



25 **Abstract**

26 **Background:** The Joint Position Reproduction (JPR) approach has been commonly used to  
27 assess joint position sense (JPS), however, no prior study investigated its psychometric  
28 properties in children. This study aimed to assess the reliability and precision of a newly  
29 developed multi-joint JPR protocol for assessing lower limb JPS in school-aged typically  
30 developing (TD) children.

31 **Methods:** Ankle, knee and hip JPS was assessed in TD children (aged 5–12 years), on two  
32 different days, by a single rater using a standardized JPR protocol (re-identification of a  
33 passively placed target position of the ipsilateral joint). The mean and best error(JRE,°) between  
34 target and reproduction angle were calculated from three-dimensional(3D) kinematics for each  
35 tested joint on both sides for three trials. Furthermore, total, joint- and limb-JRE scores were  
36 provided for clinical use. For JPR-reliability, the Intraclass Correlation Coefficient(ICC,2.1)  
37 was reported. For JPR-precision, the standard error of measurement (SEM) was calculated.

38 **Results:** 270 JPR trials were assessed in 15 TD children ( $8.6\pm 1.2$  years,8boys). The mean and  
39 best JRE, summarized for all joints for test and retest, was  $3.7^\circ$  and  $2.5^\circ$ , respectively. The ICC  
40 were poor to fair(0.01-0.44) for mean JRE, but fair to very good(0.46-0.77) for best JRE. The  
41 SEM ranged from  $0.8^\circ$ – $1.8^\circ$ , depending on the joint and side being tested.

42 **Conclusion:** Evaluating ankle, knee and hip JPS in children, using passive JPR, is more reliable  
43 and precise when using the best JRE. This study highlights the need for a multi-joint JPR  
44 approach in research and clinics, and provides joint- and limb-specific SEM values.

45 **Keywords:** Assessment; Proprioception; Joint Position Sense; Reliability; Precision

## 46 **1. Introduction**

47 The development of motor skills, such as walking, running and cycling, requires a integration  
48 of the proprioceptive and motor system<sup>[1]</sup>: i.e., to know when and how to generate goal-oriented  
49 motor behavior, the central nervous system must have an accurate perception of where the body  
50 is located in space and how different body segments are positioned relative to each other. To  
51 establish this internal schema, the brain processes input from proprioceptors embedded in the  
52 muscles (i.e. muscle spindles), tendons (i.e. Golgi tendon organs), capsuloligamentous  
53 structures and skin (i.e., mechanoreceptors)<sup>[2]</sup>. Difficulties in perceiving and integrating this  
54 proprioceptive input, resulting from brain damage<sup>[3]</sup>, sport-induced fatigue<sup>[4]</sup> or injuries<sup>[5]</sup>,  
55 particularly in the lower extremities, may diminish a child's ability to control movements and  
56 maintain balance<sup>[6]</sup>. Consequently, this can impact a child's sport performance, level of  
57 competitive success and susceptibility to (re-)injury<sup>[7, 8]</sup>. Also, delayed or deviant  
58 proprioceptive development, for example in children with neurodevelopmental disorders<sup>[3, 9]</sup>,  
59 can further exacerbate the likelihood of falls and balance problems<sup>[10, 11]</sup>. Moreover, general and  
60 sport-specific training programs designed to improve proprioception have shown enhanced  
61 injury recovery outcomes and decreased injury rates in various populations, such as young  
62 athletes with anterior cruciate ligament injury<sup>[12]</sup>, ankle sprains<sup>[13]</sup>, patellar and Achilles  
63 tendinopathy<sup>[14]</sup> and joint hypermobility syndrome<sup>[15]</sup>. Given its relation to injury and the  
64 success of such training programs, the assessment of proprioception has received more attention  
65 the past years.

66 Over the years, researchers have developed a variety of methods to assess different aspects of  
67 proprioception (i.e., sense of joint position, movement, trajectory, velocity, force, muscle  
68 tension, weight or size)<sup>[16]</sup>. Although other methods are available (e.g., Joint Position  
69 Discrimination or Threshold to detection of passive motion<sup>[17]</sup>), the most commonly used,  
70 clinically applicable and ecologically valid method to assess proprioception is Joint Position  
71 Reproduction (JPR), which focuses on the sense of joint position<sup>[18, 19]</sup>. Herein, proprioception  
72 is measured in terms of joint position reproduction error (JRE, in degrees) between the  
73 examiner-positioned joint angle and the joint angle repositioned by the subject. The magnitude  
74 of JRE is generally accepted as being a useful proprioceptive accuracy indicator (the higher the  
75 JRE the lower the accuracy). However, to determine whether meaningful changes in JRE, and  
76 thus proprioception, have occurred, but also to ensure reproducibility in repeated trials,  
77 knowledge of the measurement error and reliability of JPR method is crucial.

78 To date, research on the psychometric properties of the JPR method in children is limited<sup>[20]</sup>.  
79 Most studies have primarily focused on healthy adults aged 18 or older, demonstrating moderate  
80 to good reliability depending on the joint and JPR task being assessed<sup>[21-25]</sup>. However, these  
81 reliability findings may not be generalizable to children since proprioception continues to  
82 mature until adolescence<sup>[26, 27]</sup>, which causes children to exhibit greater inaccuracy and  
83 variability in reproducing joint positions compared to adults<sup>[28]</sup>. This discrepancy could  
84 potentially affect the reliability of JPR in children, implicating that reported measurement errors  
85 in adults (knee:  $0.62^{\circ}$ <sup>[25]</sup>, hip:  $0.63^{\circ}$  -  $0.72^{\circ}$ <sup>[23]</sup>) may not be applicable to children. Furthermore,  
86 prior adult's studies have exclusively focused on single-joint JPR assessments of the more  
87 proximal knee<sup>[20-22, 25]</sup> and hip joint<sup>[23, 24]</sup>, using multi-angle or multi-plane reproduction (i.e.  
88 consecutively testing more than one target position or movement plane in the same joint).  
89 Generalizability of these reliability findings to other, more distal joints is limited due to the  
90 joint-specific nature of JPR testing<sup>[16]</sup>. However, changes in a child's proprioceptive function  
91 resulting from sport-related fatigue, injuries or training, may manifest in one or more joints of  
92 the lower limbs, whether or not asymmetric (as previously observed in terms of strength,  
93 flexibility, and coordination<sup>[29, 30]</sup>). Performing JPR testing solely on the dominant limb<sup>[20, 21, 24,</sup>  
94 <sup>25]</sup>, precludes the evaluation of a potential proprioceptive asymmetry between limbs. In  
95 summary, a multi-joint JPR approach which includes both proximal and distal joints on both  
96 sides of the body, is needed to properly evaluate proprioception in children. However, to the  
97 best of the author's knowledge, no study has reported the reliability and precision of such a JPR  
98 approach for assessing lower limb proprioception in children. The aim of the present study was,  
99 therefore, to develop a JPR protocol to comprehensively map hip, knee and ankle joint position  
100 sense and examine the test-retest reliability and measurement error in typically developing (TD)  
101 children aged 5 to 12 years old.

## 102 **2. Methods**

103 A test-retest experimental study design was undertaken to evaluate ankle, knee and hip JPR  
104 reliability between two sessions, on two different days with at least four weeks apart to prevent  
105 recall bias. This study was conducted between March and August 2022 in accordance to, and  
106 approved by the Committee for Medical Ethics (CME) of Antwerp University Hospital (UZA)/  
107 University of Antwerp (UAntwerpen), CME of Hasselt University (UHasselt) and the Ethics  
108 Committee Research of University Hospital of Leuven (UZ Leuven)/ University of Leuven (KU  
109 Leuven) (B3002021000145). Five- to twelve-year-old children were recruited from the  
110 researcher's lab environment, an elementary school (Vrije Basisschool Lutselus, Diepenbeek,  
111 Belgium), through acquaintances and social media. Written informed consent was obtained  
112 from the children's parents before participation in the study.

