

Lower limb joint Loading during high-impact activities: implication for bone health

1 **Zainab Altai^{a,b*}, Claude Fiifi Hayford^c, Andrew Phillips^d, Jason Moran^a, Xiaojun Zhai^e, Bernard**
2 **X.W. Liew^a**

3 ^aSchool of Sport, Rehabilitation and Exercise Sciences, University of Essex, United Kingdom

4 ^bInstitute of Public Health and Wellbeing, University of Essex, United Kingdom

5 ^cDepartment of Biomedical Engineering, University of Ghana, Ghana

6 ^dDepartment of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Imperial College London, United Kingdom

7 ^eSchool of Computer Science and Electronic Engineering, University of Essex, United Kingdom

8

9

10 *** Correspondence:**

11 Zainab Altai

12 za21920@essex.ac.uk; zainabaltai0@gmail.com

13 **Keywords: Exercises intensity; high-impact exercises; Joint contact force; Musculoskeletal**
14 **modelling**

15 **Abstract**

16 Osteoporosis, a significant concern among the elderly, results in low-trauma fractures affecting
17 millions globally. Despite the inclusion of physical activities in strategies to mitigate osteoporosis-
18 related fractures, the optimal exercises for bone health remain uncertain. Determining exercises that
19 enhance bone mass requires an understanding of loading on lower limb joints. This study investigates
20 hip, knee, and ankle joint loading during walking, running, jumping, and hopping exercises, assessing
21 impacts at various intensities (maximal, medium, and minimum efforts).

22 A total of 37 healthy, active participants were recruited, with a mean (SD) age of 40.3 (13.1) years,
23 height of 1.7 (0.08) m, and mass of 68.4 (11.7) kg. Motion capture data were collected for each
24 participant while performing six different exercises: a self-selected level of walking, running, counter-
25 movement jump, squat jump, unilateral hopping, and bilateral hopping. A lower body musculoskeletal
26 model was developed for each participant in OpenSim. The static optimization method was used to
27 calculate muscle forces and hip joint contact forces.

28 The study reveals that running and hopping induce increased joint contact forces compared to walking,
29 with increments of 83% and 21%, respectively, at the hip; 134% and 94%, respectively, at the knee;
30 and 94% and 77%, respectively, at the ankle. Jump exercises exhibit less hip and ankle loading
31 compared to walking, with reductions of 36% and 19%, respectively. Joint loading varies across
32 exercises and intensities, running faster increases forces on all joints, especially the hip. Sprinting raises
33 hip forces but lowers forces on the knee and ankle. Higher jumps intensify forces on the hip, knee, and
34 ankle, whereas hopping faster reduces forces on all joints.

35 The study emphasizes the site-specific impact of exercises on lower limb joint loadings, highlighting
36 the potential of running and hopping for bone formation compared to jumping alone. These findings
37 offer insights for optimizing exercise routines to improve bone health, with potential implications for
38 risk prevention, rehabilitation, and prosthetic development.

39 1. Introduction

40 Osteoporosis poses a significant health challenge, particularly among the elderly population. One of
41 the main consequences of osteoporosis is low trauma fractures. Approximately 137 million women and
42 21 million men worldwide are estimated to face an increased risk of osteoporotic fractures, causing
43 increasingly important public health concerns.¹ Current strategies aimed to optimizing bone mass to
44 help in reducing the risk of osteoporosis-related fractures include physical activities.^{2,3} It has been
45 reported that normal walking⁴ is not associated with bone mineral density (BMD) changes in the
46 femoral neck whereas jogging combined with walking⁵, running, and jumping⁶⁻⁸ were the most
47 effective in improving bone density and other parameters of bone health. Nevertheless, the optimal
48 type and intensity of exercises that enhance bone mass are still largely unknown.^{9,10} That is due to the
49 knowledge gap on how different loading paradigms best protect/enhance bone density and strength.^{2,9}

50 The relationship between physical activities, exercises, and bone health is explained by the
51 “mechanostat” theory^{11,12}, which states that bone adapts its microstructure based on the induced
52 mechanical loadings. These loadings are represented by external loading, including ground reaction
53 forces (GRF) and joint moments, and internal loading, including joint contact forces (JCF) and muscle
54 forces. When the imposed force on the bone exceeds a particular threshold, bone formation occurs in
55 favor of bone resorption. According to a meta-analysis by Kistler-Fischbacher et al, a high GRF, of at
56 least two times the body weight, is required to stimulate an osteogenic effect.¹³ However, studies have
57 shown that GRF metrics can mislead our understanding of loading on internal structures.¹⁴ To allow
58 prediction of the osteogenic effect of different exercises, quantitative data are required on calculated
59 forces acting on the lower limb joints. These forces generate stresses and strains in the bones by which
60 local adaptation of bone microstructure occurs. Recent studies reported that JCF at the hip is strongly
61 related to the strain distribution in the proximal part of the femur during walking¹⁵, running^{16,17} and
62 jumping.¹⁷ However, while there are many benefits to high-impact exercise, it may carry potential
63 risks. High-impact movements may impose higher stress than desired on the joints, increasing the risk
64 of both acute and overuse injuries. Accordingly, the potential to relate joint contact forces at the hip,
65 knee, and ankle during different exercises to stresses and strain levels that trigger osteogenesis could
66 be a major advancement toward optimizing training programs that induce appropriate force levels to
67 stimulate bone formation while avoiding injuries.

