effect of gait bout length on gait speed, we first evaluated the presence of
218 gait bouts of different lengths in both groups. Definition of the final bin was based on a cut-off value
219 of 70% data availability for each of the groups. At a final bin size of 160+ strides, 71% of individuals
220 scheduled for TKA and 83% of healthy individuals had data available (Figure 5). From Figure 5, it can
221 also be observed that the group scheduled for TKA had smaller maximum bout lengths than the
222 healthy control group.

223 Analysis of gait speed depending on bout length revealed that for both individuals scheduled
224 for TKA and healthy participants, gait speed was higher for longer bout lengths (Figure 6). More
225 specifically, in individuals scheduled for TKA gait speed increased from 0.86 ± 0.12 m/s for bouts
226 between 0-10 strides, to 1.18 ± 0.13 m/s for bouts longer than 160 strides. In healthy controls, gait
227 speed changed from 0.96 ± 0.16 m/s for bouts between 0-10 strides to 1.33 ± 0.15 m/s for bouts longer
228 than 160 strides. Mean differences between groups were -0.10 m/s for the shortest gait bouts and -0.15
229 m/s for the longest gait bouts (Figure 6).

230

231 Discussion

232 In this study, we provide a detailed account of real-world gait and turning performance in
233 individuals scheduled for TKA. Consistent with our hypothesis, real-world gait and turning
234 performance of individuals scheduled for TKA was markedly poorer than healthy controls, evidenced
235 by a lower gait speed, a lower turning velocity, a lower maximum gait bout length, and less strides per
236 hour. In addition, the group difference in real-world gait speed was -0.10 m/s for shortest gait bouts
237 and -0.15 m/s for the longest gait bouts. Notably, individuals scheduled for TKA did not walk with
238 higher step time asymmetry compared to healthy participants.

239 Individuals scheduled for TKA had on average a 0.21 m/s lower dominant walking speed than
240 their healthy peers. Similar differences have been reported for gait speed in supervised settings (i.e.
241 gait capacity) (1, 2). Not only the value at the peak of the distribution (i.e. the most frequently
242 observed gait speed per individual), was lower in individuals scheduled for TKA, but also the 95th
243 percentile of the distribution (resembling gait capacity (13, 37)) was lower. In combination with our
244 finding that the IQR was not different between groups, these results indicate that in the group of
245 individuals scheduled for TKA the whole distribution of individual gait speeds was shifted towards
246 lower values. With the median group difference in stride time being 0.05 s, this difference in gait speed
247 can be explained as a combined effect of longer stride times and shorter stride lengths.

248 Continuous monitoring of walking enabled a profound analysis of the potential factors
249 underlying differences in gait speed between individuals scheduled for TKA and their healthy peers. A
250 major advantage of this data capture mode is the possibility to evaluate the effect of gait bout length
251 on the derived gait speed. In line with previous studies (23, 24, 30), we found that in both groups gait
252 speed scaled with bout length. The between-group difference became somewhat larger with increasing
253 bout length, although the magnitude of this effect was relatively small (i.e. from -0.10 m/s in the
254 shortest gait bouts to -0.15 m/s in the longest gait bouts) and was lower than the overall group
255 difference in gait speed. However, it is important to note that longer, uninterrupted gait bouts were
256 scarce in individuals scheduled for TKA. Together, these results may indicate that the overall mean
257 group difference in gait speed can partly be explained by the finding that individuals with advanced
258 knee OA walk shorter distances per gait bout. This latter finding is consistent with low activity levels
259 observed in knee OA groups (38), and with the lower number of steps taken as observed in the current
260 as well as in other studies (4, 5).

261 In line with a previous meta-analysis of studies measuring gait capacity (2), there was no
262 group difference in step time asymmetry. Although asymmetries in knee joint loading (39) and
263 kinematics (40) have been reported in individuals with unilateral knee OA, this does not seem to be
264 reflected in temporal asymmetries, particularly given that mean asymmetry was close to zero (i.e.
265 perfect symmetry) in the current study. This finding is also consistent with our data collected during a
266 2-minute walk test (41).