### 113 **Participants**

114 TD children were included when 1) aged 5 year 0 months until 12 years 11 months, 2) born >  
115 37 weeks of gestation (full term) and 3) cognitively capable of understanding and participating  
116 in assessment procedures. They were excluded in case of; 1) intellectual delays (IQ < 70), 2)  
117 developmental disorders (e.g. developmental coordination disorder [DCD], Autism Spectrum  
118 Disorder [ASD] or Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder [ADHD]), 3) uncorrected visual  
119 or vestibular impairments and/or 4) neurological, orthopedic or other medical conditions that  
120 might impede the proprioceptive test procedure.

121 Based on previously reported results on knee JPS in TD children<sup>[20]</sup>, the minimal acceptable  
122 level of reliability is 0.39 ( $H_0: \rho_0=0.39$ ). To provide a desired ICC of 0.80 ( $H_1: \rho_1=0.80$ ), in two-  
123 way ANOVA models, with  $\alpha = 0.05$  and  $\beta = 0.20$ , a sample of 15 TD children was needed with  
124  $n = 2$  observations per child, assessed by a single rater<sup>[31]</sup>.

### 125 **Data collection and analyses**

#### 126 *Joint Position Reproduction (JPR) protocol*

127 Joint Position Sense was assessed as the child's ability to re-identify a passively placed target  
128 position of the ipsilateral hip (20° of flexion), knee (30° of extension) and ankle joint (15° of  
129 dorsiflexion), also known as the passive-ipsilateral JPR protocol (described in Figure 1a).

130 All joints were assessed in isolation on both sides of the body. The dominant limb was defined  
131 as the one the child was most comfortable standing on while kicking a ball (representing the  
132 limb preferred to perform the balancing aspect of the task). For the ankle and knee JPR task,

133 children were seated blindfolded on the table with the lower legs hanging relaxed and  
134 unsupported (90° of knee flexion,), not wearing shoes or socks. The upper leg was fully  
135 supported by the table (90° of hip flexion) and hands were crossed on the chest. For hip JPR  
136 task, the resting position was the same, only the children sat inclined on the table to align the  
137 baseline hip joint angle at 70° of flexion. For the start position of the ankle JPR task, the  
138 examiner passively positioned the ankle in maximal plantarflexion. After familiarization (one  
139 trial), the ankle, knee and hip JPR tasks were repeated three times for both the dominant and  
140 non-dominant leg. The first JPR task undertaken was the knee JPR task, followed by the ankle  
141 and hip JPR task respectively. Six trials (3 per body side) were completed randomized (i.e. left  
142 or right side) in one joint before moving on to the next joint. In total, within one session, each  
143 child had to perform 18 trials (3 trials x 3 tested joints x 2 legs). Performing all JPR tasks took  
144 approximately 30 minutes. Depending on the region from which the child was recruited, testing  
145 was conducted at the Multidisciplinary Motor Centre Antwerp (M<sup>2</sup>OCEAN, University of  
146 Antwerp) or the Gait Real-time Analysis Interactive Lab (GRAIL, Hasselt University).

#### 147 *Rater*

148 The study was conducted by a registered physical therapist and researcher (NJ) with JPR  
149 protocol expertise, gained through preparatory training sessions and a preliminary pilot study  
150 (108 JPR trials). To minimize the impact of rater-related sources of error, the examiner was  
151 trained to standardize 1) passive joint positioning using an inclinometer (Dr. Rippstein, Lutry,  
152 Switzerland), at a constant speed, while minimizing skin contact (e.g. knee JRE task: thumb  
153 and index finger touch of the calcaneus) and 2) the verbal instructions given (e.g. knee JRE  
154 task: ‘concentrate now on the position of your lower leg in space’). To mitigate observer bias,  
155 separate test-retest trial record sheets were used.

156

**\*\*\* Insert Figure 1 here\*\*\***

157 *Instrumentation*

158 The absolute joint reproduction error (JRE, °) between the target and reproduction angle (Figure  
159 1b) was calculated from 3D kinematics using laboratory-based optoelectronic motion capture  
160 (VICON, Oxford Metrics, Oxford, UK) comprising 10 high-speed (100Hz) infrared cameras.  
161 Twenty-six 14-mm reflective markers were placed on the child's body, according to the  
162 International Society of Biomechanics (ISB) lower limb recommendations<sup>[32]</sup>: markers were  
163 placed on the lateral and medial malleolus, second metatarsal head, the most lateral point on  
164 the border of the lateral tibial condyle, the most medial point on the border of the medial tibial  
165 condyle, the tibial tuberosity, the lateral and medial femoral epicondyle, the caput femoris, the  
166 anterior superior iliac spine and posterior superior iliac, bilaterally. Hip, knee and ankle joint  
167 angles were calculated via Euler angles using Vicon Nexus software (v2.12.1; Vicon Inc). The  
168 JRE calculations were performed in MATLAB R2022a.

169 For each JPR task, JPS was expressed in two different ways:

- 170 1) The mean error calculated as the average JRE across the three repetitions, and
- 171 2) The best error calculated as the minimal JRE across the three repetitions

172 Using both expressions of JRE, the following JRE variables were defined:

- 173 a) Single-joint JRE of the ankle, knee and hip for the dominant (JRE<sub>d</sub>) and nondominant  
174 (JRE<sub>nd</sub>) side separately, resulting in mean and best JRE<sub>dankle</sub>, JRE<sub>ndankle</sub>; JRE<sub>d</sub><sub>knee</sub>,  
175 JRE<sub>nd</sub><sub>knee</sub>; JRE<sub>d</sub><sub>hip</sub>, JRE<sub>nd</sub><sub>hip</sub>;
- 176 b) Summed joint JRE of the ankle, knee and hip, summed for the dominant and  
177 nondominant side, resulting in mean and best JRE<sub>ankle</sub>, JRE<sub>knee</sub>, and JRE<sub>hip</sub>;
- 178 c) Total JRE calculated by adding the summed JRE of the ankle, knee and hip, resulting  
179 in a mean and best JRE<sub>total</sub> (JRE<sub>ankle</sub> + JRE<sub>knee</sub> + JRE<sub>hip</sub>)

## 180 **Statistical analyses**

181 The normality of the data was evaluated both visually (histogram) and with a 1-sample  
182 Kolmogorov-Smirnov goodness-of-fit test.

183 To define the *test-retest reliability* for the JRE, the Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC) was  
184 calculated using a two-way random-effects and absolute agreement ICC model (2,1)<sup>[33]</sup>. Among  
185 various types of ICCs, the ICC(2.1) was considered the most appropriate ICC form based on  
186 the study design and reliability analyses: 1) “Model” = two-way (subjects x session) - random  
187 effects<sup>[34]</sup>, given the JPR protocol is a rater-based clinical assessment where the goal is to  
188 generalize reliability results to other trained clinicians; 2) “Definition”= absolute agreement<sup>[35]</sup>,  
189 considering both random and systematic sources of errors and 3) “Type” = single  
190 rater/measurements, including analyses of single JRE scores of each child for each JPR task,  
191 assessed by a single rater. The ICC(2.1) is based upon a two-way repeated measures analyses  
192 of variance (ANOVA) with the following formula:

$$\text{ICC} = \frac{\text{MS}_S - \text{MS}_E}{\text{MS}_S + (k - 1)\text{MS}_E + \frac{k(\text{MS}_T - \text{MS}_E)}{n}}$$

193 In which  $\text{MS}_S$  is between-subjects mean square,  $\text{MS}_E$  the residual mean square (i.e. random  
194 error),  $\text{MS}_T$  the between-session mean square (i.e., systematic error),  $n$  the number of children  
195 and  $k$  the number of observations. This reliability coefficient, or ICC, represents the amount of  
196 variance in a set of single JRE scores that is attributable to differences between children ( $\text{MS}_S$ )  
197 and is interpreted as poor (ICC < 0.40); fair (ICC = 0.40–0.59); good (ICC = 0.60–0.74) or  
198 excellent (ICC  $\geq$  0.75)<sup>[36]</sup>. To further define the sources of variance for ICC calculations, a two-  
199 way repeated measures ANOVA (Sessions [test and retest] x Subjects) was performed for each  
200 JRE variable with the significance level ( $\alpha$ ) set to 0.05.