68 The “gold standard” method for in vivo measurement of joint contact forces includes using
69 instrumented implants.¹⁸ However, this method is limited by a small number of subjects in addition to
70 the altered anatomy and physiology of the joint region due to surgery. On the other hand,
71 musculoskeletal modeling based on 3D motion capture data offers advanced tools to predict joint forces
72 comparable to experimental measurements during various physical activities.¹⁹ Several previous
73 studies have employed musculoskeletal modeling to investigate the effect of different speeds of
74 walking and running on ground reaction forces²⁰ and contact forces of various lower limb joints.²¹⁻²³
75 To the authors’ knowledge, no research on such predictions during different jumping and hopping
76 movements is available. In studies in which exercise intensity is investigated, most focus
77 predominantly on the effect on a single lower limb joint (hip^{16,17,24}, knee^{25,26}, and ankle²⁶) and did
78 not investigate the combined effect of movement on other joints. Altering loading on one lower limb
79 joint may be associated with changes in the loading of the other joints.²⁷ One recent study reported
80 increased contact force of three lower limb joints when increasing the speed of gait, but more
81 interestingly, a significant increase was found in the predicted joint contact force at the knee compared
82 to the hip and ankle²⁸. Unfortunately, only walking was investigated.²⁸ Niu et al reported that
83 increasing dropping height significantly increased compressive forces of the hip, knee, and ankle
84 joints.²⁹ But more importantly, when subjects landed from low (32 cm) and medium heights (52 cm),

85 from the ankle to the knee and the hip joints, the peak joint forces in the vertical direction declined.²⁹
86 However, dropping from a height may produce a different force pattern than jumping from the ground
87 and landing. In terms of the effect of various exercise types, Pellikaan et al found that fast walking,
88 running, and unilateral hopping induced significantly higher hip joint contact forces than walking at 4
89 km/h.¹⁷ They advise that hopping needs to be considered carefully, especially in the elderly population.
90 However, no information was reported on knee and ankle joints. As aging is predictive of the
91 development of knee osteoarthritis, a condition often associated with the potential worsening of other
92 existing health issues, a comprehensive examination of all three joints becomes pivotal.

93 The present study aims to explore alterations in hip, knee, and ankle joint loading across various
94 exercise types (walking, running, countermovement jump, squat jump, unilateral hopping, and bilateral
95 hopping) and intensities (low, moderate, and maximum levels). This investigation seeks to address two
96 primary questions: firstly, which exercises elicit higher loading at the hip, knee, and ankle joints
97 compared to walking at normal speed, and secondly, how exercise intensity influences loading at these
98 three joints. By investigating the type and intensity of exercise, that optimally stimulates bone
99 remodeling without compromising joint integrity, this study seeks to contribute valuable insights to the
100 development of targeted exercise interventions for individuals at risk of osteoporosis-related issues.

101 **2. Material and methods**

102 *2.1. Dataset*

103 A total of 40 healthy participants were recruited for the present study, which occurred in the motion
104 laboratory at the University of Essex, UK. Eligible participants have to have no lower limb joint
105 replacement, have not been diagnosed with any serious lower limb injuries within the last year, and are
106 within the age range of 18 to 70 years old. The final sample includes 20 males and 20 females (age =
107 40.3 ± 13.1 years; height = 1.7 ± 0.08 m; mass = 68.4 ± 11.7 kg). Ethical approval was obtained from
108 the University of Essex Faculty of Science & Health Ethics Subcommittee (ETH2021-1155). A written
109 consent form was obtained from all participants before participating.

110 *2.2. Experimental Setup and Protocol*

111 Thirty-eight retro-reflective markers were attached to the lower extremity for each participant. Twenty-
112 two individual markers were attached to the following anatomical landmarks: left and right superior
113 iliac spines, anterior superior iliac spines and posterior superior iliac spines, medial and lateral femoral
114 condyles, medial and lateral malleoli. On the shoe, rearfoot markers were attached to the calcaneus's
115 lateral and posterior aspects, while forefoot markers were attached to the first and fifth metatarsals.
116 Furthermore, tracking clusters consisting of 4 markers were attached to the distal lateral aspect of the
117 thigh and the shank (Fig. 1). Five electromyography (EMG) sensors (Norixon, AZ., USA, 2 kHz) were
118 attached unilaterally to the dominant side of each participant targeting five different muscles: gluteus
119 maximus, gluteus medius, rectus femoris, biceps femoris, and soleus. Surface EMG signals were used
120 later to validate the musculoskeletal model's muscle force predictions. Marker trajectories were
121 recorded using sixteen 3D motion capture cameras (Vicon. Ltd., Oxford, UK, 200Hz). Ground reaction
122 forces were collected using two-floor force plates (Kistler, Winterthur, Switzerland, 2 kHz).

123 Participants performed six different exercises: walking (WK), running (RN), countermovement jump
124 (CMJ), squat jump (SJ), unilateral hopping (UH), and bilateral hopping (BH). Participants were asked
125 to perform each exercise (apart from walking) at three different self-reported intensity levels:
126 maximum effort, medium effort, and minimum effort as follows:

- 127
- 128
- 129
- 130
- 131
- 132
- 133
- 134
- 135
- 136
- 137
- 138
- 139
- 140
- 141
- Running, maximum effort (Fast) was achieved by instructing participants to sprint at their highest attainable speed; minimum effort (Natural) was achieved by asking the participants to maintain their typical jogging pace; while medium effort (Moderate) was determined collaboratively by the participants and the instructor, taking into consideration the parameters of maximum and minimum effort levels.
 - Squat jump and counter movement, maximum effort (Max) was achieved by instructing participants to jump at their highest attainable height; while minimum effort (Min) was achieved by asking the participants to perform minimal jump; and again, medium effort (Med) was determined collaboratively by the participants and the instructor, taking into consideration the parameters of maximum and minimum effort levels.
 - Unilateral hopping and Bilateral hopping, participants were instructed to hop for 10 seconds to beat three distinct frequencies (3.0 Hz, 2.6 Hz, and 2.2 Hz, representing maximum effort (Max), medium effort (Med), and minimum effort (Min), respectively)³⁰. Beats were played for the participants in advance and were asked to practice until they achieved synchronization.
 - Walking trials were collected at a self-selected speed of normal walking.

142 Participants were allowed to warm up for two minutes before recording the actual trials. Three
143 successful trials (whole foot in contact within the force plate area) were collected for each intensity
144 levels of each exercise.

