

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

Normal feeding movements expressed by dimensionality reduction of whole-body joint motions using principal component analysis

Short title: Whole-body joint motions using principal component analysis

Jun Nakatake, Shigeaki Miyazaki, Hideki Arakawa

Rehabilitation unit, University of Miyazaki Hospital, Miyazaki-shi, Miyazaki, Japan

Etsuo Chosa

University of Miyazaki, Miyazaki-shi, Miyazaki, Japan

Corresponding author:

Email: jyun_nakatake@med.miyazaki-u.ac.jp (JN)

20 **Abstract**

21 Understanding elementary feeding movements and postures is essential for improving
22 assessment and intervention strategies in occupational therapy, particularly for individuals
23 with eating difficulties, and for educating caregivers and students; however, current
24 assessment tools lack precision in evaluating complex feeding movements and often rely on
25 subjective judgments rather than objective measures. We aimed to determine elementary
26 movements and postures corresponding to different feeding phases using principal
27 component analysis (PCA). This cross-sectional observational study was conducted at a
28 Local National University Hospital and included 45 healthy, right-handed adult volunteers
29 (23 men and 22 women) aged 20–39 years (mean age, 27.3 years), with no neurological or
30 musculoskeletal impairments. Movements during yogurt feeding using a spoon were captured
31 with a three-dimensional inertial sensor motion capture system. Principal components (PCs)
32 and their scores were derived from PCA of whole-body joint motion data across four feeding
33 phases. PC scores were compared between phases using Friedman’s and post-hoc tests. The
34 primary PC, representing whole-body movement, accounted for 50.0% of the variance; the
35 second PC, associated with hand direction changes, accounted for 13.7%. The cumulative
36 variance of the first six PCs was 87.4%, including individual body-part movements and
37 fixations or combinations of these. Significant differences existed between feeding phases,
38 particularly in the reaching and transport phases, which showed greater whole-body
39 movement than that during the spooning and mouth phases. Hand direction changes were
40 more prominent during the spooning phase than during the mouth phase. PCA helped
41 determine key elementary movements and their corresponding feeding phases, which can be
42 used to assess patients with feeding difficulties and guide occupational therapy interventions.

43 **Introduction**

44 Eating difficulties caused by injuries or illnesses result in physiological, psychological, and
45 social challenges [1,2]. Impaired self-feeding skills are further associated with malnutrition
46 [3]. Occupational therapy addresses these issues by focusing on swallowing, posture,
47 movement, equipment, care methods, and habits, and providing psychosocial interventions
48 for patients [4,5]. Several interventions have been developed to improve posture in children
49 [6, 7] and provide intensive training for specific movements [8,9]. Additionally, early
50 rehabilitation using feeding devices in intensive care units has been introduced [10].
51 Eating evaluations are often conducted using assessment tools such as the functional
52 independence measure [11] and the modified Barthel index [12], which include eating as one
53 of several daily tasks. Patients are assessed on an ordinal scale based on judgments regarding
54 voluntary movements, caregiver support, or types of equipment used. An eating-specific
55 screening tool, the minimal eating observation form II, has also been developed [13]. This
56 tool consists of three items observed on a nominal or ordinal scale, focusing on the sitting
57 position. Practitioners use these assessments to evaluate the eating conditions of patients, set
58 treatment goals, and guide feeding movements and postures. However, targeted movements
59 and postures may be assessed subjectively owing to the experience of practitioners, and the
60 rationale for these assessments remains insufficient.