201 *The precision* of the JRE was estimated through the standard error of measurement (SEM)  
202 defined as:

$$\text{SEM} = \text{SD} * \sqrt{1-\text{ICC}}$$

203 In which SD is the pooled standard deviation (weighted average of standard deviations) for the  
204 two measurement sessions.



205 The ICC and SEM were defined for the following JRE variables: 1) JRE<sub>ankle</sub>, JRE<sub>end\_ankle</sub>,  
206 JRE<sub>knee</sub>, JRE<sub>end\_knee</sub>, JRE<sub>hip</sub> and JRE<sub>end\_hip</sub>; 2) JRE<sub>ankle</sub>, JRE<sub>knee</sub> and JRE<sub>hip</sub>, only for the tested  
207 joint in which the variability (SD) in JRE<sub>d</sub> and JRE<sub>end</sub> was not significantly different (paired t-  
208 test, P>0.05); and 3) JRE<sub>total</sub>.

209 To demonstrate the practical application of the SEM, two representative cases were selected  
210 from the study sample: one from the youngest age group (5-8 years) and one from the oldest  
211 age group (9-12 years). For each JRE variable, the calculated SEM was applied to the individual  
212 JRE scores to illustrate the expected range of the true scores, outside which one can be confident  
213 that a retest JRE score reflects a real change in performance.

214 Statistical analyses were performed using IBM SPSS Statistics (29.0.1) for Windows.

### 215 3. Results

216 Proprioception was assessed during 270 ankle, knee and hip JPR tests of 15 typically  
217 developing children (47% girls) with a mean age of  $8.58 \pm 1.19$  years (range 6.74 – 11.11 years).  
218 Thirteen children (87%) were right-leg dominant (Table 1). All data were collected in two  
219 University facilities; M<sup>2</sup>OCEAN laboratory (33%) or GRAIL (67%). The median test-retest  
220 time interval was 49 days (interquartile range: 35 – 60 days).

221 Descriptive data of the JRE variables, test-retest reliability (as expressed by ICC) and precision  
222 (as expressed by SEM) are presented in Table 2. Two exemplary individual cases with their  
223 corresponding observed JRE scores (mean and best error) and the estimated true JRE intervals  
224 are reported in Table 3.

225 **\*\* Insert Table 1 here\*\***

#### 226 *Mean error*

227 The JRE<sub>total</sub> was  $25.81^\circ$  (SD  $6.53^\circ$ ) and  $18.90^\circ$  (SD  $4.53^\circ$ ) for test and retest session,  
228 respectively (Table 2a). For all tested joints, regardless of the tested side, the JRE improved  
229 (decreased) at retest assessment by  $0.75^\circ$  to  $1.65^\circ$

230 The ICC ranged from 0.01 to 0.44 for all JRE variables, indicating poor to moderate test-retest  
231 reliability. This implies that an estimated 56% to 99% of observed JRE variance is attributable  
232 to within-subjects variability, with the majority of variance components being random (MS<sub>E</sub>,  
233 43%-86%) rather than systematic (MS<sub>T</sub>, 4%-38%) (Table 2a).

234 Overall, the SEM value reported for JRE<sub>total</sub> was  $4.36^\circ$  indicating that a child's true JRE  
235 summarized for all tested joints being  $\pm 8.55^\circ$  at 95% confidence ( $\pm 1.96 \times$  SEM). As the within-  
236 session variability between JRE<sub>d</sub> and JRE<sub>end</sub> was not significantly different for all joints (ankle:  
237  $p=0.34$ , knee:  $p=0.69$ ; hip:  $p=0.28$ ), the SEM was also calculated separately for JRE joint scores  
238 (JRE<sub>ankle</sub>=  $2.50^\circ$ , JRE<sub>knee</sub>=  $2.26^\circ$  and JRE<sub>hip</sub>=  $2.03^\circ$ ) (Table 2a). The SEM for JRE<sub>d</sub> and JRE<sub>end</sub>  
239 of the ankle, knee, and hip varied from  $1.15^\circ$  to  $1.75^\circ$ , with the highest SEM observed in the  
240 dominant leg.

#### 241 *Best error*

242 The JRE<sub>total</sub> was  $17.16^\circ$  (SD  $7.12^\circ$ ) and  $12.79^\circ$  (SD  $4.40^\circ$ ) for test and retest session,  
243 respectively (Table 2b). For all joints, the best JRE score on day one improved (decreased) by  
244  $1.46^\circ$  or less at re-assessment on day two, depending on the side and the joint being tested.

245 The ICC for test-retest agreement varied from moderate to very good (0.46 – 0.77) for all JRE  
246 variables, except for hip flexion (ICC  $JRE_{hip}$ = 0.13;  $JRE_{d_{hip}}$ = 0.36;  $JRE_{end_{hip}}$ = 0.11), knee  
247 extension of dominant leg ( $JRE_{d_{knee}}$ = 0.32) and ankle dorsiflexion of nondominant leg  
248 ( $JRE_{end_{ankle}}$ = 0.30). Among the latter JRE variables, 64% to 89% of the observed variance was  
249 attributable to within-subject variability with 55% to 89% of variance components considered  
250 random ( $MS_E$ ) and 0% to 9% considered systematic ( $MS_T$ ). For the JRE variables with ICC  
251 values  $\geq 0.46$ ,  $\leq 54\%$  of the observed JRE variance was attributable to within-subject variability  
252 ( $MS_E$ : 18% - 51%,  $MS_T$ : 3% - 20%).

253 The SEM for  $JRE_{total}$  was  $1.24^\circ$ . With 95% confidence ( $\pm 1.96 \times SEM$ ), it can be stated that a  
254 child's true JRE best score, summarized for all tested joints, is  $\pm 2.43^\circ$ . Separate SEM values  
255 were also determined for the summed joint JRE of the ankle ( $JRE_{ankle}$ =  $1.49^\circ$ ), knee  
256 ( $JRE_{knee}$ =  $1.28^\circ$ ) and hip ( $JRE_{hip}$ =  $0.97^\circ$ ), as there was no significant difference in SD  
257 between  $JRE_d$  and  $JRE_{end}$  across all joints (ankle:  $p=0.42$ , knee:  $p=0.58$ ; hip:  $p=0.31$ ). Also,  
258 For all other JRE variables, the SEM value was less than  $2^\circ$ , ranging from  $0.81^\circ$  to  $1.62^\circ$ .