145 2.3. *Musculoskeletal modelling*

146 A generic musculoskeletal model (gait2392) developed by Delp et al³¹ was modified by removing the
147 torso and associated muscles. The modified lower extremity model consisted of 13 body segments, 18
148 degrees of freedom (DOF), and 86 Hill-type musculotendon actuators. The hip was modelled as a ball
149 and socket joint (3 DOF), while the knee was modeled as a sliding hinge joint (1 DOF), and the ankle
150 and subtalar as revolute joints (1 DOF). Each model was scaled to match the subject's anthropometric
151 characteristics based on marker data of anatomical landmarks at the hip, knee and ankle during a static
152 trial. The maximal isometric force of each muscle was scaled by the mass of the subject divided by the
153 mass of the generic model raised to the power 2/3. The maximal isometric force was increased by a
154 factor of 3 for successful simulation for some tasks.³² A typical Opensim³³ simulation pipeline was
155 followed to estimate joint angles and moments using inverse kinematics and inverse dynamics,
156 respectively. Static optimization was used to estimate muscle forces by minimizing the sum of squared
157 muscle activations. Using joint reaction analysis,³⁴ hip, knee and ankle contact forces (JCFhip,
158 JCFknee, and JCFankle, respectively) were calculated for left and right side. However, data analysis
159 for the current study focused on the participants' dominant side, determined by asking them which foot
160 they used to kick a ball.




Fig. 1. Marker set for motion capture data and Musculoskeletal models. Twenty-two individual markers and four cluster markers were placed on the bone anatomical landmarks of the lower body (A). Six different exercises; walking, running, countermovement jump, squat jump, unilateral hopping, and bilateral hopping, were performed by each participant (B). Scaled Musculoskeletal models were developed in OpenSim representing each performed exercise (C).

161 2.4. Trial and Data processing

162 Trials were segmented based on trial type as described in Table 1. Time points used for trial
163 segmentation were defined using Visual 3D (C-motion Inc., Germantown, MD, USA). All trials were
164 then time normalized to 101 time points. Ground reaction forces and joint contact forces were also
165 normalized by the body weight of the participant (BW). Averaging processes were conducted at two
166 levels. A first averaging process resulted in an ensemble average curve across all participants for every
167 exercise intensity of every exercise type. For that, force curves were averaged for the repetitive trials
168 (three trials per exercise per intensity) for each participant across the 101 time points. Then the
169 averaged curves were used to find the mean curves of the vertical ground reaction force (vGRF) and
170 the resultant joint contact forces (JCFhip, JCFknee, and JCFankle) across all participants
171 (supplementary material, Fig. 1, Fig. 2, Fig. 3, respectively). The second averaging process resulted in
172 the mean of the peak value of forces across all participants. Peak values were identified in the averaged
173 curved of each participant then the means of the peaks were calculated for each of exercise intensity
174 across all participants.

175 Table 1. Time points used to segment trials for each of the five tested exercises.

Exercise type	Time point used for trial segmentation	
	From	To
WK	Heel strike	Toe off
RN	Heel strike	Toe off
BH	Foot on the force plate*	Foot off force plate*
UH	Foot on the force plate	Foot off force plate
CMJ	Initial stand (just before take-off)	Lowest position of the pelvis after landing
SJ	Lowest pelvis position during the squat position (just before take-off)	Lowest position of the pelvis after landing

176 * Dominant side

177 WK: walking, RN: running, CMJ: countermovement jump, SQ: squat jump, UH: unilateral hopping, and BH: bilateral hopping.

178 2.5. Statistical Analysis

179 A repeated measures ANOVA was performed on the peaks of the ground reaction forces and joint
180 contact forces of all participants to test the global effect of exercise type and exercise intensity
181 compared to walking using the General Linear Model in SPSS (Chicago, USA). The dependent variable
182 was JCF of each of the hip, knee, ankle, and vGRF, whilst the independent variable was the various
183 exercise types and intensities. Where significance was found (significance level $\alpha = 0.05$), Bonferroni
184 post hoc test was conducted to quantify pairwise differences.

185 3. Results

186 The means and standard deviations of the peak vertical ground reaction force, and joint contact forces
187 of the hip, knee, and ankle across all exercise types and intensities are indicated in Table 2.

188 3.1. Exercise type

189 All tested exercises were ranked based on the average peak force for vertical ground reaction force
190 (Fig. 2 A), hip joint contact force (Fig. 2 B), knee joint contact force (Fig. 2 C), and ankle joint contact
191 force (Fig. 2 D). Exercises with a significant difference ($p < .05$) compared to walking with self-
192 selected speed (highest peak of Peak1 and Peak2) were marked with an asterisk. The estimates,
193 lower/upper limits, and p-values as well as the results from the ANOVA were reported in the
194 supplementary material (Table 1).

195 3.1.1 Vertical ground reaction force

196 Running, unilateral hopping, and bilateral hopping imposed higher vertical ground reaction force
197 compared to walking by up to 105%, 103%, and 38% respectively. While both countermovement jump
198 and squat jump were lower than walking by 8%, and 20% respectively.

199 3.1.2 Joint contact forces

200 Running and unilateral hopping imposed higher forces on the hip joint compared to walking, with
201 increases of up to 83% and 21%, respectively. Conversely, forces on the hip joint decreased by 53%,
202 36%, and 34% during bilateral hopping, squat jumps, and counter-movement jumps, respectively.

203 All exercises resulted in higher knee joint contact forces compared to walking. Running induced the
204 highest force, increasing by up to 134%, followed by counter movement jumps at 97%, unilateral
205 hopping at 94%, squat jumps at 85%, with the lowest increase during bilateral hopping at 42% higher
206 than walking.

207 Similar to the hip joint, the ankle joint experienced increased loading during running (94%), unilateral
 208 hopping (77%), and bilateral hopping (30%) compared to walking. Conversely, both squat jumps and
 209 counter-movement jumps imposed lower forces on the ankle joint than walking, with reductions of
 210 19% and 3%, respectively.

211 3.2. Exercise Intensity

212 Overall, the impact of exercise intensity on the vertical ground reaction force was barely noticeable
 213 across all exercises with only a minor increase observed when hopping at a higher frequency. A clear
 214 effect was observed on joint contact forces (Fig. 3). Increasing running speed from jogging to a
 215 moderate speed resulted in increased forces across all joints. However, sprinting at the highest capacity
 216 exhibited a considerably higher force at the hip joint combined with decreased forces on the knee and
 217 ankle joints. Increased vertical jump amplitude caused an increase in forces experienced at the hip,
 218 knee, and ankle joints. Conversely, increased hopping frequency results in a reduction in forces exerted
 219 across all joints.