61 Kinematic analysis has revealed that posture and movement patterns during normal feeding
62 correspond to different time phases [14]. The results suggest substantial changes in whole-
63 body joint angles during the phases of reaching for the dish and transporting food to the
64 mouth. Additionally, motion direction varies during the phases of spooning food and taking it
65 into the mouth. Understanding joint motion, which involves changes in each joint angle over
66 time, can enhance assessments and interventions aimed at improving the movements or

67 postures of patients [15]. However, relying solely on individual joint motion to understand
68 feeding movements is insufficient. Practitioners often recognize the movements of patients
69 based on approximate body part motions rather than individual joint motions, which may
70 involve a combination of joint motions. These complex and functional movements during
71 feeding, such as reaching for food, manipulating the direction of the palm, approaching the
72 food with the mouth, or stabilizing the trunk to support the upper limbs, remain unclear.

73 To address this issue, we employed principal component analysis (PCA) with
74 quantitative kinematic measurements in this study. This method highlights specific features
75 of data through dimensional reduction, which is advantageous for analyzing rich
76 biomechanical variables. PCA has revealed elementary movement (EM) patterns from gross
77 movement during tasks such as reaching [16] and trunk bending [17]. Furthermore, bilateral
78 upper-limb movements [18] and postures in sign languages [19] have been categorized into
79 patterns. EM is interpreted as a combination of joint motions for movements that interact
80 with the environment or within the body.

81 We hypothesized that EMs could be defined from combinations of joint motions
82 during feeding movements and that the appearance of EMs would differ between feeding
83 phases. Therefore, we aimed to determine the EMs involved in the feeding phases of whole-
84 body joint motion in healthy individuals using PCA. The identified normal feeding
85 movements and postures could provide clinical observational assessments or intervention
86 cues for patients with eating difficulties.

87

88

89

90

91 **Materials and methods**

92 **Participants**

93 The study adhered to the STROBE guidelines [20]. The sample (accessed on May 14, 2024)
94 for this study was included in a previous study [14], and the study protocol was approved by
95 the ethics committee. Because we could not contact previous study participants, they were
96 informed about the study through the institution's website and provided with the option to opt
97 out of participation at any time. Consequently, informed consent was indirectly obtained from
98 participants who did not decline to participate to this study. Furthermore, the authors did not
99 have access to information that could identify individual participants of the previous study after
100 data collection. In total, 50 participants were recruited from our institutional staff from April
101 2013 to October 2017, meeting the following criteria: aged 20–39 years, right-handed, and
102 without neurological or musculoskeletal impairments. Individuals who were left-handed for
103 regular spoon use were excluded.

104

105 **Measurement procedures**

106 The measurement procedures performed in the occupational therapy room at the institution and
107 instrument details have been previously described [14]. The feeding movements of participants
108 were recorded using a three-dimensional motion capture system (Xsens MVN system; Xsens
109 Technologies B.V., Netherlands). This system provides kinematic output of a biomechanical
110 whole-body model composed of 17 inertial sensors attached to the participant's body,
111 consisting of 23 body segments, including the head, neck, pelvis, four vertebrae, scapulae,
112 upper arms, forearms, hands, upper legs, lower legs, feet, and toes. The neutral (zero) position
113 of the joint angles was defined as the joint angle when standing upright with feet parallel, one

114 foot width apart, upper limbs alongside the body, palms facing forward, and the head oriented
115 forward.

116 Participants sat on a stool without a backrest, with a table positioned in front of them. They
117 were instructed to use their right hand to reach for yogurt in a bowl placed on the table, spoon
118 it, transport it, and bring it to the mouth at a comfortable pace, repeating the sequence thrice.
119 The aim was to capture voluntary movements; therefore, movements from after the spoon left
120 the mouth to before the second instance, and from after the second instance to before the third
121 instance, were analyzed.

122

123 **Sample selection**

124 Given that participants performed their own feeding movements, five individuals displaying
125 the following movements were excluded from the standardization of normal feeding
126 movements: unnecessary upper limb elevation, shaking yogurt off the spoon while transporting
127 it to the mouth, looking away, shaking the head vertically while reaching for the bowl, repeated
128 spooning, or separating yogurt with the spoon. The final sample included 45 participants (23
129 men and 22 women) with a mean age of 27.3 years (standard deviation [SD] = 5.1) and an
130 average height of 164.8 cm (SD = 8.6).

