1	Normal feeding movements expressed by dimensionality
2	reduction of whole-body joint motions using principal
3	component analysis
4	
5	Jun Nakatake ¹ Shigeaki Miyazaki ¹ Hideki Arakawa ¹ Etsuo Chosa ²
6	Jun Pakatake , Singeaki Wiyazaki , Theeki Makawa , Lisuo Chosa
0	Dehebilitation unit University of Missonaly Hoonital Missonaly shi Missonaly Ianon
/	Renabilitation unit, University of Miyazaki Hospital, Miyazaki-shi, Miyazaki, Japan
8	² Community medical center, University of Miyazaki Hospital, Miyazaki-shi, Miyazaki, Japan
9	
10	Corresponding author:
11	Jun Nakatake
12	Rehabilitation unit, University of Miyazaki Hospital, Miyazaki-shi, Miyazaki, Japan
13	Email address: jyun_nakatake@med.miyazaki-u.ac.jp (JN)
14	
15	Abstract
16	Background. Understanding elementary feeding movements and postures is essential for
17	improving assessment and intervention strategies in occupational therapy, particularly for
18	individuals with eating difficulties, and for educating caregivers and students. However, the
19	current assessment tools lack precision in evaluating complex feeding movements and often
20	rely on subjective judgments rather than objective measures. We aimed to determine
21	elementary movements and postures corresponding to different feeding phases using principal
22	component analysis (PCA).
23	Methods. This cross-sectional observational study was conducted at a Local National
24	University Hospital and included 45 healthy, right-handed adult volunteers (23 men and 22
25	women) aged 20–39 years (mean age, 27.3 years), with no neurological or musculoskeletal
20	three dimensional inertial sensor motion capture system. Principal components (PCs) and their
27	scores were derived from PCA of whole-body joint motion data across four feeding phases PC
20	scores were compared between phases using Friedman's and post-hoc tests
30	Results. The primary PC, representing whole-body movement, accounted for 50.0% of the
31	variance: the second PC, associated with hand direction changes, accounted for 13.7%. The
32	cumulative variance of the first six PCs was 87.4%, including individual body-part movements
33	and fixations or combinations of these. Significant differences existed between feeding phases,
34	particularly in the reaching and transport phases, which showed greater whole-body movement
35	than that during the spooning and mouth phases. Hand direction changes were more prominent
36	during the spooning phase than during the mouth phase.

1

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

37 Conclusions. PCA helped determine key elementary movements and their corresponding

- 38 feeding phases, which can be used to assess patients with feeding difficulties and guide
- 39 occupational therapy interventions.
- 40

41 Introduction

42 Eating difficulties caused by injuries or illnesses result in physiological, psychological, and 43 social challenges (Cipriano-Crespo et al., 2020; Klinke et al. 2013). Impaired self-feeding 44 skills are further associated with malnutrition (Ciliz et al., 2023). Occupational therapy 45 addresses these issues by focusing on swallowing, posture, movement, equipment, care 46 methods, and habits, and providing psychosocial interventions for patients (Boop et al., 2017; 47 Philipps et al. 2012). Several interventions have been developed to improve posture in children 48 (Bhattacharjya et al., 2021; Mlinda, Leyna, & Massawe, 2018) and provide intensive training 49 for specific movements (Jo, Noh, & Kam, 2020; Treger et al., 2012). Additionally, early 50 rehabilitation using feeding devices in intensive care units has been introduced (Koester et al., 51 2018).

52 Eating evaluations are often conducted using assessment tools such as the functional 53 independence measure (Uniform Data System for Medical Rehabilitation, 1990) and the 54 modified Barthel index (Shah, Vanclay, & Cooper, 1989), which include eating as one of 55 several daily tasks. Patients are assessed on an ordinal scale based on judgments regarding 56 voluntary movements, caregiver support, or types of equipment used. An eating-specific 57 screening tool, the minimal eating observation form II, has also been developed (Westergren et 58 al., 2009). This tool consists of three items observed on a nominal or ordinal scale, focusing on 59 the sitting position. Practitioners use these assessments to evaluate the eating conditions of 60 patients, set treatment goals, and guide feeding movements and postures. However, targeted 61 movements and postures may be assessed subjectively owing to the experience of practitioners, 62 and the rationale for these assessments remains insufficient.