259 **\*\* Insert Table 2 here\*\***

#### 260 *Exemplary individual cases*

261 For the summed joint JRE of the ankle, a younger child showed a mean error of  $13.53^\circ$ , while  
262 for the knee and hip, the mean errors were smaller (i.e.,  $11.44^\circ$  and  $7.90^\circ$ , respectively).  
263 Considering the reported SEM values ( $JRE_{ankle}$ =  $2.50^\circ$ ,  $JRE_{knee}$ =  $2.26^\circ$ ,  $JRE_{hip}$  =  $2.03^\circ$ ), this  
264 child's estimated true JRE mean score varies from  $11.03^\circ$  to  $16.03^\circ$  for the ankle,  $9.18^\circ$  to  
265  $13.70^\circ$  for the knee and  $5.87^\circ$  to  $9.93^\circ$  for the hip. In an older child, lower JRE mean scores  
266 were observed for all three joints ( $JRE_{ankle}$ =  $7.56^\circ$ ,  $JRE_{knee}$ =  $7.32^\circ$ ,  $JRE_{hip}$  =  $5.36^\circ$ ). In this case,  
267 a re-assessment JRE mean score ranging from  $5.06^\circ$  to  $10.06^\circ$  for the ankle,  $5.06^\circ$  to  $9.58^\circ$  for  
268 the knee and  $3.33^\circ$  to  $7.39^\circ$  for the hip should be interpreted as random variability (Table 3a).  
269 When considering the best error, lower JRE values with smaller 95% confidence intervals were  
270 observed in both cases, for all JRE variables. For example, in the younger child,  $JRE_{total}$  ( $17.85^\circ$ )  
271 was determined by only  $6.33^\circ$  to  $9.31^\circ$  JRE for ankle dorsiflexion,  $4.57^\circ$  to  $7.13^\circ$  JRE for knee  
272 extension and, to a smaller extent, by  $3.21^\circ$  to  $5.15^\circ$  for hip flexion (Table 3b).

273 **\*\* Insert Table 3 here\*\***

274

## 275 Discussion

276 This study evaluated the precision and test-retest reliability of a newly developed multi-joint  
277 JPR protocol for assessing lower limb JPS in typically developing children aged 5 to 12 years.  
278 Our findings indicated that evaluating ankle, knee and hip JPS in TD children is more reliable  
279 and precise when using the best score (rather than the mean score). Also, the systematic error  
280 between sessions, observed for the best score (0%-20%), is half of the mean score (4%-42%).  
281 This implies more consistency in JPR testing across sessions, and thus less tendency to  
282 overestimate or underestimate the true JRE score when using the best score. Additionally, total  
283 and joint- and limb-specific SEM values were provided for clinical use. These values can be  
284 used as an estimated error of a single JPR measurement, accounting for the inherent variability  
285 in the JPR measurement process in TD children. This provides clinicians with 95% confidence  
286 that a child's true JRE score lies between two SEMs from the observation made (as described  
287 in case reports). For instance, changes in ankle, knee and hip JRE of less than 1.75° should be  
288 interpreted with caution before concluding that, due to training or injury, true improvement or  
289 deterioration in a child's ankle, knee or hip JPS has occurred. Understanding and reporting SEM  
290 values are therefore crucial when interpreting individual scores or making (clinical) decisions  
291 based on JPR assessment.

292 Given the importance of proprioception in developing motor skills<sup>[1]</sup>, improving motor  
293 learning<sup>[37]</sup> and achieving athlete success<sup>[7, 8]</sup>, proprioceptive assessment received more  
294 attention the past years. Although JPR is feasible and commonly used in children<sup>[38]</sup>, there is  
295 limited research on its psychometric properties, especially for non-robotic assessments. Only  
296 one prior study reported the reliability of JPR for evaluating knee JPS in TD children (ICC:  
297 0.26 – 0.39)<sup>[20]</sup>. Our findings, characterized by ICC values ranging from 0.20 to 0.32, align with  
298 those reported by Fatoye et al. (2008). This highlights the challenge of achieving reliable knee  
299 JPR assessments, particularly when utilizing mean JRE scores. Children's attention spans,  
300 known to be limited<sup>[39]</sup> and developing until the age of 10<sup>[40]</sup>, might be challenged in repeated  
301 trials. Although it is recommended to implement multiple trials per target position<sup>[41, 42]</sup>, one  
302 might counteract for this potential concentration effect by selecting the best JRE instead of  
303 calculating the average. Our study supports this hypothesis by showing enhanced reliability for  
304 JPR testing with the JRE expressed as the best score (ICC: 0.32-0.46). Besides, Fatoye et al.  
305 (2008) focused exclusively on knee JPS assessment. Generalizability to other lower limb joints  
306 is thereby limited, as JPR testing is characterized by both joint- and limb-specificity<sup>[16]</sup>.

307 Besides knee proprioception, ankle and hip proprioception can also be altered by sport-related  
308 injuries<sup>[5]</sup>, sport-induced fatigue<sup>[4]</sup> and general or sport-specific training<sup>[43]</sup>, all of which may  
309 subsequently lead to altered postural control. This highlights the importance of a comprehensive  
310 assessment, measuring (potential deficits in) multiple joints involved in the proprioceptive  
311 ability underlying postural control and sport performance. Additionally, assessing both sides is  
312 also of importance, as this allows for the evaluation of inter-limb asymmetry (e.g.  
313 proprioceptive performance of skill limb [JREd]/ the stance limb [JREnd] x 100%)<sup>[44]</sup>, which  
314 should also be taken into consideration when assessing performance and injury risk in children  
315 engaged in sports<sup>[45]</sup>. By providing a multi-joint JPR approach with total- and joint-specific  
316 SEM values, this study allows researchers and clinicians to evaluate changes in a child's general  
317 proprioceptive function (e.g.  $JRE_{total} > SEM_{total}$ ), resulting from improvement or deterioration  
318 in one or more joints (e.g.  $JRE_{ankle} > SEM_{ankle}$ ,  $JRE_{knee} > SEM_{knee}$ ,  $JRE_{hip} \leq SEM_{hip}$ ), whether or  
319 not asymmetric (e.g.  $JREd_{ankle} > SEMd_{ankle}$ ,  $JREnd_{ankle} \leq SEMnd_{ankle}$ ).

320 However, the low reliability of knee JPR tests (ICC: 0.20 – 0.32) obtained in our study,  
321 using the mean JRE scores, are in contrast with previously reported results in healthy adults  
322 (ICC 0.42-0.80)<sup>[22, 23, 25]</sup>. This discrepancy could be explained by variations in i) target positions,  
323 with adult studies involving more end range positions (40°-70° extension) compared to the  
324 midrange position (30° extension) in our study, and ii) positioning – replication procedure,  
325 which was actively controlled in the adult subjects, whereas the JPR protocol in our study was  
326 passive. Since joint mechanoreceptors and muscle spindles are more sensitive during end  
327 range<sup>[46]</sup> and active movements<sup>[47]</sup>, respectively, it is plausible that these proprioceptors were  
328 more activated, which could enhance the accuracy and reliability observed in adults. However,  
329 unlike Suner-Keklik et al. (2017) (2.3°)<sup>[25]</sup>, other adult studies did not report better  
330 proprioceptive knee accuracy (3.33°- 4.65°)<sup>[22, 23]</sup> compared to our sample of TD children  
331 (3.42°- 4.33°). Noteworthy is the large between-subject variability in these studies, with ages  
332 ranging from 18 to 50 years<sup>[22]</sup> and from 65 to 81 years<sup>[23]</sup>. This variability could also strongly  
333 influence the magnitude of the ICC<sup>[48]</sup> and may therefore mask poor trial-to-trial consistency in  
334 these studies. Moreover, another potential factor contributing to the mixed reliability results  
335 could be the participant's ages. During childhood, periods of rapid growth spurts are often  
336 accompanied by musculotendon stiffness<sup>[49]</sup> and stretching of collagen<sup>[50]</sup>, both of which can  
337 affect proprioception<sup>[51, 52]</sup>. Hence, proprioception continues to improve until late  
338 adolescence<sup>[53]</sup>, leading to greater variability in reproducing joint positions in children  
339 compared to adults<sup>[26]</sup>. This variability may reduce JPR reliability and precision in children, as

340 evidenced by the observed SEM ( $1.37^\circ - 1.75^\circ$ ), which is larger than those reported in adults  
341 for comparable knee ( $0.63^\circ$ )<sup>[25]</sup> and hip JPR procedures ( $0.63^\circ - 0.72^\circ$ )<sup>[23]</sup>. This highlights the  
342 need for psychometric research on the estimation error of the JPR protocol in children,  
343 particularly. Following this, one might also assume that proprioceptive development is marked  
344 by an increase in reliability, in addition to the predominantly studied increase in accuracy<sup>[28]</sup>.  
345 This may have potentially resulted in an over- and underestimation in SEM for the younger  
346 (case 1) and older children (case 2), respectively. To better understand these changes in JRE  
347 accuracy, reliability and precision with age, further longitudinal research on ankle, knee and  
348 hip JPR in a larger TD sample is needed.