131

132 **Data analysis**

133 Joint angles during a successive feeding cycle, consisting of reaching the hand to the bowl
134 (reaching phase), spooning yogurt (spooning phase), transporting yogurt to the mouth
135 (transport phase), and bringing yogurt to the mouth (mouth phase), were extracted from the
136 biomechanical model. Data were collected at the right shoulder (flexion/extension,

137 abduction/adduction, and internal/external rotation), elbow (flexion/extension), forearm
138 (pronation/supination), wrist (palmar/dorsal flexion and radial/ulnar deviation), C7-T1
139 (flexion/extension and right/left lateral flexion), and hip (flexion/extension) at a frequency of
140 120 Hz. A typical case is displayed in Fig 1. The change in joint angles in each feeding phase
141 was calculated using maximum and minimum values, with basic statistics presented in S1
142 Table, referenced from a previous cross-sectional study [14]. Performance times during the
143 phases were also recorded.

144

145 **Fig 1. Typical waveforms of whole-body joint angle change across all feeding phases**

146 (A) Changes in the shoulder and elbow joint angles. (B) Changes in the forearm and wrist joint
147 angles. (C) Changes in the neck (C7-T1) and hip joint angle. In all figures, the vertical axis
148 indicates the joint angle, the horizontal axis indicates the performance time, and the vertical
149 dotted line indicates the initial and final durations of each feeding phase.

150

151 To test our hypothesis, we analyzed changes in joint angles and performance times (11
152 variables) for one sample containing four feeding phases for each participant (data points of 45
153 $\times 4 = 180$) using PCA. Subsequently, principal components (PCs) indicating EMs were
154 interpreted from the loadings. Additionally, PC scores were calculated and compared between
155 feeding phases using the Friedman test, with the significance level set at $p < .05$. Post-hoc
156 analysis was performed using the Wilcoxon signed-rank test with Bonferroni correction (p
157 $< .008$). The effect size r was interpreted as medium = $|0.3|$ and large = $|0.5|$ [21].

158

159

160

161 **Results**

162 **Principal component analysis**

163 The first PC accounted for 50.0% of the variance, followed by the second PC with 13.7%.
164 The variances for PCs 3 through 6 were 7.8%, 6.5%, 5.0%, and 4.3%, respectively. The
165 cumulative variance across the first six PCs totaled 87.4%. The loadings for each PC (Fig 2)
166 allowed for the following interpretations: PC 1 represented whole-body movement over time;
167 PC 2 indicated changes in hand direction while maintaining head stability; PC 3 involved
168 elbow joint motion with stable shoulder joint angles; PC 4 captured lateral neck motion with
169 fixed elbow angles; PC 5 reflected wrist palmar/dorsal flexion; and PC 6 highlighted trunk
170 stability achieved via hip joint fixation.

171

172 **Fig 2. Parameter loadings of PCs**

173 Vertical axis indicates parameters, and horizontal axis indicates loadings.

174 PC, principal component.

175

176 **Movements characterizing feeding phases**

177 Friedman's test revealed significant differences in PC scores across feeding phases for PCs
178 1–5 (PC 1, $\chi^2 = 122$, $p < .0001$; PC 2, $\chi^2 = 109$, $p < .0001$; PC 3, $\chi^2 = 32$, $p < .0001$; PC 4, $\chi^2 =$
179 66 , $p < .0001$; PC 5, $\chi^2 = 18$, $p = .0004$). PC 6 did not show significant differences between
180 phases ($\chi^2 = 8$, $p = .0554$).