63 While studies had reported summarized measurements and waveforms regarding 64 joint angles necessary for normal feeding activities (Nagao, 2004; Doğan et al., 2019; van Andel et al., 2008), these movement and posture patterns correspond to different time phases 65 66 (Nakatake et al., 2021). The results suggest substantial changes in whole-body joint angles 67 during the phases of reaching for the dish and transporting food to the mouth. Additionally, 68 motion direction varies during the phases of spooning food and taking it into the mouth. 69 Understanding these joint motions, which involves changes in each joint angle over time, can 70 enhance assessments and interventions aimed at improving the movements or postures of 71 patients (Kontaxis et al., 2009). However, relying solely on individual joint motion attached to 72 corresponding time phases to understand feeding movements is insufficient. Practitioners often 73 recognize the movements of patients based on approximate body part motions rather than 74 individual joint motions, which may involve a combination of joint motions, namely 75 coordination. These movements during feeding, such as reaching for food, manipulating the 76 direction of the palm, approaching the food with the mouth, or stabilizing the trunk to support 77 the upper limbs, may involve coordinated, complex joint motions that play significant roles in

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

78 daily living. However, their specific functions remain unclear.

79 To address this issue, we employed principal component analysis (PCA) with 80 quantitative kinematic measurements. This method highlights specific fictitious features of 81 data through dimensional reduction, summarizing variables, which is advantageous for 82 analyzing rich biomechanical variables (Daffertshofer et al., 2004). PCA has revealed 83 elementary movement (EM) patterns from gross movement during tasks, such as reaching 84 (Kaminski, 2007) and trunk bending (Tricon et al., 2007). Furthermore, bilateral upper-limb 85 movements (Burns et al., 2017) and postures in sign languages (Bigand et al., 2021) have been 86 categorized into patterns. EM is interpreted as a combination of joint motions for movements 87 that interact with the environment or within the body.

We hypothesized that EMs could be defined from combinations of joint motions during feeding movements and that the appearance of EMs would differ between feeding phases. Therefore, we assessed the secondary analysis of a previous dataset (Nakatake et al., 2021) and aimed to determine the EMs involved in the feeding phases of whole-body joint motion in healthy individuals using PCA. The identified normal feeding movements and postures could provide clinical observational assessments or intervention cues for patients with eating difficulties.

95

96 Materials and methods

97 Participants

98 The study adhered to the STROBE guidelines (von Elm et al., 2007) and was presented in 99 preprint server (Nakatake et al., 2024). The sample for this study was included in a previous 100 study (Nakatake et al., 2021), and the study protocol was approved by the Research Ethics 101 Committee of the Faculty of Medicine at the University of Miyazaki (Miyazaki-shi, Japan) 102 (approval number: O-1501). As we could not contact previous study participants, they were 103 informed about the study through the institution's website and provided with the option to opt 104 out of participation at any time. Consequently, informed consent was indirectly obtained from 105 participants who did not decline to participate in this study. Furthermore, the authors did not 106 have access to information that could identify individual participants of the previous study 107 after data collection. In total, 50 participants were recruited from our institutional staff from 108 April 2013 to October 2017, meeting the following criteria: aged 20–39 years, right-handed, 109 and without neurological or musculoskeletal impairments. Individuals who were left-handed 110 for regular spoon use were excluded.

111

112 Measurement procedures

113 The measurement procedures performed in the occupational therapy room at the institution and

114 instrument details have been previously described (Nakatake et al., 2021). The feeding

- 115 movements of participants were recorded using a three-dimensional motion capture system
- 116 (Xsens MVN system; Xsens Technologies B.V., Netherlands). This system provides kinematic
- 117 output of a biomechanical whole-body model composed of 17 inertial sensors attached to the
- 118 participant's head, sternum, scapulas, pelvis, upper-arms, forearms, hands, upper-legs,

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

lower-legs, and feet, consisting of 23 body segments, including the head, neck, pelvis, four
vertebrae, scapulae, upper arms, forearms, hands, upper legs, lower legs, feet, and toes. The

121 neutral (zero) position of the joint angles was defined as the joint angle when standing upright

- 122 with feet parallel, one foot width apart, upper limbs alongside the body, palms facing forward,
- and the head oriented forward.