220 Table 2. Mean and SD of the peak vertical ground reaction force and joint contact forces of the hip,
 221 knee and ankle predicted by the musculoskeletal models for the six tested exercises.

Exercise	Mean±SD peak ground reaction forces and joint contact forces normalised by the body weight				Mean±SD Speed (m/sec)	Mean±SD Jump height (m)	Mean±SD Stance duration (sec)
	vGRF	JCFhip	JCFknee	JCFankle			
Walking	1.28±0.09	6.31±1.23	4.50±0.50	5.05±0.53	1.59±0.41	-	-
Running Natural	2.51±0.26	8.21±1.32	9.70±1.26	9.54±1.43	2.98±0.61	-	-
Running Moderate	2.62±0.27	9.47±2.17	10.54±2.02	9.79±1.36	4.25±0.59	-	-
Running Fast	2.62±0.30	11.56±4.08	9.97±1.77	9.51±1.30	5.26±0.83	-	-
Squat Jumps Min	1.05±0.15	4.06±1.33	6.65±1.38	4.11±0.66	-	0.21±0.06	-
Squat Jumps Med	1.08±0.14	4.47±1.45	7.13±1.53	4.44±0.65	-	0.26±0.08	-
Squat Jumps Max	1.03±0.11	5.83±2.21	8.32±2.05	4.32±0.59	-	0.32±0.09	-
Counter Jumps Min	1.22±0.18	4.18±1.52	7.26±1.69	4.92±0.67	-	0.23±0.05	-
Counter Jumps Med	1.18±0.13	4.59±1.44	7.80±1.82	4.92±0.58	-	0.28±0.07	-
Counter Jumps Max	1.19±0.14	5.63±2.38	8.88±2.59	5.04±0.64	-	0.33±0.08	-
Unilateral Hopping Min	2.36±0.27	7.65±1.43	8.74±1.48	8.04±1.64	-	-	0.31±0.05
Unilateral Hopping Med	2.59±0.25	7.56±1.46	8.02±1.13	8.96±1.58	-	-	0.28±0.06
Unilateral Hopping Max	2.59±0.22	6.98±1.14	6.84±0.92	8.72±1.23	-	-	0.25±0.06
Bilateral Hopping Min	1.63±0.29	3.50±0.74	6.39±1.14	6.22±1.35	-	-	0.25±0.04
Bilateral Hopping Med	1.76±0.24	3.18±0.57	5.21±0.76	6.55±1.15	-	-	0.21±0.03
Bilateral Hopping Max	1.73±0.22	2.93±0.76	4.20±0.86	6.27±0.96	-	-	0.19±0.02

222 vGRF: Vertical ground reaction force
 223 JCFhip: Hip joint contact force
 224 JCFknee: Knee joint contact force
 225 JCFankle: Ankle joint contact force
 226 SD: standard deviation

227




Fig. 2. Average peak vertical Ground reaction force (A), resultant joint contact forces of the hip (B), knee (C), and ankle (D) expressed in body weight of each participant (BW) ranked from left to right for the highest to the lowest predicted force. Asterisks denote the exercises with significantly different ($p < 0.05$) peak force compared to walking (highest peak of Peak1 and Peak2) indicated by the horizontal line.




Fig. 3. Distribution of peak vGRF and peak JCFs during walking, running, squat jump, counter movement jump, unilateral hopping, and bilateral hopping and at three different exercise intensities. vGRF ground reaction force; JCF contact force at hip, knee, and ankle.

229 4. Discussion

230 The current study explores the effect of high-impact exercises at different intensity levels on hip, knee,
231 and ankle joint loadings. The aim was to evaluate the types and intensity of exercises that may either
232 trigger or support bone tissue formation. Running and hopping at all tested intensities lead to
233 significantly higher joint contact forces in the three joints compared to normal walking speed,
234 potentially stimulating bone remodeling. Hip joint load was higher than the knee and ankle during
235 walking, while knee joint load was higher during running and jumping, and ankle load was higher
236 during hopping.

237 The range of joint contact forces of the hip, knee, and ankle joints predicted by the current study is
238 comparable to previous studies.^{12,16,17,22,35-37} Prior simulation studies reported hip joint forces during
239 slow to fast runs to be 7.5-10.0 BW¹⁶ with speed range (0.8 to 3.6 m/sec), compared to our predicted
240 8.2-11.6 BW. Knee joint forces were reported around 7.8-12.0 BW at 4.36 m/sec^{12,22}, while our
241 prediction was 9.7-10.5 BW. Ankle joint forces ranged from 11.9 BW to 13 BW at 4.36 m/sec^{22,35}
242 compared to our prediction of around 10.0 BW. Some of our predicted forces are slightly higher, one
243 reason possibly due to our cohort comprising healthy, active individuals who exercise regularly at least
244 three times a week, as indicated by a questionnaire administered before data collection. This is
245 confirmed by the higher running speed range of the current study cohort (2.98 to 5.25 m/sec) compared
246 to the above-mentioned studies. Another reason could be related to the use of static optimization
247 technique to estimate muscle forces in the musculoskeletal models of the present study. Static
248 optimization methods were reported to likely overestimate lower-limb joint contact forces during
249 vigorous gait tasks.²² However, static optimization solutions were also reported to practically
250 equivalent to dynamic solution³⁸. In terms of hopping and jumping, despite the limited available
251 information, our results align with the existing data. Pellikaan et al. reported a hip joint contact force

252 range of 6.0-7.57 BW during self-selected unilateral hopping at what pace¹⁷. The study included post-
253 menopausal elderly women, potentially leading to lower reported values compared to our study. While
254 during maximal countermovement jump performed by athletic males, joint contact forces were
255 reported to be 5.5-8.4 BW, 6.9-9.0 BW, and 8.9-10.0 BW at 0.38 m jump height³⁹ compared to our
256 predictions (4.2-5.6 BW, 7.3-8.9 BW and 4.9-5.0 BW at jump height range of 0.23 to 0.33 m) for hip,
257 knee, and ankle joints, respectively. Knee joint contact force during squat jumps was reported to be an
258 average of 7.07 BW³⁷ compared to the current study prediction (6.65 BW- 8.32BW at jump height
259 range of 0.21 to 0.32 m).