267 In addition to real-world gait parameters, turning velocity was lower in individuals scheduled
268 for TKA than in healthy controls, irrespective of the size and direction of the turn. Individuals
269 scheduled for TKA may thus exploit a generally more cautious turning strategy. In a previous study,
270 we also found slower turning in individuals scheduled for TKA for 180 degree turns during a 2-minute
271 walking trial (42). Importantly, lower real-world turning velocity has been associated with a higher fall
272 risk (21, 43), adding relevance to these findings. The absence of a difference between turning in the
273 direction of the affected vs. the unaffected leg in individuals scheduled for TKA may not be

274 surprising, given that compensation is possible as both legs are involved in making the turn, which
275 typically consist of 2-4 steps according to real-world data (21, 43).

276 Our findings hold important clinical relevance. For individuals with knee OA, walking activity
277 is important to protect against further disease progression (6-9). Moreover, individuals scheduled for
278 TKA list improving walking ability as a main treatment goal (11, 44). Our data clearly indicate
279 walking limitations for the average individual scheduled for TKA. In fact, most individuals scheduled
280 for TKA did not show uninterrupted gait bouts lasting longer than 10 minutes, which may be a
281 limiting factor for recreational walking or purposeful trips to, for example, a shopping center. On the
282 other hand, a large proportion of individuals scheduled for TKA walked at relatively high speed (i.e. >
283 1.25 m/s (3)), and were well able to scale up gait speed with increasing bout length. In this group, the
284 room for improvement is limited, which is important information when discussing expectations
285 regarding knee arthroplasty.

286 This study has a number of limitations that merit attention. First, as of yet, no consensus or
287 standard exists on how to process real-world gait data collected with IMUs. Choices made in the
288 sensor configuration and processing algorithms – including sensor location (i.e. lower back vs. feet),
289 definitions of gait bout start and stops, and degrees of freedom in heading direction – may have had a
290 substantial impact on the derived gait and turning performance parameters. Although such influences
291 on the between-group comparisons in our study are likely small, they limit comparison of results with
292 other studies that used different sensor configurations and/or algorithms (13, 20, 28-30). Secondly,
293 battery life of the sensors was limited to 10-12 hours. Thus, we did not capture gait and turning data
294 for the full day. However, total monitored time was similar between groups, and quantitative
295 parameters were normalized to the number of hours. Nevertheless, this limits interpretation of our
296 results in terms of physical activity, for example when comparing our data to guidelines for the
297 recommended number of steps per day (38). Finally, our sample included individuals with unilateral
298 knee OA without previous joint replacement surgery in any other joint. This resulted in a selected
299 group, not representative for all individuals scheduled for TKA, who may have a relatively high
300 walking performance. Nonetheless, compared to the Dutch population undergoing TKA, our group

301 only had a slightly lower age (i.e. 4 years), while BMI and male/female ratio were relatively similar
302 (45).

303

304 **Conclusion**

305 Real-world monitoring of gait and turning using IMUs revealed that individuals scheduled for
306 TKA had lower walking activity and lower real-world gait and turning speed compared to healthy
307 peers of similar age. Parameters derived from IMUs provided a rich profile of real-world mobility
308 measures that were indicative of walking and turning limitations, which may provide a relevant
309 dimension for future studies.

310

311 **Acknowledgements**

312 We want to thank Edward King for his support with data processing, and Saskia Susan and
313 Jolanda Rubrech for their contribution to patient recruitment and data management.

314

315 **Author contributions**

316 Conception and design: RB, KD, and KS. Obtaining of funding: KD and KS. Collection and
317 assembly of data: RB. Analysis and interpretation of the data: all authors. Drafting the first version of
318 the article: RB. Critical revision of the article and approval of final version: all authors. Supervision:
319 NK, AG, and KS. Technical support: ME.

320

321 **Role of the funding source**

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

324

325 **Conflict of interest**

326 Mahmoud El-Gohary has a significant financial interest in APDM Wearable Technologies, a
327 company that may have a commercial interest in the results of this research and technology.