Participants sat on a stool of height 40 cm without a backrest, with a table adjusted at their elbow height that were positioned in front of their trunk at a distance of 10 cm. They were instructed to use their right hand to reach for yogurt in a bowl placed on the table, scoop it

- with a stainless spoon (17.5 cm in length, 41 g in weight), transport it, and bring it to their
- 127 with a stainless spoon (17.5 cm in length, 41 g in weight), transport it, and bring it to their 128 mouth at a comfortable pace, repeating the sequence thrice. The aim was to capture voluntary
- movements; therefore, movements from after the spoon left the mouth to before the second
- 130 instance, and from after the second instance to before the third instance, were analyzed.
- 131

132 Sample selection

Given that participants performed their own feeding movements, five individuals displayingthe following movements were excluded from the standardization of normal feeding

- 135 movements: unnecessary upper limb elevation, shaking yogurt off the spoon while transporting
- 136 it to the mouth, looking away, shaking the head vertically while reaching for the bowl, repeated
- spooning, or separating yogurt with the spoon. The final sample included 45 participants (23
- 138 men and 22 women) with a mean age of 27.3 years (standard deviation [SD] = 5.1) and an 139 average height of 164.8 cm (SD = 8.6).
- 140

141 Data analysis

Joint angles during a successive feeding cycle, consisting of reaching the hand to the bowl(reaching phase), spooning yogurt (spooning phase), transporting yogurt to the mouth

144 (transport phase), and bringing yogurt to the mouth (mouth phase), were identified by

- 145 confirming pictures in recorded movies synchronized to the system and extracted from the
- 146 biomechanical model. Data were collected at the right shoulder (flexion/extension,
- 147 abduction/adduction, and internal/external rotation), elbow (flexion/extension), forearm
- 148 (pronation/supination), wrist (palmar/dorsal flexion and radial/ulnar deviation), C7-T1
- 149 (flexion/extension and right/left lateral flexion), and hip (flexion/extension) at a frequency of
- 150 120 Hz. A typical case is displayed in Fig 1. The change in joint angles in each feeding phase
- 151 was calculated using maximum and minimum values. Performance times during the phases
- 152 were also recorded.
- 153 This study performed PCA which summarizes entire variables to theorical fictitious 154 components called principal components (PCs). PCs consist of sum of substantial
- 155 measurements loaded by coefficients. Accordingly, each data point has scores of PC. To test
- 156 our hypothesis, we analyzed changes in joint angles and performance times (11 variables) for
- 157 one sample containing four feeding phases for each participant (data points of $45 \times 4 = 180$)
- 158 using PCA. Subsequently, the PC was selected to ensure that the cumulative variance ratio
- 159 (contribution ratio to all PC) was \geq 85%. PCs indicating EMs were interpreted from the
- 160 loadings. Additionally, PC scores were calculated and compared between feeding phases using

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

161 the Friedman test, with the significance level set at p < .05. Post-hoc analysis was performed

using the Wilcoxon signed-rank test with Bonferroni correction (p < .008). The effect size r was

163 interpreted as medium = |0.3| and large = |0.5| (Hugh & Hugh, 2009).

164

165 **Results**

166 **Principal component analysis**

167 The first PC accounted for 50.0% of the variance, followed by the second PC with 13.7%. The

variances for PCs 3 through 6 were 7.8%, 6.5%, 5.0%, and 4.3%, respectively. The cumulative

169 variance across the first six PCs totaled 87.4%. The loadings for each PC (Fig 2) allowed for

170 the following interpretations: PC 1 represented whole-body movement over time; PC 2

171 indicated changes in hand direction while maintaining head stability; PC 3 involved elbow

172 joint motion with stable shoulder joint angles; PC 4 captured lateral neck motion with fixed

- elbow angles; PC 5 reflected wrist palmar/dorsal flexion; and PC 6 highlighted trunk stabilityachieved via hip joint fixation.
- 174 achieved via mp joint fixation
- 175

176 Movements characterizing feeding phases

Friedman's test revealed significant differences in PC scores across feeding phases for PCs 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, $\chi^2 = 66$, p(NO01; PC 5, $\chi^2 = 18$, p = .0004). PC 6 did not show significant differences between phases (χ^2 180 = 8, p = .0554).