260 The current study assumes normal walking, which is a low-impact daily activity, as the baseline to
261 judge which exercise is seen as a more potent stimulus for promoting beneficial changes in bone
262 structure and density^{4,17,40}. Running and hopping involves brief periods of weightlessness followed by
263 forceful ground impacts and joint loading, inducing a more significant skeletal response. These results
264 are partly in agreement with several clinical trials and simulation studies. Fast-walking intervention
265 program^{5,41,42}, running¹⁷, and hopping^{17,43} were reported to preserve femoral neck BMD in an elderly
266 population. Interestingly, our results suggest no, or even a negative, effect of countermovement jump
267 and squat jump exercises, even when jumps are performed with the maximal effort, in particular at the
268 hip and ankle joint regions at which loading was found to be less than walking. Therefore, jump
269 exercises alone seem to be unsuitable to increase or maintain the BMD. Despite jumping strength
270 training was reported previously with a high risk for lower extremity joint overloading⁴⁴, in support of
271 our results,⁴⁵ Nishiumi et al reported that high impact programs represented by two-legged vertical
272 jumps with jump-rope might improve functional mobility but have no significant change on BMD
273 values of the femoral neck and lumbar spine.

274 When breaking down the effect of each exercise on each joint, the predicted values of joint contact
275 forces during running were highest at the knee, followed by the hip, and then the ankle (load at all
276 joints were higher than walking). Jumping induced a higher load at the knee joint than the hip and ankle
277 joints (load at the knee only was higher than walking), while hopping loaded the ankle joint the most,
278 followed by the knee joint and least at the hip joint (load at the knee and ankle were higher than
279 walking) (Fig. 3). Our study suggests that exercises that improve bone strength are site-specific.
280 Running might enhance bone formation of the whole lower limb joints. Jumping may improve bone
281 formation at the knee joint but, with no or even negative effect on hip and ankle joint regions. Hopping
282 has more effect on the ankle joint than the knee joint, but not the hip joint. Therefore, an osteoporosis
283 exercise program would be better suited to include a combination of these three exercises. However, it
284 is noteworthy that each high-impact exercise was investigated individually, and the combined effects
285 of these exercises were not assessed. Indeed, this is an important factor as a conventional exercise
286 program may be structured to incorporate a variety of high-impact exercises at varying intensities,
287 alongside complementary strength training.¹⁰

288 When considering exercise intensity, hip, knee, and ankle joint contact forces increased with higher
289 jumping height but decreased with increased hopping frequency. While there is limited information in
290 the literature regarding the relationship between lower limb joint loading and the intensity level of
291 hopping and jumping exercises, this relation can be partially explained by the amplitude of muscle
292 activation and the cumulative loading on joints during specific exercises. Previous studies have
293 indicated that increased eccentric muscle forces play a role in enhancing vertical jump height.⁴⁶ This
294 is attributed to the correlation between eccentric strength during knee extension and squatting exercises
295 and the resulting jump height. Consequently, an augmentation in jump height might be attributed to
296 increased muscle forces and, subsequently, elevated loading at the joints. On the other hand, increasing
297 hopping frequency is combined with a decrease in hip flexion, knee flexion, and ankle dorsiflexion,

298 which in turn results in an increase in the stiffness of lower limb joints^{47,48} and reduced muscle
299 activations when measured by EMGs.^{49,50} Running showed a different pattern with increasing speed
300 from slow (2.98 m/sec) to moderate (4.25 m/sec) being associated with increased joint contact forces
301 at the hip, knee, and ankle joints. Previous studies have also reported a positive linear relation when
302 assessing running speed (very slow 0.8 m/sec to moderate 3.6 m/sec) with changes in joint contact
303 forces at the hip¹⁶ and ankle (4.17m/sec).⁵¹ However, when running was performed at maximum effort
304 (sprinting at 5.26 m/sec), the increased force at the hip joint was combined with a decreased force at
305 the knee and ankle joints. Large hip muscles, such as the gluteal muscles, become highly active when
306 running fast to counteract the joint moment and to generate higher forces at the hip joint.⁵² In support
307 of our findings, running at a slower speed (2.23 m/sec) was previously reported with increased
308 accumulated loads at the knee compared to faster running (4.38 m/sec).⁵³ Peterson et al. explained that
309 the relatively shorter duration of ground contact, combined with the relatively longer distance covered
310 during a loading cycle, reduced the number of loading cycles to traverse an equivalent distance and
311 appeared to mitigate the impact of high loads per stride.

312 It is worth mentioning that the impact of exercise intensity on the vertical ground reaction force was
313 barely noticeable compared to joint contact forces across all exercises as shown in Table 1. Therefore,
314 the use of ground reaction forces is possibly not a good predictor of peak skeletal loading at the joints
315 and so should not be used alone to assess the intensity of an exercise regimen.¹⁴ The discrepancies
316 between joint loads and ground reaction forces suggest that other factors, such as muscle activations
317 play an important role in joint loading¹⁶. This is related to the fact that muscles exert considerable
318 forces to equilibrate the external moments caused by ground reaction forces during a given motion,
319 serving as protectionary mechanism against damage to the surroundings non-contractile tissue.