328

329 **References**

- 330 1. Mills K, Hunt MA, Ferber R. Biomechanical deviations during level walking associated with
331 knee osteoarthritis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken)*.
332 2013;65(10):1643-65.
- 333 2. Boekesteijn RJ, van Gerven J, Geurts ACH, Smulders K. Objective gait assessment in
334 individuals with knee osteoarthritis using inertial sensors: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Gait
335 & Posture*. 2022;98:109-20.
- 336 3. Fritz S, Lusardi M. White Paper: “Walking Speed: the Sixth Vital Sign”. *Journal of Geriatric
337 Physical Therapy*. 2009;32(2).
- 338 4. Verlaan L, Bolink SA, Van Laarhoven SN, Lipperts M, Heyligers IC, Grimm B, et al.
339 Accelerometer-based Physical Activity Monitoring in Patients with Knee Osteoarthritis: Objective and
340 Ambulatory Assessment of Actual Physical Activity During Daily Life Circumstances. *Open Biomed
341 Eng J*. 2015;9:157-63.
- 342 5. Winter CC, Brandes M, Müller C, Schubert T, Ringling M, Hillmann A, et al. Walking ability
343 during daily life in patients with osteoarthritis of the knee or the hip and lumbar spinal stenosis: a cross
344 sectional study. *BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders*. 2010;11(1):233.
- 345 6. Lo GH, Vinod S, Richard MJ, Harkey MS, McAlindon TE, Kriska AM, et al. Association
346 Between Walking for Exercise and Symptomatic and Structural Progression in Individuals With Knee
347 Osteoarthritis: Data From the Osteoarthritis Initiative Cohort. *Arthritis & Rheumatology*.
348 2022;74(10):1660-7.

- 349 7. Sun R, Tomkins-Lane C, Muaremi A, Kuwabara A, Smuck M. Physical activity thresholds for
350 predicting longitudinal gait decline in adults with knee osteoarthritis. *Osteoarthritis and Cartilage*.
351 2021;29(7):965-72.
- 352 8. White DK, Tudor-Locke C, Zhang Y, Fielding R, LaValley M, Felson DT, et al. Daily
353 walking and the risk of incident functional limitation in knee osteoarthritis: an observational study.
354 *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken)*. 2014;66(9):1328-36.
- 355 9. Fenton SAM, Neogi T, Dunlop D, Nevitt M, Doherty M, Duda JL, et al. Does the intensity of
356 daily walking matter for protecting against the development of a slow gait speed in people with or at
357 high risk of knee osteoarthritis? An observational study. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage*. 2018;26(9):1181-9.
- 358 10. te Molder MEM, Verhoef LM, Smolders JMH, Heesterbeek PJC, van den Ende CHM.
359 Prioritization of adverse consequences after total knee arthroplasty contributing to a poor response: A
360 Best-Worst Scaling Exercise among total knee arthroplasty patients and knee specialists. *The Journal*
361 *of Arthroplasty*. 2023.
- 362 11. Lange T, Schmitt J, Kopkow C, Rataj E, Günther KP, Lützner J. What Do Patients Expect
363 From Total Knee Arthroplasty? A Delphi Consensus Study on Patient Treatment Goals. *J*
364 *Arthroplasty*. 2017;32(7):2093-9.e1.
- 365 12. Latijnhouwers D, Vlieland T, Marijnissen WJ, Damen PJ, Nelissen R, Gademan MGJ. Sex
366 differences in perceived expectations of the outcome of total hip and knee arthroplasties and their
367 fulfillment: an observational cohort study. *Rheumatol Int*. 2023;43(5):911-22.
- 368 13. Van Ancum JM, van Schooten KS, Jonkman NH, Huijben B, van Lummel RC, Meskers
369 CGM, et al. Gait speed assessed by a 4-m walk test is not representative of daily-life gait speed in
370 community-dwelling adults. *Maturitas*. 2019;121:28-34.
- 371 14. Takayanagi N, Sudo M, Yamashiro Y, Lee S, Kobayashi Y, Niki Y, et al. Relationship
372 between Daily and In-laboratory Gait Speed among Healthy Community-dwelling Older Adults.
373 *Scientific Reports*. 2019;9(1):3496.
- 374 15. Warmerdam E, Hausdorff JM, Atrsaei A, Zhou Y, Mirelman A, Aminian K, et al. Long-term
375 unsupervised mobility assessment in movement disorders. *Lancet Neurol*. 2020;19(5):462-70.