The PC scores for each phase across the first five PCs are summarized in Fig 3 and Tables S2 and S3. PC 1 scores were highest in the reaching phase, followed by the transport, spooning, and mouth phases, with significant differences and large to medium effect sizes between phases (reaching vs. spooning, z = -5.8, p < .0001, r = -0.62; reaching vs. transport, z =-5.8, p < .0001, r = -0.61; reaching vs. mouth, z = -5.8, p < .0001, r = -0.62; spooning vs. transport, z = -5.8, p < .0001, r = -0.62; spooning vs. transport, z = -5.8, p < .0001, r = -0.62; spooning vs. mouth, z = -3.5, p = .0005, r = -0.36; transport vs. mouth, z = -5.8, p < .0001, r = -0.62).

For PC 2, scores between all phases were significant with large effect to medium sizes, in the order of spooning, reaching, mouth, and transport phases (reaching vs. spooning, z = -3.1, p < .0018, r = -0.33; reaching vs. transport, z = -5.8, p < .0001, r = -0.62; reaching vs. mouth, z = -5.5, p < .0001, r = -0.58; spooning vs. transport, z = -5.8, p < .0001, r = -0.62; spooning vs. mouth, z = -5.8, p < .0001, r = -0.62; transport vs. mouth, z = -4.9, p < .0001, r = -0.52).

PC 3 scores were higher in the reaching, spooning, and transport phases than in the mouth phase, with large to small effects (reaching vs. mouth, z = -2.7, p = .0066, r = -0.29; spooning vs. mouth, z = -5.5, p < .0001, r = -0.58; transport vs. mouth, z = -3.1, p = .0019, r = -0.33).

For PC 4, the mouth phase had the highest scores (mouth vs. reaching, z = -2.8, p=.0045, r = -0.30; mouth vs. spooning, z = -5.6, p < .0001, r = -0.59; mouth vs. transport, z = -5.6, p < .0001, r = -0.59), whereas the transport phase had the lowest scores (transport vs. reaching, z = -5.2, p < .0001, r = -0.55; transport vs. spooning, z = -4.0, p = .0001, r = -0.43),

202 with significant differences and large or medium effect sizes.

Finally, PC 5 scores were significantly higher in the spooning and transport phases than in the reaching phase, with medium effect sizes (spooning vs. reaching, z = -3.3, p = .0009, r = -0.35; transport vs. reaching, z = -3.3, p = .0009, r = -0.35).

206

207 Discussion

208 In this study, we aimed to identify elementary feeding movements and postures based on joint 209 kinematics using PCA and to compare these movements across different feeding phases. The 210 analysis revealed that the six PCs accounted for over 85% of the variance across all phases, 211 supporting the hypothesis that EMs are defined by combinations of joint motions during 212 feeding and that their occurrence varies across feeding phases. These findings suggest that 213 understanding EMs can enhance the ability of occupational therapists to assess and improve 214 feeding movements and postures through targeted interventions, such as positioning, specific 215 movement training, and the use of adaptive devices.

216 The primary EM, involving whole-body movement for mouth and hand coordination, 217 was most prominent in the reaching phase, followed by the transport phase. The second EM, 218 which involved changes in hand direction by coordinating wrist joint motions with the fixed 219 neck flexion angle, was prominent in the spooning phase followed by reaching phase. The 220 third EM, characterized by elbow motion with fixed shoulder angles, was frequently observed 221 in the spooning, transport, and reaching phases. Lateral neck motion with fixed elbow angles 222 was mostly observed in the mouth phase, but not in the transport phase. The spooning and 223 transport phases involved more wrist flexion/extension movements. Trunk stability, achieved 224 through hip joint fixation, was consistently recognized across all phases (Fig 4).