349         Among different set-ups for the JPR protocol<sup>[18, 22]</sup>, ipsilateral passive reproduction of  
350 midrange target positions in sitting was considered the most preferable protocol in this study.  
351 Passive JPR, particularly at midrange, enhances its clinical applicability in children, where  
352 disease- or injury-related pain, muscle weakness, motor control and/or range of motion  
353 limitations can impede active (end range) joint reproductions. Although some studies suggest  
354 greater external (ecological) validity<sup>[16]</sup> and reliability<sup>[22]</sup> for active JPR end range, smaller  
355 passive movements elicit similar muscle spindle stretch responses<sup>[54]</sup> and midrange positions  
356 also achieve reliable results for JPR assessment<sup>[25]</sup>. On the other hand, a seated position  
357 precludes the balance challenges and co-contraction of the lower limbs associated with weight-  
358 bearing<sup>[55]</sup>, which could also influence a child's outcome on JPR test.

359         In this study, potential sources of JRE variance are categorized into two components:  
360 systematic bias (e.g., learning or fatigue effects during the test) or random error, due to inherent  
361 subject, rater or instrument variation. To mitigate the risk of random test-retest variation, this  
362 JPR protocol was standardized as much as possible: same examiner, same verbal instructions  
363 and same test conditions with the use of a blindfold and randomized order of target positions  
364 (left – right side) for each joint. The relatively small test-retest differences ( $0.03-1.65^\circ$ ) and  
365 between-session variability ( $MS_T$ ) observed in JRE, support this test-retest condition control.  
366 Additionally, the time between sessions is also comparable to within-subject measurements  
367 taken in clinical practice. However, the small improvement in JRE across three joints, within  
368 one session, may indicate an overall *learning effect* ( $JRE_{knee} \geq JRE_{ankle} > JRE_{hip}$ ), as this was  
369 the order in which the JPR tasks were carried out. Potential learning effects can be mitigated  
370 by also randomizing the order of joints to be tested in addition to randomizing the order of  
371 target positions and body side for each joint. Moreover, muscle fatigue has also been reported  
372 to adversely affect muscle spindle activity and afferent proprioceptive signalization<sup>[56]</sup>. As a



373 result thereof inaccuracy and variability in reproducing joint positions (and thus JRE error)  
374 increases<sup>[57]</sup>. However, the use of a passive JPR protocol precludes a potential *muscle fatigue*  
375 *effect* in this study. Furthermore, contralateral JPR testing<sup>[18]</sup> and multi-angles reproduction<sup>[22-</sup>  
376 <sup>58]</sup> have been reasoned to require more attention<sup>[59]</sup>, potentially leading to a *concentration*  
377 *fatigue effect*. To reduce this effect and the associated JRE variations, this study opted for a  
378 single-angle ipsilateral JPR procedure, particularly as children are known to have a shorter  
379 attention span<sup>[39, 40]</sup>. Nevertheless, by assessing multiple repetitions for multiple joints on both  
380 sides of the body, the JPR test duration was relatively long (approximately 30 minutes).  
381 Consequently, any lapse in concentration may still influence the JRE and pose a risk of greater  
382 within-subject variability, which in turns contributes to lower test-retest reliability. To address  
383 this potential concentration fatigue effect, our study suggests maintaining multiple trials, as  
384 recommended<sup>[41, 42]</sup>, but selecting the best score.

385         Among all JRE variables, the majority (53% - 96%) of the observed within-subject  
386 variance was attributable to random sources of error ( $MS_E$ ), such as alertness and attentiveness  
387 by the rater. The use of robotic<sup>[60]</sup> or isokinetic system<sup>[25]</sup> devices could mitigate rater-related  
388 error sources. However, their application in a clinical setting is rather impractical due to their  
389 high cost, lack of portability and complexity, particularly in children. Also, the weight of the  
390 dynamometer and straps used to stabilize the lower limbs can cause additional sensory input<sup>[61]</sup>.  
391 Manual JPR procedures, using the same open kinetic chain positions, are therefore more of  
392 interest, as they are also feasible and accurate for children aged 5 years or older<sup>[60]</sup>. Inter-rater  
393 reliability, usually associated with lower ICC and higher measurement error than intra-rater  
394 reliability<sup>[48]</sup>, was not assessed. Also, in clinical practice repeated measurements are usually  
395 taken by the same trained therapist. Moreover, instrumentation error can also introduce random  
396 variations in JRE during repeated testing. To ensure reliability in JPR assessments, it is  
397 recommended to measure JPS as the absolute error between the target and reproduction position  
398 (JRE), disregarding the direction of the error<sup>[18]</sup>. To quantify these joint positions, laboratory-  
399 based 3D optoelectronic motion capture was used. The latter is widely recognized for its  
400 reliability and precision in capturing angle, knee and hip kinematics during various tasks, like  
401 walking, running and jumping<sup>[62, 63]</sup>. However, variability in marker placement can still be a  
402 small but potential source of random error<sup>[64]</sup>. A recently emerging and promising solution to  
403 address this issue is markerless motion capture. Using simple video recordings and deep  
404 learning, this technique has the potential to analyze kinematics in clinical settings, beyond the  
405 laboratory with a high degree of automatization. Despite this, markerless systems may still face

406 challenges in extracting accurate joint centres and angles from recorded video images<sup>[65]</sup>. As  
407 such, it remains uncertain whether these techniques are adequately valid (compared to marker-  
408 based motion capture), particularly for measuring JRE during ankle, knee and hip JPR tests in  
409 children.



410 **Conclusion**

411 This study was the first to examine the test-retest reliability and precision of a multi-joint  
412 approach for assessing lower limb JPS in school-aged TD children. The findings provide  
413 valuable insights for clinical assessments of proprioception in children and recommend: i)  
414 adopting a comprehensive approach that evaluates both proximal and distal joints for both  
415 dominant and nondominant leg, ii) considering the best error as preferred outcome and iii) using  
416 the reported total and joint--specific SEM values when making clinical decisions based on JPR  
417 assessments. To better understand potential developmental changes in accuracy (JRE),  
418 reliability (ICC) and precision (SEM), further longitudinal research on ankle, knee and hip JPR  
419 in a larger sample of TD children is warranted.

420 **Acknowledgements**

421 This study was undertaken at Hasselt University and the University of Antwerp, Belgium.  
422 Measurements were conducted at the Gait Real-time Analysis Interactive Lab (GRAIL) and the  
423 Multidisciplinary Motor Centre Antwerp (M<sup>2</sup>OCEAN) laboratory, serviced by the university  
424 faculties. The authors would like to thank all children and parents who volunteered and  
425 participated in this study and the school and master's students who collaborated and assisted  
426 with the recruitment of the children.