- 376 16. Friesen KB, Zhang Z, Monaghan PG, Oliver GD, Roper JA. All eyes on you: how researcher
377 presence changes the way you walk. *Scientific Reports*. 2020;10(1):17159.
- 378 17. Glaister BC, Bernatz GC, Klute GK, Orendurff MS. Video task analysis of turning during
379 activities of daily living. *Gait Posture*. 2007;25(2):289-94.
- 380 18. Doré AL, Golightly YM, Mercer VS, Shi XA, Renner JB, Jordan JM, et al. Lower-extremity
381 osteoarthritis and the risk of falls in a community-based longitudinal study of adults with and without
382 osteoarthritis. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken)*. 2015;67(5):633-9.
- 383 19. Mancini M, El-Gohary M, Pearson S, McNames J, Schlueter H, Nutt JG, et al. Continuous
384 monitoring of turning in Parkinson's disease: Rehabilitation potential. *NeuroRehabilitation*.
385 2015;37:3-10.
- 386 20. Del Din S, Godfrey A, Galna B, Lord S, Rochester L. Free-living gait characteristics in ageing
387 and Parkinson's disease: impact of environment and ambulatory bout length. *J Neuroeng Rehabil*.
388 2016;13(1):46.
- 389 21. Leach JM, Mellone S, Palumbo P, Bandinelli S, Chiari L. Natural turn measures predict
390 recurrent falls in community-dwelling older adults: a longitudinal cohort study. *Scientific Reports*.
391 2018;8(1):4316.
- 392 22. Storm FA, Nair KPS, Clarke AJ, Van der Meulen JM, Mazzà C. Free-living and laboratory
393 gait characteristics in patients with multiple sclerosis. *PLOS ONE*. 2018;13(5):e0196463.
- 394 23. Mueller A, Hoefling HA, Muaremi A, Praestgaard J, Walsh LC, Bunte O, et al. Continuous
395 Digital Monitoring of Walking Speed in Frail Elderly Patients: Noninterventional Validation Study
396 and Longitudinal Clinical Trial. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth*. 2019;7(11):e15191.
- 397 24. Shah VV, McNames J, Harker G, Mancini M, Carlson-Kuhta P, Nutt JG, et al. Effect of Bout
398 Length on Gait Measures in People with and without Parkinson's Disease during Daily Life. *Sensors*
399 (Basel). 2020;20(20).
- 400 25. Shah VV, McNames J, Mancini M, Carlson-Kuhta P, Nutt JG, El-Gohary M, et al. Digital
401 Biomarkers of Mobility in Parkinson's Disease During Daily Living. *Journal of Parkinson's Disease*.
402 2020;10:1099-111.

- 403 26. Shah VV, McNames J, Mancini M, Carlson-Kuhta P, Spain RI, Nutt JG, et al. Laboratory
404 versus daily life gait characteristics in patients with multiple sclerosis, Parkinson's disease, and
405 matched controls. *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*. 2020;17(1):159.
- 406 27. Chapman RM, Moschetti WE, Van Citters DW. Stance and swing phase knee flexion recover
407 at different rates following total knee arthroplasty: An inertial measurement unit study. *Journal of*
408 *Biomechanics*. 2019;84:129-37.
- 409 28. Fransen BL, Pijnappels M, Butter IK, Burger BJ, van Dieën JH, Hoozemans MJM. Patients'
410 perceived walking abilities, daily-life gait behavior and gait quality before and 3 months after total
411 knee arthroplasty. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg*. 2022;142(6):1189-96.
- 412 29. Vangeneugden J, Verlaan L, Oomen P, Liu WY, Peters M, Natour N, et al. Signatures of knee
413 osteoarthritis in women in the temporal and fractal dynamics of human gait. *Clin Biomech (Bristol,*
414 *Avon)*. 2020;76:105016.
- 415 30. Rehman RZU, Guan Y, Shi JQ, Alcock L, Yarnall AJ, Rochester L, et al. Investigating the
416 Impact of Environment and Data Aggregation by Walking Bout Duration on Parkinson's Disease
417 Classification Using Machine Learning. *Frontiers in Aging Neuroscience*. 2022;14.
- 418 31. Kellgren JH, Lawrence JS. Radiological assessment of osteo-arthrosis. *Ann Rheum Dis*.
419 1957;16(4):494-502.
- 420 32. Perruccio AV, Stefan Lohmander L, Canizares M, Tennant A, Hawker GA, Conaghan PG, et
421 al. The development of a short measure of physical function for knee OA KOOS-Physical Function
422 Shortform (KOOS-PS) - an OARSI/OMERACT initiative. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage*. 2008;16(5):542-
423 50.
- 424 33. Insall JN, Dorr LD, Scott RD, Scott WN. Rationale of the Knee Society clinical rating system.
425 *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 1989(248):13-4.
- 426 34. Morris R, Stuart S, McBarron G, Fino PC, Mancini M, Curtze C. Validity of Mobility Lab
427 (version 2) for gait assessment in young adults, older adults and Parkinson's disease. *Physiological*
428 *Measurement*. 2019;40(9):095003.
- 429 35. El-Gohary M, Pearson S, McNames J, Mancini M, Horak F, Mellone S, et al. Continuous
430 Monitoring of Turning in Patients with Movement Disability. *Sensors*. 2014;14(1):356-69.