225 The whole-body movement observed in the reaching and transport phases aligns with 226 that reported previously (Nakatake et al., 2021), confirming the coordination of upper and 227 lower limb and neck joint motions. This theorical EM was revealed by the application of PCA 228 to the biomechanical data. During the reaching phase, the shoulder flexes, abducts, and 229 internally rotates, whereas the elbow extends, positioning the hand toward the bowl. The 230 transport phase is characterized by the movement of the upper limb toward the mouth. The 231 range of motion in hip flexion/extension during reaching facilitates the trunk's return to a 232 neutral position, which is necessary for hand-reaching motion within upper limb length 233 (Kaminski, Bock, & Gentile, 1995). Additionally, head and trunk movements during the 234 transport phase bring the mouth closer to the food (Chinju et al., 2024; Inada et al., 2012; van 235 der Kamp & Steenbergen, 1999). The coordination of arm, neck, and trunk motions establishes 236 the coupling of whole-body movements across the two feeding phases. The other PCs were 237 defined as theorical EMs for the first time. Notably, PCs 3 and 6 indicated shoulder or hip joint 238 fixation in most feeding phases, highlighting the stabilization of proximal body parts. Stability 239 is crucial for the functional performance of the upper extremities and reportedly enhances 240 neutral trunk position (Gillen et al., 2007) and shoulder and trunk fixation (Olczak, 241 Truszczyńska-Baszak, & Mróz, 2022) in individuals with disabilities. Therefore, healthy 242 feeding likely requires stabilizing the upper arm and trunk.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

243 Our PCA revealed that various body segment movements dimensionally reduced the 244 configuration of normal feeding: PC 2 and PC 3 in the reaching phase, PC 2, PC 3, and PC 5 in 245 the spooning phase, PC 3 and PC 5 in the transport phase, and PC 4 in the mouth phase. These 246 upper-body joint motions, which configure each PC in the corresponding feeding phases, have 247 been confirmed in recent research (Doğan et al., 2019; Nakatake et al., 2021). Each EM can be 248 interpreted as follows: PC 2, which involves positioning the hand by changing the two coupled 249 wrist joint motions, represents the approach and manipulation of an object. PC 3 reflects hand 250 transport away from the trunk or closing the mouth via elbow joint motions, representing an 251 upper limb reaching movement. These movements are well-established functions of the upper 252 extremities (Kapandji, Owerko, & Anderson, 2019). Additionally, the elbow joint motion of 253 PC 3 may be adapted for spooning yogurt. Counterintuitively, food intake into the mouth 254 involved neck lateral flexion (PC 4). Wrist flexion/extension (PC 5) enables manipulating and 255 transporting foods, with these aspects warranting consideration.

256 The results of this study suggest that normal feeding involves various elements related 257 to neck, trunk, and upper extremity movements and postures across different feeding phases. 258 This objective knowledge clarifies our practical experience and supports more effective 259 interventions for patients with eating difficulties, as outlined in the following implications. 260 Practitioners may assess whether the feeding movements of patients are within normal ranges 261 using EMs identified through PCA in this study. Treatment goals and programs focused on 262 specific EMs can be developed to address feeding difficulties. To enhance feeding movements 263 and postures, practitioners might consider implementing targeted positioning strategies, 264 intensive movement training, or the use of adaptive devices, along with providing education for 265 patients and their caregivers or occupational therapy students.