## References

1. Shumway-Cook, A. and M.H. Woollacott, *Motor control: translating research into clinical practice*. 2007: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.
2. Proske, U. and S.C. Gandevia, *The kinaesthetic senses*. The Journal of physiology, 2009. **587**(17): p. 4139-4146.
3. Wingert, J.R., et al., *Joint-position sense and kinesthesia in cerebral palsy*. Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation, 2009. **90**(3): p. 447-453.
4. Sayyadi, P., et al., *The effectiveness of fatigue on repositioning sense of lower extremities: systematic review and meta-analysis*. BMC Sports Sci Med Rehabil, 2024. **16**(1): p. 35.
5. Alghadir, A.H., et al., *Effect of Chronic Ankle Sprain on Pain, Range of Motion, Proprioception, and Balance among Athletes*. Int J Environ Res Public Health, 2020. **17**(15).
6. Goble, D.J., et al., *Brain activity during ankle proprioceptive stimulation predicts balance performance in young and older adults*. Journal of neuroscience, 2011. **31**(45): p. 16344-16352.
7. Han, J., Anson, J., Waddington, G., & Adams, R., *Sport Attainment and Proprioception*. International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching, 2014. **9**: p. 159-170.
8. Han, J., et al., *Level of competitive success achieved by elite athletes and multi-joint proprioceptive ability*. J Sci Med Sport, 2015. **18**(1): p. 77-81.
9. Tran, H.-T., et al., *Sensory processing impairments in children with developmental coordination disorder*. Children, 2022. **9**(10): p. 1443.
10. Damiano, D.L., et al., *Contribution of hip joint proprioception to static and dynamic balance in cerebral palsy: a case control study*. Journal of neuroengineering and rehabilitation, 2013. **10**: p. 1-10.
11. Chen, F.-C., et al., *Joint position sense of lower extremities is impaired and correlated with balance function in children with developmental coordination disorder*. Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine, 2020. **52**(8): p. 1-9.
12. Moezy, A., et al., *A comparative study of whole body vibration training and conventional training on knee proprioception and postural stability after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction*. British journal of sports Medicine, 2008. **42**(5): p. 373-385.
13. Rivera, M.J., et al., *Proprioceptive training for the prevention of ankle sprains: an evidence-based review*. Journal of athletic training, 2017. **52**(11): p. 1065-1067.
14. Kraemer, R. and K. Knobloch, *A soccer-specific balance training program for hamstring muscle and patellar and achilles tendon injuries: an intervention study in premier league female soccer*. The American journal of sports medicine, 2009. **37**(7): p. 1384-1393.
15. Sahin, N., et al., *Evaluation of knee proprioception and effects of proprioception exercise in patients with benign joint hypermobility syndrome*. Rheumatology international, 2008. **28**: p. 995-1000.
16. Horváth, Á., et al., *The measurement of proprioceptive accuracy: A systematic literature review*. 2023, Elsevier B.V. p. 219-225.
17. de Jong, A., et al., *Performance in different proprioceptive tests does not correlate in ankles with recurrent sprain*. Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation, 2005. **86**(11): p. 2101-2105.
18. Goble, D.J., *Proprioceptive acuity assessment via joint position matching: from basic science to general practice*. Physical therapy, 2010. **90**(8): p. 1176-1184.
19. Hillier, S., M. Immink, and D. Thewlis, *Assessing proprioception: a systematic review of possibilities*. Neurorehabilitation and neural repair, 2015. **29**(10): p. 933-949.
20. Fatoye, F.A., et al., *Repeatability of joint proprioception and muscle torque assessment in healthy children and in children diagnosed with hypermobility syndrome*. 2008. p. 108-123.
21. Baert, I.A.C., et al., *Inter- and intrarater reliability of two proprioception tests using clinical applicable measurement tools in subjects with and without knee osteoarthritis*. 2018, Elsevier Ltd. p. 105-109.
22. Olsson, L., et al., *Test-retest reliability of a knee joint position sense measurement method in sitting and prone position*. 2004. p. 37-47.
23. Arvin, M., et al., *Reproducibility of a knee and hip proprioception test in healthy older adults*. 2015, Springer International Publishing. p. 171-177.

24. Benjaminse, A., et al., *Reliability and Precision of Hip Proprioception Methods in Healthy Individuals*. 2009. p. 457-463.
25. Suner-Keklik, S., et al., *The Validity and Reliability of Knee Proprioception Measurement Performed With Inclinometer in Different Positions*. 2017.
26. Holst-Wolf, J.M., I.L. Yeh, and J. Konczak, *Development of Proprioceptive Acuity in Typically Developing Children: Normative Data on Forearm Position Sense*. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 2016. **10**.
27. Sigmundsson, H., H. Whiting, and J. Loftesnes, *Development of proprioceptive sensitivity*. *Experimental Brain Research*, 2000. **135**: p. 348-352.
28. Goble, D.J., et al., *Development of upper limb proprioceptive accuracy in children and adolescents*. *Hum Mov Sci*, 2005. **24**(2): p. 155-70.
29. Guan, Y., et al., *Association between inter-limb asymmetries in lower-limb functional performance and sport injury: a systematic review of prospective cohort studies*. *Journal of clinical medicine*, 2022. **11**(2): p. 360.
30. Magill, J.R., et al., *Healthy Pediatric Athletes Have Significant Baseline Limb Asymmetries on Common Return-to-Sport Physical Performance Tests*. *Orthopaedic Journal of Sports Medicine*, 2021. **9**(1): p. 2325967120982309.
31. Walter, S., M. Eliasziw, and A. Donner, *Sample size and optimal designs for reliability studies*. *Statistics in medicine*, 1998. **17**(1): p. 101-110.
32. Wu, G., et al., *ISB recommendation on definitions of joint coordinate system of various joints for the reporting of human joint motion—part I: ankle, hip, and spine*. *Journal of biomechanics*, 2002. **35**(4): p. 543-548.
33. Koo, T.K. and M.Y. Li, *A guideline of selecting and reporting intraclass correlation coefficients for reliability research*. *Journal of chiropractic medicine*, 2016. **15**(2): p. 155-163.
34. Shrout, P.E. and J.L. Fleiss, *Intraclass correlations: uses in assessing rater reliability*. *Psychological bulletin*, 1979. **86**(2): p. 420.
35. McGraw, K.O. and S.P. Wong, *Forming inferences about some intraclass correlation coefficients*. *Psychological methods*, 1996. **1**(1): p. 30.
36. Cicchetti, D.V., *Guidelines, criteria, and rules of thumb for evaluating normed and standardized assessment instruments in psychology*. *Psychological assessment*, 1994. **6**(4): p. 284.
37. Wong, J.D., et al., *Can proprioceptive training improve motor learning?* *J Neurophysiol*, 2012. **108**(12): p. 3313-21.
38. Chu, V.W.T. and *Assessing Proprioception in Children: A Review*. 2017, Routledge. p. 458-466.
39. Konrad, K., et al., *Development of attentional networks: an fMRI study with children and adults*. *Neuroimage*, 2005. **28**(2): p. 429-39.
40. Betts, J., et al., *The development of sustained attention in children: the effect of age and task load*. *Child Neuropsychol*, 2006. **12**(3): p. 205-21.
41. Dover, G., & Powers, M. E., *Reliability of Joint Position Sense and Force-Reproduction Measures During Internal and External Rotation of the Shoulder*. *Journal of athletic training*, 2003. **38**(4): p. 304–310.
42. Wycherley, A.S., P.S. Helliwell, and H.A. Bird, *A novel device for the measurement of proprioception in the hand*. *Rheumatology (Oxford)*, 2005. **44**(5): p. 638-41.
43. Winter, L., et al., *The Effectiveness of Proprioceptive Training for Improving Motor Performance and Motor Dysfunction: A Systematic Review*. *Front Rehabil Sci*, 2022. **3**: p. 830166.
44. Parkinson, A.O., et al., *The Calculation, Thresholds and Reporting of Inter-Limb Strength Asymmetry: A Systematic Review*. *J Sports Sci Med*, 2021. **20**(4): p. 594-617.
45. Magill, J.R., et al., *Healthy Pediatric Athletes Have Significant Baseline Limb Asymmetries on Common Return-to-Sport Physical Performance Tests*. *Orthop J Sports Med*, 2021. **9**(1): p. 2325967120982309.
46. Borsa PA, L.S., Irrgang JJ, Safran MR, Fu FH, *The effects of joint position and direction of joint motion on proprioceptive sensibility in anterior cruciate ligament deficient athletes*. *American Journal of Sports Medicine*, 1997. **25**: p. 336-40.