320 The present results should be utilized and interpreted with caution owing to certain limitations. The
321 current study employed static optimization technique. Future studies may investigate joint contact force
322 prediction for high-impact activities using subject-specific MRI-based musculoskeletal models.⁵⁴
323 Nonetheless, static optimization has been found to adequately replicate muscle activation patterns
324 during walking^{38,55} and hopping⁵⁶, even though the magnitudes of the produced forces remain
325 unverified due to the impracticality of in vivo data acquirement. Another factor is related to the study
326 cohort. Our cohort includes healthy, highly active individuals of both genders, spanning different age
327 groups. Peak joint loading from young adults cannot be generalized to elderly populations^{57,58},
328 similarly for physically non-active to active people, given the differences in motion strategy used to
329 perform an exercise between those groups such as gait length and speed, and standing balance.⁵⁹
330 Therefore, the current results should not be interpreted for age or gender-specific populations.
331 However, this was beyond the scope of the current study, a follow-up study will address further analysis
332 by generating age- and gender-based subgroups.

333 The investigation of lower limb joint performance during high-impact activities in this study
334 contributes to the understanding of how such exercise influences joint loading, offering implications
335 for optimizing exercise regimens to enhance bone health. We emphasize that activities like running
336 and hopping, involving weight-bearing and dynamic impacts, appear more favorable for bone
337 formation than jumping alone. Furthermore, our analysis underscores the site-specific nature of
338 exercises in influencing bone strength through unique patterns in joint contact forces under various
339 exercises. Running at varying speeds demonstrated differing impacts on the hip, knee, and ankle joints,
340 while hopping frequency inversely affected joint forces. The current study findings are crucial not only
341 for optimizing exercise regimens to enhance bone health but also for various other aspects, such as
342 designing risk prevention and rehabilitation programs, developing prosthetics, and analyzing sports or

343 occupational activities. Future studies should focus on investigating the stress and strain effects on
344 joints to further understand how joint forces of various exercise types and intensities might trigger bone
345 formation. This can be achieved through coupled musculoskeletal models and finite element models.

346 **5. Author Contributions**

347 Conceptualization—ZA, BL; Data Curation—ZA, BL, Funding Acquisition—
348 BL, Methodology—ZA, CF, BL, Project Administration—BL, Software—ZA, CF, Supervision—AP,
349 JM, BL, Validation—AP, JM, BL, Visualization—ZA, Writing—Original Draft Preparation—ZA,
350 Writing—Review and Editing—All authors.

351 **6. Conflict of Interest**

352 The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial
353 relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

354 **7. Funding**

355 ZA and BL were supported by The Academy of Medical Sciences, UK, Springboard Award
356 (SBF006\1019).

357 **8. References**

- 358 1. Odén A, McCloskey E V., Kanis JA, Harvey NC, Johansson H. Burden of high fracture
359 probability worldwide: secular increases 2010–2040. *Osteoporos Int* 2015;**26**:2243–8.
360 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00198-015-3154-6>.
- 361 2. Benedetti MG, Furlini G, Zati A, Letizia Mauro G. The Effectiveness of Physical Exercise on
362 Bone Density in Osteoporotic Patients. *Biomed Res Int* 2018;**2018**:1–10.
363 <https://doi.org/10.1155/2018/4840531>.
- 364 3. Moayyeri A. The Association Between Physical Activity and Osteoporotic Fractures: A Review
365 of the Evidence and Implications for Future Research. *Ann Epidemiol* 2008;**18**:827–35.
366 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annepidem.2008.08.007>.
- 367 4. Nikander R, Sievänen H, Heinonen A, Daly RM, Uusi-Rasi K, Kannus P. Targeted exercise
368 against osteoporosis: A systematic review and meta-analysis for optimising bone strength
369 throughout life. *BMC Med* 2010;**8**:47. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1741-7015-8-47>.
- 370 5. Martyn-St James M, Carroll S. A meta-analysis of impact exercise on postmenopausal bone
371 loss: the case for mixed loading exercise programmes. *Br J Sports Med* 2009;**43**:898–908.
372 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsm.2008.052704>.
- 373 6. Heinonen A, Kannus P, Sievänen H, Oja P, Pasanen M, Rinne M, et al. Randomised controlled
374 trial of effect of high-impact exercise on selected risk factors for osteoporotic fractures. *Lancet*
375 1996;**348**:1343–7. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(96\)04214-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(96)04214-6).
- 376 7. Manaye S, Cheran K, Murthy C, Bornemann EA, Kamma HK, Alabbas M, et al. The Role of
377 High-intensity and High-impact Exercises in Improving Bone Health in Postmenopausal
378 Women: A Systematic Review. *Cureus* 2023;**15**:1–8. <https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.34644>.

- 379 8. Vainionpaa A, Korpelainen R, Leppaluoto J, Jamsa T. Effects of high-impact exercise on bone
380 mineral density: a randomized controlled trial in premenopausal women. *Osteoporos Int*
381 2005;**16**:191–7. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00198-004-1659-5>.
- 382 9. Brooke-Wavell K, Skelton DA, Barker KL, Clark EM, De Biase S, Arnold S, et al. Strong,
383 steady and straight: UK consensus statement on physical activity and exercise for osteoporosis.
384 *Br J Sports Med* 2022;**56**:837–46. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2021-104634>.
- 385 10. Kitagawa T, Hiraya K, Denda T, Yamamoto S. A comparison of different exercise intensities
386 for improving bone mineral density in postmenopausal women with osteoporosis: A systematic
387 review and meta-analysis. *Bone Reports* 2022;**17**:101631.
388 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bonr.2022.101631>.
- 389 11. Frost HM. Bone's Mechanostat: A 2003 Update. *Anat Rec - Part A Discov Mol Cell Evol Biol*
390 2003;**275**:1081–101. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ar.a.10119>.
- 391 12. Saxby DJ, Modenese L, Bryant AL, Gerus P, Killen B, Fortin K, et al. Tibiofemoral contact
392 forces during walking, running and sidestepping. *Gait Posture* 2016;**49**:78–85.
393 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2016.06.014>.
- 394 13. Kistler-Fischbacher M, Weeks BK, Beck BR. The effect of exercise intensity on bone in
395 postmenopausal women (part 2): A meta-analysis. *Bone* 2021;**143**:115697.
396 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bone.2020.115697>.
- 397 14. Matijevich ES, Branscombe LM, Scott LR, Zelik KE. Ground reaction force metrics are not
398 strongly correlated with tibial bone load when running across speeds and slopes: Implications
399 for science, sport and wearable tech. Grabowski A, editor. *PLoS One* 2019;**14**:e0210000.
400 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0210000>.
- 401 15. Altai Z, Montefiori E, Veen B V., Paggiosi MA, Mccloskey V, Viceconti M, et al. Femoral neck
402 strain prediction during level walking using a combined musculoskeletal and finite element
403 model approach. 2021:1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0245121>.
- 404 16. Giarmatzis G, Jonkers I, Wesseling M, Van Rossom S, Verschueren S. Loading of Hip
405 Measured by Hip Contact Forces at Different Speeds of Walking and Running. *J Bone Miner*
406 *Res* 2015;**30**:1431–40. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jbmr.2483>.
- 407 17. Pellikaan P, Giarmatzis G, Vander Sloten J, Verschueren S, Jonkers I. Ranking of osteogenic
408 potential of physical exercises in postmenopausal women based on femoral neck strains. Garcia
409 Aznar JM, editor. *PLoS One* 2018;**13**:e0195463. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0195463>.
- 410 18. D'Lima DD, Fregly BJ, Colwell CW. Implantable sensor technology: measuring bone and joint
411 biomechanics of daily life in vivo. *Arthritis Res Ther* 2013;**15**:203.
412 <https://doi.org/10.1186/ar4138>.
- 413 19. Stansfield BW, Nicol AC, Paul JP, Kelly IG, Graichen F, Bergmann G. Direct comparison of
414 calculated hip joint contact forces with those measured using instrumented implants. An
415 evaluation of a three-dimensional mathematical model of the lower limb. *J Biomech*
416 2003;**36**:929–36. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9290\(03\)00072-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9290(03)00072-1).