266 This study has some limitations, including its focus on right-handed individuals using 267 a spoon to eat yogurt, because of the heterogeneity of dominant upper-limb movements 268 between right- and left-handed individuals (Nelson, Berthier, & Konidaris, 2018). These 269 specific conditions may influence the observed EMs and warrant further research to better 270 understand and validate these findings. Individuals exhibiting EMs outside the normal range, 271 such as the minimum or maximum values of PC 1 during the reaching phase, should be noted in 272 clinical assessments. In this study, we employed a portable inertial motion capture system, 273 which offers flexibility in measurement settings. However, alternative methods, such as 274 single-camera markerless capture (Scott et al., 2022) or visual kinematic observation 275 (Bernhardt, Bate, & Matyas, 1998), may offer additional benefits in clinical practice (Demers

- 276 & Levin, 2017) and should be evaluated for their applicability.
- 277

278 **Conclusions**

The PCA of whole-body kinematic data identified several EMs associated with normal feeding,
each corresponding to specific functional phases. These findings provide a theorical

foundation for defining normal feeding movements and postures. Further research is warranted

 $281 \qquad \text{foundation for defining normal feeding movements and postures. Further research is warranted and the second sec$

to validate the application of these findings to clinical practices related to addressing feeding

283 difficulties.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

\mathbf{a}	\mathbf{n}	
	V /	
	$\Delta \Delta$	

285 **References**

- Bernhardt J, Bate PJ, Matyas TA. 1998. Accuracy of observational kinematic assessment of
 upper-limb movements. *Physical Therapy* 78:259–270. DOI: 10.1093/ptj/78.3.259.
- 288 Bhattacharjya S, Lenker JA, Schraeder R, Ghosh A, Ghosh R, Mandal S. 2021.
- 289 Comprehensive needs assessment to ensure appropriate rehabilitation training for
- 290 community-based workers and caregivers in India. American Journal of Occupational
- 291 *Therapy: Official Publication of the American Occupational Therapy Association* 75:
- 292 7501205130p1-7501205130p10. DOI: 10.5014/ajot.2021.040097.
- Bigand F, Prigent E, Berret B, Braffort A. 2021. Decomposing spontaneous sign language
 into elementary movements: A principal component analysis-based approach. *PLOS ONE* 16:e0259464. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0259464.
- Boop C, Smith J, Kannenberg K. 2017. The practice of occupational therapy in feeding,
- 297 eating, and swallowing. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy: Official*
- 298 Publication of the American Occupational Therapy Association
- 299 71(Supplement_2):7112410015p1-7112410015p13. DOI: <u>10.5014/ajot.2017.716S04</u>.
- 300 Burns MK, Patel V, Florescu I, Pochiraju KV, Vinjamuri R. 2017. Low-dimensional
- 301 synergistic representation of bilateral reaching movements. *Frontiers in Bioengineering*302 & *Biotechnology* 5:2. DOI: 10.3389/fbioe.2017.00002.
- Chinju K, Yamamoto Y, Inada E, Iwashita Y, Sato H. 2024. Analysis of head motions during
 food intake in Japanese adults using a new motion capture system. *Archives of Oral Biology* 160:105908. DOI: 10.1016/j.archoralbio.2024.105908.
- Ciliz O, Tulek Z, Hanagasi H, Bilgic B, Gurvit IH. 2023. Eating difficulties and relationship
 with nutritional status among patients with dementia. *Journal of Nursing Research: JNR* 31:e260. DOI: 10.1097/jnr.0000000000538.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