47. Lan, N. and X. He, *Fusimotor control of spindle sensitivity regulates central and peripheral coding of joint angles*. Front Comput Neurosci, 2012. **6**: p. 66.
48. Weir, J.P. and *Quantifying test-retest reliability using the intraclass correlation coefficient and the SEM*. 2005. p. 231-240.
49. Lambertz D, M.I., Grosset J-F, Perot C, *Evaluation of musculotendinous stiffness in prepubertal children and adults, taking into account muscle activity*. J Appl Physiol., 2003. **95**: p. 64-72.
50. Bird, H.A., *Joint hypermobility in children*. Rheumatology (Oxford), 2005. **44**(6): p. 703-4.
51. Loram, I.D., et al., *The consequences of short-range stiffness and fluctuating muscle activity for proprioception of postural joint rotations: the relevance to human standing*. J Neurophysiol, 2009. **102**(1): p. 460-74.
52. Hall MG, F.W., Sturrock RD, Hamblen DL, Baxendale RA., *The effect of hypermobility syndrome on knee joint proprioception*. Br J Rheumatol, 1995. **34**(121-5).
53. Sigmundsson, H., H.T.A. Whiting, and J.M. Loftesnes, *Development of proprioceptive sensitivity*. Experimental Brain Research, 2000. **135**(3): p. 348-352.
54. Wise, A.K., J.E. Gregory, and U. Proske, *The responses of muscle spindles to small, slow movements in passive muscle and during fusimotor activity*. Brain research, 1999. **821**(1): p. 87-94.
55. Ford, K.R., et al., *The effects of age and skill level on knee musculature co-contraction during functional activities: a systematic review*. British journal of sports medicine, 2008. **42**(7): p. 561-566.
56. Ribeiro, F. and J. Oliveira, *Factors influencing proprioception: what do they reveal*. Vol. 14. 2011: chapter.
57. Ribeiro, F., et al., *The effect of fatigue on knee position sense is not dependent upon the muscle group fatigued*. Muscle Nerve, 2011. **44**(2): p. 217-20.
58. Juul-Kristensen, B., et al., *Test-retest reliability of joint position and kinesthetic sense in the elbow of healthy subjects*. 2008. p. 65-72.
59. Khamwong, P., et al., *Reliability of muscle function and sensory perception measurements of the wrist extensors*. Physiotherapy theory and practice, 2010. **26**(6): p. 408-415.
60. Davies, T.L., et al., *Robotic Assessments of Proprioception and the Impact of Age*. 2020. p. 5171-5175.
61. Nasser, N., et al., *Reliability and accuracy of joint position sense measurement in the laboratory and clinic; utilising a new system*. Acta Medica Iranica, 2007: p. 395-404.
62. Harsted, S., et al., *Concurrent validity of lower extremity kinematics and jump characteristics captured in pre-school children by a markerless 3D motion capture system*. Chiropractic & manual therapies, 2019. **27**: p. 1-16.
63. Merriault, P., et al., *A study of vicon system positioning performance*. Sensors, 2017. **17**(7): p. 1591.
64. Tsushima, H., M.E. Morris, and J. McGinley, *Test-retest reliability and inter-tester reliability of kinematic data from a three-dimensional gait analysis system*. Journal of the Japanese Physical Therapy Association, 2003. **6**(1): p. 9-17.
65. Wade, L., et al., *Applications and limitations of current markerless motion capture methods for clinical gait biomechanics*. PeerJ, 2022. **10**: p. e12995.

## Figures and Tables

*Figure 1a includes photographs of identifying body parts. To request access to Figure 1a and the associated materials, please contact the corresponding author.*




Figure 1a. **The passive-ipsilateral JPR protocol.** (A) **Experience:** from the resting position, the examiner positioned the child's limb in a predetermined target joint position (hip = 20° of flexion, knee = 30° of extension, ankle = 15° of dorsiflexion) using an inclinometer, distally attached to the moving segment (hip = upper leg, knee = lower leg, ankle = plantar foot side), approximately perpendicular to the flexion-extension axis. (B) **Memory:** after experiencing and memorizing this joint position for 5 seconds, the child's limb was passively returned to the neutral start position. (C) **Reproduction:** afterwards, the examiner moved the ipsilateral limb back into the same range and the child was asked to re-identify the target joint position as accurate as possible by pressing a button synchronized to motion capture software.




Figure 1b. **The absolute joint reproduction error (JRE, °)** (red) between the passive target ( $\alpha$ ) and passive reproduction joint angle ( $\beta$ ) was calculated from 3D kinematics (VICON, Oxford Metrics, Oxford, UK) and used as a measure of JPS. Perfect ankle, knee or hip joint angle reproduction would yield a JRE value of zero.

**Table 1.** Population characteristics

	Typically developing children (n=15)
Age, years <sup>a</sup>	8.58 (1.19)
Height, cm <sup>a</sup>	136.70 (9.67)
Leg length dominant leg, cm <sup>a</sup>	70.75 (8.06)
Leg length nondominant leg, cm <sup>a</sup>	70.00 (7.62)
Weight, kg <sup>b</sup>	30.33 (4.04)
BMI, kg/m <sup>2</sup> <sup>b</sup>	16.29 (2.49)
Boys/girls <sup>c</sup>	8/7 (53%/47%)

427 Data are presented as mean (SD)<sup>a</sup>, Median (IQR)<sup>b</sup>, Frequency (%)<sup>c</sup>

**Table 2a.** Descriptive data of the JRE (*mean error*), test-retest reliability (as expressed by ICC) and precision (as expressed by SEM)

		N	Day 1 (test)	Day 2 (re-test)	Pooled SD, °	ICC (95% CI)	Variance components			SEM
			Mean JRE (SD), °	Mean JRE (SD), °			MS <sub>S</sub> (%)	MS <sub>T</sub> (%)	MS <sub>E</sub> (%)	
TOTAL	JRE <sub>total</sub>	15	25.81 (6.53)	18.90 (4.53)	5.62	0.40 (-0.11 – 0.77)	21.88 (40)	23.24 (42)	9.69 (18)	4.36
Hip FLEX	JRE <sub>hip</sub>	15	7.29 (2.44)	5.35 (1.46)	2.01	0.02 (-0.33 – 0.40)	0 (0)	1.60 (28)	4.04 (72)	2.03
	JRE <sub>dhip</sub>	15	3.75 (1.48)	2.57 (1.02)	1.27	0.16 (-0.49 – 0.29)	0 (0)	0.59 (27)	1.62 (73)	1.37
	JRE <sub>endhip</sub>	15	3.54 (1.38)	2.79 (0.87)	1.15	0.01 (-0.40 – 0.47)	0.01 (1)	0.20 (13)	1.32 (86)	1.15
Knee EXT	JRE <sub>knee</sub>	15	8.66 (3.21)	6.89 (2.80)	3.01	0.44 (-0.02 – 0.76)	4.51 (44)	1.26 (12)	4.57 (44)	2.26
	JRE <sub>d knee</sub>	15	4.33 (2.29)	3.47 (1.56)	1.96	0.20 (-0.29 – 0.63)	0.81 (20)	0.17 (4)	3.03 (76)	1.75
	JRE <sub>end knee</sub>	15	4.33 (1.95)	3.42 (1.89)	1.92	0.32 (-0.16 – 0.69)	1.26 (32)	0.25 (6)	2.42 (62)	1.58
Ankle DF	JRE <sub>ankle</sub>	15	9.86 (3.26)	6.66 (2.17)	2.77	0.19 (-0.14 – 0.57)	2.36 (19)	4.79 (38)	5.30 (43)	2.50
	JRE <sub>d ankle</sub>	15	4.93 (2.33)	3.28 (1.77)	2.07	0.33 (-0.10 – 0.69)	1.81 (33)	1.21 (22)	2.47 (45)	1.69
	JRE <sub>end ankle</sub>	15	4.92 (1.73)	3.38 (1.21)	1.49	0.03 (-0.26 – 0.43)	0.11 (3)	1.06 (32)	2.11 (64)	1.46