- 417 20. Keller TS, Weisberger AM, Ray JL, Hasan SS, Shiavi RG, Spengler DM. Relationship between
418 vertical ground reaction force and speed during walking , slow jogging , and running. *Clin*
419 *Biomech* 1996;**11**:253–9. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0268-0033\(95\)00068-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0268-0033(95)00068-2).
- 420 21. Zhao K, Shan C, Luximon Y. Contributions of individual muscle forces to hip, knee, and ankle
421 contact forces during the stance phase of running: a model-based study. *Heal Inf Sci Syst*
422 2022;**10**:11. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13755-022-00177-9>.
- 423 22. Rooney BD, Derrick TR. Joint contact loading in forefoot and rearfoot strike patterns during
424 running. *J Biomech* 2013;**46**:2201–6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2013.06.022>.
- 425 23. Fukuchi CA, Fukuchi RK, Duarte M. Effects of walking speed on gait biomechanics in healthy
426 participants: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Syst Rev* 2019;**8**:153.
427 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-019-1063-z>.
- 428 24. Modenese L, Phillips ATM. Prediction of hip contact forces and muscle activations during
429 walking at different speeds. *Multibody Syst Dyn* 2012;**28**:157–68.
430 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11044-011-9274-7>.
- 431 25. Lenton GK, Bishop PJ, Saxby DJ, Doyle TLA, Pizzolato C, Billing D, et al. Tibiofemoral joint
432 contact forces increase with load magnitude and walking speed but remain almost unchanged
433 with different types of carried load. Srinivasan M, editor. *PLoS One* 2018;**13**:e0206859.
434 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0206859>.
- 435 26. Wang X, Ma Y, Hou BY, Lam W-K. Influence of Gait Speeds on Contact Forces of Lower
436 Limbs. *J Healthc Eng* 2017;**2017**:1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2017/6375976>.
- 437 27. Bowd J, Biggs P, Holt C, Whatling G. Does Gait Retraining Have the Potential to Reduce Medial
438 Compartmental Loading in Individuals With Knee Osteoarthritis While Not Adversely
439 Affecting the Other Lower Limb Joints? A Systematic Review. *Arch Rehabil Res Clin Transl*
440 2019;**1**:100022. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arrct.2019.100022>.
- 441 28. Alexander N, Schwameder H, Baker R, Trinler U. Effect of different walking speeds on joint
442 and muscle force estimation using AnyBody and OpenSim. *Gait Posture* 2021;**90**:197–203.
443 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2021.08.026>.
- 444 29. Niu W, Wang L, Jiang C, Zhang M. Effect of Dropping Height on the Forces of Lower Extremity
445 Joints and Muscles during Landing: A Musculoskeletal Modeling. *J Healthc Eng* 2018;**2018**:1–
446 8. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2018/2632603>.
- 447 30. Yen JT, Chang Y-H. Rate-dependent control strategies stabilize limb forces during human
448 locomotion. *J R Soc Interface* 2010;**7**:801–10. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsif.2009.0296>.
- 449 31. Delp SL, Loan JP, Hoy MG, Zajac FE, Topp EL, Rosen JM. An interactive graphics-based
450 model of the lower extremity to study orthopaedic surgical procedures. *IEEE Trans Biomed Eng*
451 1990;**37**:757–67. <https://doi.org/10.1109/10.102791>.
- 452 32. Kotsifaki A, Van Rossom S, Whiteley R, Korakakis V, Bahr R, Sideris V, et al. Single leg
453 vertical jump performance identifies knee function deficits at return to sport after ACL
454 reconstruction in male athletes. *Br J Sports Med* 2022;**56**:490–8.