- 309 Cipriano-Crespo C, Rodríguez-Hernández M, Cantero-Garlito P, Mariano-Juárez L. 2020.
- Eating experiences of people with disabilities: A qualitative study in Spain. *Healthcare*
- 311 8:512. DOI: <u>10.3390/healthcare8040512</u>.
- 312 Daffertshofer A, Lamoth CJC, Meijer OG, Beek PJ. 2004. PCA in studying coordination and
- 313 variability: A tutorial. *Clinical Biomechanics* 19:415–428. DOI:
- 314 <u>10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2004.01.005</u>.
- Demers M, Levin MF. 2017. Do activity level outcome measures commonly used in
 neurological practice assess upper-limb movement quality? *Neurorehabilitation & Neural Repair* 31:623–637. DOI: 10.1177/1545968317714576.
- Doğan M, Koçak M, Onursal Kılınç Ö, Ayvat F, Sütçü G, Ayvat E, Kılınç M, Ünver Ö, Aksu
 Yıldırım S. 2019. Functional range of motion in the upper extremity and trunk joints:
 Nine functional everyday tasks with inertial sensors. *Gait & Posture* 70:141–147. DOI:
- 321 <u>10.1016/j.gaitpost.2019.02.024</u>.
- Gillen G, Boiangiu C, Neuman M, Reinstein R, Schaap Y. 2007. Trunk posture affects upper
 extremity function of adults. *Perceptual & Motor Skills* 104:371–380. DOI:
 10.2466/pms.104.2.371-380.
- Hugh C, Hugh C. 2009. *Research Methods and Statistics in Psychology*. 5th ed. Routledge.
 DOI: <u>10.4324/9780203769669</u>.
- 327 Inada E, Saitoh I, Nakakura-Ohshima K, Maruyama T, Iwasaki T, Murakami D, Tanaka M,
- 328 Hayasaki H, Yamasaki Y. 2012. Association between mouth opening and upper body
- 329 movement with intake of different-size food pieces during eating. Archives of Oral
- 330 *Biology* 57:307–313. DOI: <u>10.1016/j.archoralbio.2011.08.023</u>.
- Jo E-J, Noh D-H, Kam K-Y. 2020. Effects of contextual interference on feeding training in
 patients with stroke. *Human Movement Science* 69:102560. DOI:
 10.1016/j.humov.2019.102560.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

224	IZ ' 1'TD	0007	/TNI 1*	1 /	1 1	· • ·	•	1 .
334	Kaminski TR	2007	The counting	hetween unne	r and lower	extremity s	synergies	dumng
557	manning in in.	2007.	The coupling	between uppe	and to wer	CAUCIIII V	syncizics	uuiiiz

- 335 whole body reaching. *Gait & Posture* 26:256–262. DOI:
- 336 <u>10.1016/j.gaitpost.2006.09.006</u>.
- Kaminski TR, Bock C, Gentile AM. 1995. The coordination between trunk and arm motion
 during pointing movements. *Experimental Brain Research* 106:457–466. DOI:
 10.1007/BF00231068.
- 340 Kapandji IA, Owerko C, Anderson A. 2019. Physiology of the joints, Volume 1 *The Upper*
- 341 *Limb*. 7th ed. Handspring Publisher LTD.
- Klinke ME, Wilson ME, Hafsteinsdóttir TB, Jónsdóttir H. 2013. Recognizing new
 perspectives in eating difficulties following stroke: A concept analysis. *Disability & Rehabilitation* 35:1491–1500. DOI: 10.3109/09638288.2012.736012.
- 345 Koester K, Troeller H, Panter S, Winter E, Patel JJ. 2018. Overview of Intensive Care
- 346 Unit-related physical and functional impairments and rehabilitation-related devices.
- 347 Nutrition in Clinical Practice: Official Publication of the American Society for
- 348 *Parenteral & Enteral Nutrition* 33:177–184. DOI: <u>10.1002/ncp.10077</u>.
- Kontaxis A, Cutti AG, Johnson GR, Veeger HEJ. 2009. A framework for the definition of
 standardized protocols for measuring upper-extremity kinematics. *Clinical*
- 351 *Biomechanics (Bristol, Avon)* 24:246–253. DOI: 10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2008.12.009.
- 352 Mlinda SJ, Leyna GH, Massawe A. 2018. The effect of a practical nutrition education
- 353 programme on feeding skills of caregivers of children with cerebral palsy at Muhimbili
- 354 National Hospital, in Tanzania. *Child: Care, Health & Development* 44:452–461. DOI:
- 355 <u>10.1111/cch.12553</u>.
- Nagao T. 2004. Joint *Motion Analysis* of the *Upper Extremity Required* for *Eating Activities*. *Bulletin of Health Sciences Kobe 19*:13–31.
- Nakatake J, Miyazaki S, Arakawa H, Chosa E. 2024. Normal feeding movements expressed
 by dimensionality reduction of whole-body joint motions using principal component

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

analysis. *medRxiv* (accessed on November 30, 2024). DOI:

- 361 10.1101/2024.09.14.24313686.
- Nakatake J, Totoribe K, Arakawa H, Chosa E. 2021. Exploring whole-body kinematics when
 eating real foods with the dominant hand in healthy adults. *PLOS ONE* 16:e0259184.
- 364 DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0259184.
- Nelson EL, Berthier NE, Konidaris GD. 2018. Handedness and Reach-to-Place Kinematics in
 Adults: Left-Handers Are Not Reversed Right-Handers. *Journal of Motor Behavior*50:381–391. DOI: 10.1080/00222895.2017.1363698.
- Olczak A, Truszczyńska-Baszak A, Mróz J. 2022. Change in the results of motor coordination
 and handgrip strength depending on age and body position-An observational study of
 stroke patients and healthy volunteers. *International Journal of Environmental*
- 371 *Research & Public Health* 19:4703. DOI: 10.3390/ijerph19084703.
- Philipps J, Reinhart C, Rohde A, Virgil K, Moser C. 2012. Feeding and swallowing. *Journal*of Occupational Therapy, Schools, & Early Intervention 5:90–104. DOI:
 10.1080/19411243.2012.701524.

Scott B, Seyres M, Philp F, Chadwick EK, Blana D. 2022. Healthcare applications of single
camera markerless motion capture: A scoping review. *PeerJ* 10:e13517. DOI:
10.7717/peerj.13517.

378 Shah S, Vanclay F, Cooper B. 1989. Improving the sensitivity of the Barthel index for stroke

379 rehabilitation. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 42:703–709. DOI:

<u>10.1016/0895-4356(89)90065-6</u>.

Treger I, Aidinof L, Lehrer H, Kalichman L. 2012. Modified constraint-induced movement
therapy improved upper limb function in subacute poststroke patients: A small-scale
clinical trial. *Topics in Stroke Rehabilitation* 19:287–293. DOI: 10.1310/tsr1904-287.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Tricon V, Le Pellec-Muller A, Martin N, Mesure S, Azulay J-P, Vernazza-Martin S. 2007.

385	Balance control and adaptation of kinematic synergy in aging adults during forward
386	trunk bending. Neuroscience Letters 415:81–86. DOI: 10.1016/j.neulet.2006.12.046.
387	Uniform data system for medical rehabilitation. 1990. Guide for Use of the Uniform Data Set
388	for Medical Rehabilitation. Data Management, S., & Center for Functional Assessment,
389	R. State University of New York at Buffalo.
390	van Andel CJ, Wolterbeek N, Doorenbosch CAM, Veeger DHEJ, Harlaar J. 2008. Complete
391	3D kinematics of upper extremity functional tasks. Gait & Posture 27:120–127. DOI:
392	<u>10.1016/j.gaitpost.2007.03.002</u> .
393	van der Kamp J, Steenbergen B. 1999. The kinematics of eating with a spoon: Bringing the
394	food to the mouth, or the mouth to the food? Experimental Brain Research 129:68–76.
395	DOI: 10.1007/s002210050937.
396	von Elm E, Altman DG, Eggar M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. 2007.
397	STROBE initiative. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in
398	Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: Guidelines for observational studies. Lancet
399	370:1453–1457. DOI: 10.1016/s0140-6736(07)61602-X.
400	Westergren A, Lindholm C, Mattsson A, Ulander K. 2009. Minimal eating observation form:
401	Reliability and validity. Journal of Nutrition, Health & Aging 13:6–12. DOI:
402	10.1007/s12603-009-0002-4.

403

384



Performance time (s)







PC 3



1.0



PC 5







Reaching phase



Spooning phase



Transport phase



Mouth phase



It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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

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

Fig 2. Parameter loadings of PCs.

Vertical axis indicates parameters, and horizontal axis indicates loadings. PC, principal component.

Fig 3. Comparison of PC scores between feeding phases.

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

Fig 4. Image of PCs embedded in feeding phases.

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

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

fixation during all feeding phases.

PC, principal component.

Table S1. Performance time analyzed using principal component analysis.

Table S2. PC score for each feeding phase.

Values are presented as median (interquartile range). PC, principal component.

Table S3. Post-hoc comparison of PC scores between feeding phases.

The comparison was performed using Wilcoxon signed-rank test with Bonferroni correction (p < 0.008). PC, principal component.