181 The PC scores for each phase across the first five PCs are summarized in Fig 3 and
182 S2 and S3 Tables. PC 1 scores were highest in the reaching phase, followed by the transport,
183 spooning, and mouth phases, with significant differences and large to medium effect sizes

184 between phases (reaching vs. spooning, $z = -8.1, p < .0001, r = -0.86$; reaching vs. transport, z
185 $= -5.2, p < .0001, r = -0.55$; reaching vs. mouth, $z = -8.2, p < .0001, r = -0.86$; spooning vs.
186 transport, $z = 7.7, p < .0001, r = 0.81$; spooning vs. mouth, $z = -2.9, p = .0039, r = -0.30$;
187 transport vs. mouth, $z = -8.1, p < .0001, r = -0.85$).

188

189 **Fig 3. Comparison of PC scores between feeding phases**

190 Vertical and horizontal axes indicate the PC score and feeding phases, respectively. The
191 upper, middle, and lower lines of the boxplot indicate the upper, median, and lower quartiles,
192 respectively. The upper and lower bars indicate the maximum and minimum values,
193 respectively. Dots indicate outliers. Box plots connected by the above lines show significant
194 differences between feeding phases, as determined using post-hoc analysis of the Wilcoxon
195 signed-rank test with Bonferroni correction ($p < .008$).

196 PC, principal component.

197

198 For PC 2, scores were significantly higher in the reaching and spooning phases than
199 in the transport and mouth phases, with large effect sizes (reaching vs. transport, $z = -7.1, p$
200 $< .0001, r = -0.75$; reaching vs. mouth, $z = -6.6, p < .0001, r = -0.69$; spooning vs. transport, z
201 $= -8.1, p < .0001, r = -0.85$; spooning vs. mouth, $z = -8.2, p < .0001, r = -0.86$). Additionally,
202 the mouth phase had a higher score than the transport phase (mouth vs. transport, $z = 4.8, p$
203 $< .0001, r = 0.51$).

204 PC 3 scores were higher in the reaching, spooning, and transport phases than in the mouth
205 phase, with large to medium effects (reaching vs. mouth, $z = -3.2, p = .0013, r = -0.34$;
206 spooning vs. mouth, $z = -6.6, p < .0001, r = -0.69$; transport vs. mouth, $z = -4.7, p < .0001, r =$
207 -0.49).

208 For PC 4, the mouth phase had the highest scores (mouth vs. reaching, $z = 4.2$, p
209 $<.0001$, $r = 0.44$; mouth vs. spooning, $z = 6.6$, $p <.0001$, $r = 0.70$; mouth vs. transport, $z = 6.3$,
210 $p <.0001$, $r = 0.66$), whereas the transport phase had the lowest scores (transport vs. reaching,
211 $z = -3.0$, $p = .0023$, $r = -0.32$; transport vs. spooning, $z = -4.2$, $p <.0001$, $r = -0.44$), with
212 significant differences and large or medium effect sizes.

213 Finally, PC 5 scores were significantly higher in the spooning, transport, and mouth
214 phases than in the reaching phase, with medium effect sizes (spooning vs. reaching, $z = 3.3$, p
215 $= .001$, $r = 0.35$; transport vs. reaching, $z = 2.9$, $p = .0042$, $r = 0.30$; mouth vs. reaching, $z =$
216 3.0 , $p = .0029$, $r = 0.31$).

217

218 **Discussion**

219 In this study, we aimed to identify elementary feeding movements and postures based on
220 joint kinematics using PCA and to compare these movements across different feeding phases.
221 The analysis revealed that the six PCs accounted for over 80% of the variance across all
222 phases, supporting the hypothesis that EMs are defined by combinations of joint motions
223 during feeding and that their occurrence varies across feeding phases. These findings suggest
224 that understanding EMs can enhance the ability of occupational therapists to assess and
225 improve feeding movements and postures through targeted interventions, such as positioning,
226 specific movement training, and the use of adaptive devices.