- 431 36. Atrsaei A, Corrà MF, Dadashi F, Vila-Chã N, Maia L, Mariani B, et al. Gait speed in clinical
432 and daily living assessments in Parkinson's disease patients: performance versus capacity. *npj*
433 *Parkinson's Disease*. 2021;7(1):24.
- 434 37. Hendriks MMS, Vos-van der Hulst M, Weijs RWJ, van Lotringen JH, Geurts ACH, Keijsers
435 NLW. Using Sensor Technology to Measure Gait Capacity and Gait Performance in Rehabilitation
436 Inpatients with Neurological Disorders. *Sensors*. 2022;22(21).
- 437 38. Wallis JA, Webster KE, Levinger P, Taylor NF. What proportion of people with hip and knee
438 osteoarthritis meet physical activity guidelines? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Osteoarthritis*
439 *and Cartilage*. 2013;21(11):1648-59.
- 440 39. Christiansen CL, Bade MJ, Judd DL, Stevens-Lapsley JE. Weight-bearing asymmetry during
441 sit-stand transitions related to impairment and functional mobility after total knee arthroplasty. *Arch*
442 *Phys Med Rehabil*. 2011;92(10):1624-9.
- 443 40. Ismailidis P, Egloff C, Hegglin L, Pagenstert G, Kern R, Eckardt A, et al. Kinematic
444 changes in patients with severe knee osteoarthritis are a result of reduced walking speed rather than
445 disease severity. *Gait Posture*. 2020;79:256-61.
- 446 41. Boekesteijn RJ, Smolders JMH, Busch VJJF, Geurts ACH, Smulders K. Independent and
447 sensitive gait parameters for objective evaluation in knee and hip osteoarthritis using wearable sensors.
448 *BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders*. 2021;22(1):242.
- 449 42. Boekesteijn R, Smolders J, Busch V, Keijsers N, Geurts A, Smulders K. Objective monitoring
450 of functional recovery after total knee and hip arthroplasty using sensor-derived gait measures. *PeerJ*.
451 2022;10:e14054.
- 452 43. Mancini M, Schlueter H, El-Gohary M, Mattek N, Duncan C, Kaye J, et al. Continuous
453 Monitoring of Turning Mobility and Its Association to Falls and Cognitive Function: A Pilot Study. *J*
454 *Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*. 2016;71(8):1102-8.
- 455 44. Whitebird RR, Solberg LI, Ziegenfuss JY, Asche SE, Norton CK, Swiontkowski MF, et al.
456 Personalized outcomes for hip and knee replacement: the patients point of view. *Journal of Patient-*
457 *Reported Outcomes*. 2021;5(1):116.
- 458 45. LROI. Annual report 2022 2022 [20-6-2023]. Available from: <https://www.lroi-report.nl/>.

459 **Figure legends**

460 **Figure 1:** Overview of the IMUs embedded in socks. The sensor system consisted of a large
461 casing (positioned above the lateral malleolus) containing the battery and memory drive, which was
462 connected to the IMU on the dorsum of the foot via a small cable (left panel).

463 **Figure 2:** Ridgeplot showing all individual distributions of real-world gait speed (left panel) and
464 maximum turning velocity (right panel) for individuals scheduled for TKA (red) and for healthy
465 controls (green). For individuals scheduled for TKA both turns over the affected and unaffected leg
466 were included. Data are ordered from low to high based on the value at the dominant peak of real-
467 world gait speed or the median of maximum turning velocity (exact values are indicated on the y-
468 axis).

469 **Figure 3:** Violin plots with for all gait parameters with an overlay of individual datapoints.
470 Mean values are indicated by the large white dots in the distributions, median values by the solid lines,
471 and 1st and 3rd quartiles are indicated by the dashed lines. P-values of statistical tests are reported in
472 each panel.

473 **Figure 4:** Violin plots with for all turning parameters with an overlay of individual datapoints.
474 Mean values are indicated by the large white dots in the distributions, median values by the solid lines,
475 and 1st and 3rd quartiles are indicated by the dashed lines. P-values of statistical tests are reported in
476 each panel.

477 **Figure 5:** Availability of gait bouts of a specific bout length in both groups. The dashed line at a
478 bout length of 160 strides indicates our maximum bin size, with 83% availability in healthy
479 participants and 71% in individuals scheduled for TKA.