Abbreviations: JRE = Joint Reproduction Error; ICC = Intraclass Correlation Coefficient; SEM = Standard Error of Measurement;

Variance components of two-way repeated measures ANOVA (Sessions [test and retest] x Subjects) correspond to the sources of variance for ICC calculations: Mean Squared error of JRE attributable to differences between subjects, between sessions (systematic error) and within subjects (random error)



**Table 2b.** Descriptive data of the JRE (*best error*), test-retest reliability (as expressed by ICC) and precision (as expressed by SEM)

		N	Day 1 (test)	Day 2 (re-test)	Pooled SD, °	ICC (95% CI)	Variance components			SEM
			Mean JRE (SD), °	Mean JRE (SD), °			MS <sub>S</sub> (%)	MS <sub>T</sub> (%)	MS <sub>E</sub> (%)	
TOTAL	JRE <sub>total</sub>	15	17.16 (7.12)	12.79 (4.40)	5.92	0.52 (-0.02 – 0.82)	22.68 (52)	8.76 (20)	12.36 (28)	1.24
Hip FLEX	JRE <sub>hip</sub>	15	4.24 (1.49)	3.57 (1.26)	1.38	0.13 (-1.34 – 0.70)	0.26 (13)	0.11 (5)	1.65 (82)	0.97
	JRE <sub>dhip</sub>	15	2.45 (1.44)	1.82 (0.84)	1.18	0.36 (-0.10 – 0.71)	0.55 (36)	0.14 (9)	0.84 (55)	0.95
	JRE <sub>endhip</sub>	15	1.78 (0.83)	1.75 (0.91)	0.87	0.11 (-0.46 – 0.59)	0.08 (11)	0 (0)	0.65 (89)	0.81
Knee EXT	JRE <sub>knee</sub>	15	6.20 (2.88)	4.80 (2.64)	2.76	0.52 (0.06 – 0.80)	4.35 (52)	0.77 (9)	3.27 (39)	1.28
	JRE <sub>d knee</sub>	15	3.53 (2.30)	2.75 (1.36)	1.89	0.32 (-0.18 – 0.70)	1.17 (32)	0.15 (4)	2.39 (64)	1.56
	JRE <sub>end knee</sub>	15	2.66 (1.90)	2.04 (1.59)	1.75	0.46 (-0.02 – 0.77)	1.45 (46)	0.09 (3)	1.63 (51)	1.29
Ankle DF	JRE <sub>ankle</sub>	15	6.73 (4.68)	4.42 (2.39)	3.72	0.54 (0.05 – 0.82)	8.70 (54)	2.31 (14)	5.09 (32)	1.49
	JRE <sub>d ankle</sub>	15	3.35 (2.82)	2.51 (2.08)	2.48	0.77 (0.42 – 0.91)	4.97 (77)	0.28 (4)	1.19 (18)	1.18
	JRE <sub>end ankle</sub>	15	3.37 (2.47)	1.91 (1.18)	1.94	0.30 (-0.12 – 0.67)	1.39 (30)	0.91 (20)	2.36 (51)	1.62

Abbreviations: JRE = Joint Reproduction Error; ICC = Intraclass Correlation Coefficient; SEM = Standard Error of Measurement;

Variance components of two-way repeated measures ANOVA (Sessions [test and retest] x Subjects) correspond to the sources of variance for ICC calculations: Mean Squared error of JRE attributable to differences between subjects, between sessions (systematic error) and within subjects (random error)

**Table 3a.** Observed and estimated true JRE intervals (*mean error*) for two example cases

		Case 1		Case 2	
		JRE, °	JRE, °	JRE, °	JRE, °
		Observed	True (range)	Observed	True (range)
TOTAL	JRE <sub>total</sub>	32.87	(28.51 – 37.23)	20.24	(15.88 – 24.6)
Hip FLEX	JRE <sub>hip</sub>	7.90	(5.87 – 9.93)	5.36	(3.33 – 7.39)
	JREd <sub>hip</sub>	4.76	(3.39 – 6.13)	2.76	(1.39 – 4.13)
	JREnd <sub>hip</sub>	3.14	(1.99 – 4.29)	2.60	(1.45 – 3.75)
Knee EXT	JRE <sub>knee</sub>	11.44	(9.18 – 13.70)	7.32	(5.06 – 9.58)
	JREd <sub>knee</sub>	5.53	(3.78 – 7.28)	3.20	(1.45 – 4.95)
	JREnd <sub>knee</sub>	5.91	(4.33 – 7.49)	4.12	(2.54 – 5.70)
Ankle DF	JRE <sub>ankle</sub>	13.53	(11.03 – 16.03)	7.56	(5.06 – 10.06)
	JREd <sub>ankle</sub>	7.46	(5.77 – 9.15)	3.75	(2.06 – 5.44)
	JREnd <sub>ankle</sub>	6.07	(4.61 – 7.53)	3.81	(2.35 – 5.27)

Abbreviations: JRE = Joint Reproduction Error (in degrees); Case 1 = young child (5-8 years), Case 2 = older child (9-12 years) -

**Table 3b.** Observed and estimated true JRE intervals (*best error*) for two example cases

		Case 1		Case 2	
		JRE, °	JRE, °	JRE, °	JRE, °
		Observed	True (range)	Observed	True (range)
TOTAL	JRE <sub>total</sub>	17.85	(16.61 – 19.09)	11.05	(9.81 – 12.29)
Hip FLEX	JRE <sub>hip</sub>	4.18	(3.21 – 5.15)	2.95	(1.98 – 3.92)
	JRE <sub>dhip</sub>	2.27	(1.32 – 3.22)	1.18	(0.23 – 2.13)
	JRE <sub>endhip</sub>	1.91	(1.10 – 2.72)	1.77	(0.96 – 2.58)
Knee EXT	JRE <sub>knee</sub>	5.85	(4.57 – 7.13)	3.80	(2.52 – 5.08)
	JRE <sub>dknee</sub>	3.08	(1.52 – 4.64)	1.75	(0.19 – 3.31)
	JRE <sub>endknee</sub>	2.77	(1.48 – 4.06)	2.05	(0.76 – 3.34)
Ankle DF	JRE <sub>ankle</sub>	7.82	(6.33 – 9.31)	4.30	(2.81 – 5.79)
	JRE <sub>dankle</sub>	4.40	(3.22 – 5.58)	1.93	(0.75 – 3.11)
	JRE <sub>endankle</sub>	3.42	(1.80 – 5.04)	2.37	(0.75 – 3.99)

Abbreviations: JRE = Joint Reproduction Error (in degrees); Case 1 = young child (5-8 years), , Case 2 = older child (9-12 years)