227 The primary EM, involving whole-body movement for mouth and hand
228 coordination, was most prominent in the reaching phase, followed by the transport phase. The
229 second EM, which involved changes in hand direction by coordinating wrist joint motions
230 with the fixed neck flexion angle, was prominent in the spooning and reaching phases. The
231 third EM, characterized by elbow motion with fixed shoulder angles, was frequently observed

232 in the spooning, transport, and reaching phases. Lateral neck motion with fixed elbow angles
233 was mostly observed in the mouth phase, but not in the transport phase. The spooning,
234 transport, and mouth phases involved more wrist flexion/extension movements. Trunk
235 stability, achieved through hip joint fixation, was consistently recognized across all phases
236 (Fig 4).

237

238 **Fig 4. Image of PCs embedded in feeding phases**

239 The line art shows human movements and postures while sitting during each feeding phase.
240 The arrow directions indicate the possibility of motion corresponding to each body part. Red
241 circles with oblique lines indicate that the motion of the overlapping arrows does not occur.
242 Light blue indicates whole-body movements that require time during the reaching and
243 transport phases. Green indicates changing the hand direction while maintaining the neck
244 flexion angle during the reaching and spooning phases. Orange indicates the elbow motion
245 that maintains shoulder flexion and rotation angles during the reaching, spooning, and
246 transporting phases. Pink indicates lateral neck motion while maintaining the elbow angle in
247 the mouth phase. Gray indicates wrist palm/dorsal flexion during spooning, transport, and
248 mouth phases. Brown color indicates trunk posture fixation during all feeding phases.
249 PC, principal component.

250

251 The whole-body movement observed in the reaching and transport phases aligns with that
252 reported previously [14], confirming the coordination of upper and lower limb and neck joint
253 motions. This was revealed by the application of PCA to the biomechanical data. During the
254 reaching phase, the shoulder flexes, abducts, and internally rotates, whereas the elbow
255 extends, positioning the hand toward the bowl. The transport phase is characterized by the

256 movement of the upper limb toward the mouth. The range of motion in hip flexion/extension
257 during reaching facilitates the trunk's return to a neutral position, which is necessary for
258 hand-reaching motion within upper limb length [22]. Additionally, head and trunk
259 movements during the transport phase bring the mouth closer to the food [23–25]. The
260 coordination of arm, neck, and trunk motions establishes the coupling of whole-body
261 movements across the two feeding phases. Notably, PCs 3 and 6 indicated shoulder or hip
262 joint fixation in most feeding phases, highlighting the stabilization of proximal body parts.
263 Stability is crucial for the functional performance of the upper extremities and reportedly
264 enhances neutral trunk position [26] and shoulder and trunk fixation [27] in individuals with
265 disabilities. Therefore, healthy feeding likely requires stabilizing the upper arm and trunk.
266 Our PCA revealed that various body segment movements dimensionally reduced the
267 configuration of normal feeding: PC 2 and PC 3 in the reaching phase, PC 2, PC 3, and PC 5
268 in the spooning phase, PC 3 and PC 5 in the transport phase, and PC 4 and PC 5 in the mouth
269 phase. These upper-body joint motions, which configure each PC in the corresponding
270 feeding phases, have been confirmed in recent research [14,28]. Each EM can be interpreted
271 as follows: PC 2, which involves positioning the hand by changing the two coupled wrist
272 joint motions, represents the approach and manipulation of an object. PC 3 reflects hand
273 transport away from the trunk or closing the mouth via elbow joint motions, representing an
274 upper limb reaching movement. These movements are well-established functions of the upper
275 extremities [29]. Additionally, the elbow joint motion of PC 3 may be adapted for spooning
276 yogurt. Counterintuitively, food intake into the mouth involved not only wrist
277 flexion/extension (PC 5) but also neck lateral flexion (PC 4); these aspects warrant
278 consideration.