- 455 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2021-104692>.
- 456 33. Delp SL, Anderson FC, Arnold AS, Loan P, Habib A, John CT, et al. OpenSim: Open-source
457 software to create and analyze dynamic simulations of movement. *IEEE Trans Biomed Eng*
458 2007;**54**:1940–50. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TBME.2007.901024>.
- 459 34. Steele KM, DeMers MS, Schwartz MH, Delp SL. Compressive tibiofemoral force during crouch
460 gait. *Gait Posture* 2012;**35**:556–60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2011.11.023>.
- 461 35. Brockett CL, Chapman GJ. Biomechanics of the ankle. *Orthop Trauma* 2016;**30**:232–8.
462 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mporth.2016.04.015>.
- 463 36. Cassiolas G, Di Paolo S, Marchiori G, Grassi A, Della Villa F, Bragonzoni L, et al. Knee Joint
464 Contact Forces during High-Risk Dynamic Tasks: 90° Change of Direction and Deceleration
465 Movements. *Bioengineering* 2023;**10**:179. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bioengineering10020179>.
- 466 37. Jensen RL, Ebben WP. Ground and Knee Joint Reaction Forces During Variations. In: *Proc*
467 *XXIII Int Symp Biomech Sport* 2005.p.373–6.
- 468 38. Anderson FC, Pandy MG. Static and dynamic optimization solutions for gait are practically
469 equivalent. *J Biomech* 2001;**34**:153–61. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9290\(00\)00155-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9290(00)00155-X).
- 470 39. Cleather DJ, Goodwin JE, Bull AMJ. Hip and knee joint loading during vertical jumping and
471 push jerking. *Clin Biomech* 2013;**28**:98–103.
472 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2012.10.006>.
- 473 40. Martelli S, Kersh ME, Schache AG, Pandy MG. Strain energy in the femoral neck during
474 exercise. *J Biomech* 2014;**47**:1784–91. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2014.03.036>.
- 475 41. Howe TE, Shea B, Dawson LJ, Downie F, Murray A, Ross C, et al. Exercise for preventing and
476 treating osteoporosis in postmenopausal women. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2011;**2011**:1–
477 167. <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD000333.pub2>.
- 478 42. Ma D, Wu L, He Z. Effects of walking on the preservation of bone mineral density in
479 perimenopausal and postmenopausal women. *Menopause* 2013;**20**:1216–26.
480 <https://doi.org/10.1097/GME.0000000000000100>.
- 481 43. Allison SJ, Folland JP, Rennie WJ, Summers GD, Brooke-Wavell K. High impact exercise
482 increased femoral neck bone mineral density in older men: A randomised unilateral intervention.
483 *Bone* 2013;**53**:321–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bone.2012.12.045>.
- 484 44. Schwameder H. Knee Joint Loading in Jump Landings in Diverse Conditions. In: *40th Int Soc*
485 *Biomech Sport Conf* 2022.p.628–31.
- 486 45. Sen EI, Esmaeilzadeh S, Eskiyurt N. Effects of whole-body vibration and high impact exercises
487 on the bone metabolism and functional mobility in postmenopausal women. *J Bone Miner Metab*
488 2020;**38**:392–404. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00774-019-01072-2>.
- 489 46. Nishiumi D, Nishioka T, Saito H, Kurokawa T, Hirose N. Associations of eccentric force
490 variables during jumping and eccentric lower-limb strength with vertical jump performance: A

- 491 systematic review. Lavender AP, editor. *PLoS One* 2023;**18**:e0289631.
492 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0289631>.
- 493 47. Austin GP, Tiberio D, Garrett GE. Effect of Frequency on Human Unipedal Hopping. *Percept*
494 *Mot Skills* 2002;**95**:733–40. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pms.2002.95.3.733>.
- 495 48. Monte A, Nardello F, Zamparo P. Mechanical advantage and joint function of the lower limb
496 during hopping at different frequencies. *J Biomech* 2021;**118**:110294.
497 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2021.110294>.
- 498 49. Bobbert MF, Richard Casius LJ. Spring-like leg behaviour, musculoskeletal mechanics and
499 control in maximum and submaximum height human hopping. *Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci*
500 2011;**366**:1516–29. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2010.0348>.
- 501 50. Jessup LN, Kelly LA, Cresswell AG, Lichtwark GA. Linking muscle mechanics to the metabolic
502 cost of human hopping. *J Exp Biol* 2023;**226**. <https://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.245614>.
- 503 51. Baggaley M, Derrick TR, Brent Edwards W. Sensitivity of Internal Tibial Forces and Moments
504 to Static Optimization Moment Constraints at the Subtalar and Ankle Joints. *J Biomech Eng*
505 2023;**145**. <https://doi.org/10.1115/1.4055036>.
- 506 52. Dorn TW, Schache AG, Pandy MG. Muscular strategy shift in human running: dependence of
507 running speed on hip and ankle muscle performance. *J Exp Biol* 2012;**215**:1944–56.
508 <https://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.064527>.
- 509 53. Petersen J, Sørensen H, Nielsen RØ. Cumulative Loads Increase at the Knee Joint With Slow-
510 Speed Running Compared to Faster Running: A Biomechanical Study. *J Orthop Sport Phys*
511 *Ther* 2015;**45**:316–22. <https://doi.org/10.2519/jospt.2015.5469>.
- 512 54. Montefiori E, Kalkman BM, Henson WH, Paggiosi MA, McCloskey E V., Mazzà C. MRI-based
513 anatomical characterisation of lower-limb muscles in older women. Rushton A, editor. *PLoS*
514 *One* 2020;**15**:e0242973. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0242973>.
- 515 55. Modenese L, Phillips ATM, Bull AMJ. An open source lower limb model: Hip joint validation.
516 *J Biomech* 2011;**44**:2185–93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2011.06.019>.
- 517 56. Mokhtarzadeh H, Perraton L, Fok L, Muñoz MA, Clark R, Pivonka P, et al. A comparison of
518 optimisation methods and knee joint degrees of freedom on muscle force predictions during
519 single-leg hop landings. *J Biomech* 2014;**47**:2863–8.
520 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2014.07.027>.
- 521 57. Prince F, Corriveau H, Hébert R, Winter DA. Gait in the elderly. *Gait Posture* 1997;**5**:128–35.
522 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0966-6362\(97\)01118-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0966-6362(97)01118-1).
- 523 58. Fukuchi RK, Duarte M. Comparison of three-dimensional lower extremity running kinematics
524 of young adult and elderly runners. *J Sports Sci* 2008;**26**:1447–54.
525 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02640410802209018>.
- 526 59. Peterson MJ, Pieper CF, Sloane R, Crowley GM, Cowper A, Mcconnell ES, et al. the Veterans
527 LIFE study. 2017. <https://doi.org/10.12715/har.2015.4.36.Differences>.