480 **Figure 6:** Effect of bout length on gait speed. In the top panel mean and standard deviations are
481 displayed for each bin size for both groups. In addition, data availability for each group is indicated in
482 the top panel as the percentage of individuals for whom data are available in each bin. Mean
483 differences with 95% confidence intervals are provided in the bottom panel.

484 **Tables**

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

Parameter	Individuals scheduled for TKA (n=34)	Healthy controls (n=31)	Mean difference [95 % CI]
Age (y)	65 (9)	65 (10)	0 [-4 ; 5]
Sex (M:F)	13:21	12:19	-
Height (m)	1.73 (0.11)	1.75 (0.07)	-0.02 [-0.06; 0.03]
Mass (kg)	86 (15)	75 (11)	11 [4; 17]
BMI (kg/m ²)	28.5 (3.4)	24.5 (3.1)	4.0 [2.4; 5.6]
KL grade (I:II:III:IV)	0:0:10:24	-	-
KOOS-PS (0-100)	55 (12)	-	-
KSS – clinical score (0-100)	65 (8)	-	-
KSS – functional score (0-100)	65 (14)	-	-
NRS pain rest (0-10)	4.1 (2.5)	0.5 (1.0)	3.6 [2.7; 4.6]
NRS pain activity (0-10)	6.2 (2.0)	0.7 (1.0)	5.5 [4.7; 6.3]
Monitored time (h)	60 (17)	58 (17)	2 [-7; 10]

486 *Note:* Data are provided as mean (SD). BMI = body mass index, KL = Kellgren Lawrence, KOOS-PS = Knee Osteoarthritis
487 Outcome Score – Physical Function Shortform, KSS = knee society score, NRS = numeric rating scale.

Table 2: Detailed output of the statistical models comparing individuals scheduled for TKA and healthy controls. Data are presented as mean (SD) for both groups if not otherwise indicated. In case data were log-transformed or non-parametric tests were conducted, data were presented as median (IQR) (in *italic*).

Parameter	Individuals scheduled for TKA (n=34)	Healthy controls (n=31)	Median difference	Estimate (95% CI) of the group difference	Test statistic	P-value
Gait speed – value at dominant peak (m/s)	<i>1.15 (0.17)</i>	<i>1.36 (0.28)</i>	-0.21	-	U = 840	<0.001
Gait speed – 95 th percentile (m/s)	1.35 (0.17)	1.53 (0.16)	-	-0.17 (-0.25; 0.09)	t(63) = -4.32	<0.001
Gait speed – IQR (m/s)	<i>0.27 (0.08)</i>	<i>0.26 (0.10)</i>	0.01	1.01 (0.86; 1.20)*	t(63) = 0.17	0.863
Stride time – median (s)	<i>1.14 (0.12)</i>	<i>1.09 (0.07)</i>	0.05	-	U = 321	0.007
Step time asymmetry (%)	1.4 (3.2)	0.6 (2.7)	-	0.6 (-0.9; 2.0)	t(63) = 0.80	0.426
Maximum bout length (strides)	<i>248 (306)</i>	<i>564 (714)</i>	-316	0.52 (0.34; 0.82)*	t(63) = -2.93	0.005
#Bouts/hour	6.1 (2.9)	6.1 (2.5)	-	-0.0 (-1.4; 1.3)	t(63) = -0.07	0.941
#Strides/hour	<i>123 (114)</i>	<i>195 (237)</i>	-72	0.55 (0.37; 0.81)*	t(63) = -3.08	0.003
Maximum turning velocity – median (deg/s)	93.1 (10.9)	-	-	Aff vs. HC: -6.3 (-11.5; -1.0)	t(62) = -2.38	0.020
<i>Affected</i>	91.7 (10.7)	-	-	Unaff vs. HC: -7.7 (-12.9; -2.4)	t(62) = -2.93	0.005
<i>Unaffected</i>	-	99.4 (10.1)	-	Aff vs Unaff: 1.4 (-0.0; 2.7)	t(32) = 2.01	0.053
<i>Combined</i>						
#Turns/hour	24.1 (10.0)	25.8 (11.3)	-	-1.8 (-7.2 ; 3.7)	t(62) = -0.65	0.520

Aff = affected leg, Unaff = unaffected leg, HC = healthy controls

* = parameter was log-transformed. Estimates should be interpreted as relative change of the parameter compared to the value of healthy control