279 The results of this study suggest that normal feeding involves various elements related to

280 neck, trunk, and upper extremity movements and postures across different feeding phases.
281 This objective knowledge clarifies our practical experience and supports more effective
282 interventions for patients with eating difficulties, as outlined in the following implications.
283 Practitioners may assess whether the feeding movements of patients are within normal ranges
284 using EMs identified through PCA in this study. Treatment goals and programs focused on
285 specific EMs can be developed to address feeding difficulties. To enhance feeding
286 movements and postures, practitioners might consider implementing targeted positioning
287 strategies, intensive movement training, or the use of adaptive devices, along with providing
288 education for patients and their caregivers or occupational therapy students.
289 This study has some limitations, including its focus on right-handed individuals using a spoon
290 to eat yogurt, because of the heterogeneity of dominant upper-limb movements between
291 right- and left-handed individuals [30]. These specific conditions may influence the observed
292 EMs and warrant further research to better understand and validate these findings. In this
293 study, we employed a portable inertial motion capture system, which offers flexibility in
294 measurement settings. However, alternative methods, such as single-camera markerless
295 capturing [31] or visual kinematic observation [32], may offer additional benefits in clinical
296 practice [33] and should be evaluated for their applicability.

297

298 **Conclusions**

299 The PCA of whole-body kinematic data identified several EMs associated with normal
300 feeding, each corresponding to specific functional phases. These findings provide a
301 foundation for defining normal feeding movements and postures. Further research is

302 warranted to validate the application of these findings to clinical practices related to
303 addressing feeding difficulties.

304 **References**

- 305 1. Cipriano-Crespo C, Rodríguez-Hernández M, Cantero-Garlito P, Mariano-Juárez L.
306 Eating experiences of people with disabilities: A qualitative study in Spain. *Healthcare*
307 (Basel). 2020;8: 512. doi: [10.3390/healthcare8040512](https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare8040512).
- 308 2. Klinke ME, Wilson ME, Hafsteinsdóttir TB, Jónsdóttir H. Recognizing new
309 perspectives in eating difficulties following stroke: A concept analysis. *Disabil Rehabil*.
310 2013;35: 1491–1500. doi: 10.3109/09638288.2012.736012.
- 311 3. Ciliz O, Tulek Z, Hanagasi H, Bilgic B, Gurvit IH. Eating difficulties and
312 relationship with nutritional status among patients with dementia. *J Nurs Res*. 2023;31: e260.
313 doi: 10.1097/jnr.0000000000000538.
- 314 4. Philipps J, Reinhart C, Rohde A, Virgil K, Moser C. Feeding and swallowing. *J*
315 *Occup Ther Sch Early Interv*. 2012;5: 90–104. doi: 10.1080/19411243.2012.701524.
- 316 5. The practice of occupational therapy in feeding, eating, and swallowing. *Am J Occup Ther*.
317 2017;71 Supplement 2(Supplement_2): 7112410015p1–7112410015p13. doi:
318 [10.5014/ajot.2017.716S04](https://doi.org/10.5014/ajot.2017.716S04).
- 319 6. Bhattacharjya S, Lenker JA, Schraeder R, Ghosh A, Ghosh R,
320 Mandal S. Comprehensive needs assessment to ensure appropriate rehabilitation training for
321 community-based workers and caregivers in India. *Am J Occup Ther*. 2021;75,
322 7501205130p7501205131-7501205130p7501205110: 7501205130p1–7501205130p10. doi:
323 10.5014/ajot.2021.040097.
- 324 7. Mlinda SJ, Leyna GH, Massawe A. The effect of a practical nutrition education
325 programme on feeding skills of caregivers of children with cerebral palsy at Muhimbili
326 National Hospital, in Tanzania. *Child Care Health Dev*. 2018;44: 452–461. doi:
327 [10.1111/cch.12553](https://doi.org/10.1111/cch.12553).
- 328 8. Jo E-J, Noh D-H, Kam K-Y. Effects of contextual interference on feeding training in

- 328 patients with stroke. *Hum Mov Sci.* 2020;69: 102560. doi: [10.1016/j.humov.2019.102560](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.humov.2019.102560).
- 329 9. Treger I, Aidinof L, Lehrer H, Kalichman L. Modified constraint-induced movement
330 therapy improved upper limb function in subacute poststroke patients: A small-scale clinical
331 trial. *Top Stroke Rehabil.* 2012;19: 287–293. doi: 10.1310/tsr1904-287.
- 332 10. Koester K, Troeller H, Panter S, Winter E, Patel JJ. Overview of Intensive Care
333 Unit-related physical and functional impairments and rehabilitation-related devices. *Nutr Clin*
334 *Pract.* 2018;33: 177–184. doi: [10.1002/ncp.10077](https://doi.org/10.1002/ncp.10077).
- 335 11. Uniform data system for medical rehabilitation. 1990. *Guide for use of the uniform data*
336 *set for medical rehabilitation. Data management, S., & Center for Functional Assessment, R.*
337 *State University of New York at Buffalo.*
- 338 12. Shah S, Vanclay F, Cooper B. Improving the sensitivity of the Barthel index for
339 stroke rehabilitation. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 1989;42: 703–709. doi: [10.1016/0895-](https://doi.org/10.1016/0895-4356(89)90065-6)
340 [4356\(89\)90065-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0895-4356(89)90065-6).
- 341 13. Westergren A, Lindholm C, Mattsson A, Ulander K. Minimal eating observation
342 form: Reliability and validity. *J Nutr Health Aging.* 2009;13: 6–12. doi: 10.1007/s12603-009-
343 0002-4.
- 344 14. Nakatake J, Totoribe K, Arakawa H, Chosa E. Exploring whole-body kinematics
345 when eating real foods with the dominant hand in healthy adults. *PLOS ONE.* 2021;16:
346 e0259184. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0259184.
- 347 15. Kontaxis A, Cutti AG, Johnson GR, Veeger HEJ. A framework for the definition of
348 standardized protocols for measuring upper-extremity kinematics. *Clin Biomech (Bristol*
349 *Avon).* 2009;24: 246–253. doi: 10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2008.12.009.
- 350 16. Kaminski TR. The coupling between upper and lower extremity synergies during
351 whole body reaching. *Gait Posture.* 2007;26: 256–262. doi: [10.1016/j.gaitpost.2006.09.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2006.09.006).

- 352 17. Tricon V, Le Pellec-Muller A, Martin N, Mesure S, Azulay J-P, Vernazza-Martin S.
353 Balance control and adaptation of kinematic synergy in aging adults during forward trunk
354 bending. *Neurosci Lett*. 2007;415: 81–86. doi: [10.1016/j.neulet.2006.12.046](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neulet.2006.12.046).
- 355 18. Burns MK, Patel V, Florescu I, Pochiraju KV, Vinjamuri R. Low-dimensional
356 synergistic representation of bilateral reaching movements. *Front Bioeng Biotechnol*. 2017;5:
357 2. doi: [10.3389/fbioe.2017.00002](https://doi.org/10.3389/fbioe.2017.00002).
- 358 19. Bigand F, Prigent E, Berret B, Braffort A. Decomposing spontaneous sign language
359 into elementary movements: A principal component analysis-based approach. *PLOS ONE*.
360 2021;16: e0259464. doi: [10.1371/journal.pone.0259464](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0259464).
- 361 20. von Elm E, Altman DG, Eggar M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP.
362 STROBE initiative. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in
363 Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for observational studies. *Lancet*. 2007;370:
364 1453–1457. doi: [10.1016/s0140-6736\(07\)61602-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(07)61602-X).
- 365 21. Hugh C, Hugh C. *Research methods and statistics in psychology*. 5th ed. Routledge;
366 2009. doi: [10.4324/9780203769669](https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203769669).
- 367 22. Kaminski TR, Bock C, Gentile AM. The coordination between trunk and arm
368 motion during pointing movements. *Exp Brain Res*. 1995;106: 457–466. doi:
369 [10.1007/BF00231068](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00231068).
- 370 23. Chinju K, Yamamoto Y, Inada E, Iwashita Y, Sato H. Analysis of head motions
371 during food intake in Japanese adults using a new motion capture system. *Arch Oral Biol*.
372 2024;160: 105908. doi: [10.1016/j.archoralbio.2024.105908](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.archoralbio.2024.105908).
- 373 24. Inada E, Saitoh I, Nakakura-Ohshima K, Maruyama T, Iwasaki T, Murakami D, et
374 al. Association between mouth opening and upper body movement with intake of different-
375 size food pieces during eating. *Arch Oral Biol*. 2012;57: 307–313. doi:

376 [10.1016/j.archoralbio.2011.08.023](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.archoralbio.2011.08.023).

377 25. van der Kamp J, Steenbergen B. The kinematics of eating with a spoon: Bringing the
378 food to the mouth, or the mouth to the food? *Exp Brain Res*. 1999;129: 68–76. doi:

379 10.1007/s002210050937.

380 26. Gillen G, Boiangiu C, Neuman M, Reinstein R, Schaap Y. Trunk posture affects
381 upper extremity function of adults. *Percept Mot Skills*. 2007;104: 371–380. doi:

382 10.2466/pms.104.2.371-380.

383 27. Olczak A, Truszczyńska-Baszak A, Mróz J. Change in the results of motor
384 coordination and handgrip strength depending on age and body position-An observational
385 study of stroke patients and healthy volunteers. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2022;19:

386 4703. doi: [10.3390/ijerph19084703](https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19084703).

387 28. Doğan M, Koçak M, Onursal Kılınc Ö, Ayvat F, Sütçü G, Ayvat E, et al. Functional
388 range of motion in the upper extremity and trunk joints: Nine functional everyday tasks with
389 inertial sensors. *Gait Posture*. 2019;70: 141–147. doi: [10.1016/j.gaitpost.2019.02.024](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2019.02.024).

390 29. Kapandji IA, Owerko C, Anderson A 2019. *Physiology of the joints, Volume 1 The*
391 *upper limb*. 7th ed.. Handspring Publisher LTD.

392 30. Eliza LN, Neil EB, George DK. Handness and reach-to-place kinematics in adults:
393 Left-handers are not reversed right-handers. *J Mot Behav*. 2018;50: 381–391. doi:

394 10.1080/100222895.2017.1363698.

395 31. Scott B, Seyres M, Philp F, Chadwick EK, Blana D. Healthcare applications of
396 single camera markerless motion capture: A scoping review. *PeerJ*. 2022;10: e13517. doi:

397 10.7717/peerj.13517.

398 32. Bernhardt J, Bate PJ, Matyas TA. Accuracy of observational kinematic assessment
399 of upper-limb movements. *Phys Ther*. 1998;78: 259–270. doi: [10.1093/ptj/78.3.259](https://doi.org/10.1093/ptj/78.3.259).

400 33. Demers M, Levin MF. Do activity level outcome measures commonly used in
401 neurological practice assess upper-limb movement quality? *Neurorehab Neural Repair*.
402 2017;31: 623–637. doi: 10.1177/1545968317714576.
403
404
405

406 **Supporting information**

407 **S1 Table: Kinematic parameters analyzed using principal component analysis**

408 **S2 Table: PC score for each feeding phase**

409 **S3 Table: Post-hoc comparison of PC scores between feeding phases**

410


411

412

413

414

415



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.14.24313686>; this version posted September 15, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).







Fig1

PC 1




PC 2




medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.14.24313686>; this version posted September 15, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).


PC 3



PC 4



PC 5



PC 6






Fig2



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.14.24313686>; this version posted September 15, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).









Fig3

Reaching phase




Spooning phase



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.14.24313686>; this version posted September 15, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#).

Transport phase



Mouth phase



Fig4