From Exercise to Strain: Rapid and Accurate Prediction of Femoral Neck Loading

- Zainab Altai^{a,b*}, Andrew T.M. Phillips^c, Jason Moran^a, Xiaojun Zhai^d, Qichang Mei^{e,f,g}, Bernard
 X.W. Liew^a
- ³ ^a School of Sport, Rehabilitation and Exercise Sciences, University of Essex, Colchester, United
- 4 Kingdom
- ⁵ ^b Institute of Public Health and Wellbeing, University of Essex, Colchester, United Kingdom
- ^c Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Imperial College London, London, United
 Kingdom
- ^d School of Computer Science and Electronic Engineering, University of Essex, United Kingdom
- 9 ^e Faculty of Sports Science, Ningbo University, Ningbo, China.
- ¹⁰ ^fResearch Academy of Grand Health, Ningbo University, Ningbo, China.
- ^g Auckland Bioengineering Institute, The University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.
- 12

13 * Correspondence:

- 14 Zainab Altai
- 15 School of Sport, Rehabilitation and Exercise Sciences,
- 16 University of Essex,
- 17 Wivenhoe Park,
- 18 CO4 3SQ
- 19 Colchester, Essex, UK
- 20 +44 (0) 1206 876217
- 21 <u>za21920@essex.ac.uk;</u> zainabaltai0@gmail.com

22 Keywords: Femoral neck strains, ballistic exercises, finite element modelling, musculoskeletal

23 modelling, neural network, Inertial measurement units

24 Abstract

25 Femoral neck fractures pose significant morbidity and mortality risks, particularly among osteoporotic patients. This study aims to identify effective exercises for enhancing bone health and develop a neural 26 27 network model to predict femoral neck strains during exercise using inertial measurement unit (IMU) 28 data. We employed musculoskeletal modeling (MSK) and finite element (FE) analysis to assess 29 femoral neck strains during various ballistic exercises—walking, running, countermovement jumps, 30 squat jumps, unilateral hopping, and bilateral hopping—across three intensity levels: high, moderate, and low. Results showed that running at all intensities produced significantly higher strains compared 31 to walking $(1985 \pm 802 \ \mu\epsilon \ \text{tensile}, 5053 \pm 181 \ \mu\epsilon \ \text{compressive}, \ p < 0.001)$, with peak tensile strains 32 reaching 3731 µɛ and compressive strains up to 9541 µɛ. Low-intensity unilateral hopping also yielded 33 34 significantly higher strains (3003 $\mu\epsilon$, p < 0.001) than walking, suggesting its osteogenic potential. In contrast, squat jumps, countermovement jumps, and bilateral hopping generated lower peak strains. 35 The neural network model demonstrated high prediction accuracy, achieving correlations up to 0.97 36 37 and root mean square errors as low as 145.20 µε. These findings support the use of neural networks 38 and IMU sensors for practical, cost-effective interventions to improve bone health and reduce fracture 39 risk.

40 **1. Introduction**

Femoral neck fractures are the most common osteoporotic fractures, leading to high morbidity and mortality rates, with 50% of patients losing independent mobility and up to 30% mortality within six months^{1,2}. Additionally, the related costs place a significant strain on healthcare systems. The number of men and women at high risk of experiencing a major osteoporotic fracture is projected to increase from 157 million in 2010 to 319 million by 2040³. Therefore, reducing the risk of osteoporotic hip fractures is critical.

47 Exercise is a proven method to enhance bone health. However, the type, intensity, and frequency of 48 the exercise directly affect the extent of its benefits on bone health⁴. Ballistic exercises, such as hopping and jumping, are particularly promising for stimulating femoral neck adaptation^{5,6}. It has been reported 49 that normal walking⁷ is not associated with bone mineral density (BMD) changes in the femoral neck 50 whereas jogging combined with walking⁸, running, and jumping^{9,10} were the most effective in 51 52 improving BMD. On the other hand, while more frequent exercise is known to improve BMD, the 53 specific benefits of increasing exercise intensity for enhancing BMD remain unclear⁴. Recent research 54 has focused more on the effectiveness and safety of moderate- to high-intensity exercise compared to traditional low-intensity approaches, which prioritize safety^{11,12}. A comprehensive meta-analysis 55 56 examined the effects of different exercise intensities-low, moderate, and high-across various 57 regimens, including resistance training, impact training such as walking, jogging, and jumping, and 58 combined resistance and impact exercises on BMD at the lumber spine and femoral neck in 59 postmenopausal women. The analysis revealed that high-intensity exercise was significantly more effective in increasing lumbar spine BMD compared to moderate- and low-intensity exercises, with 60 mean differences of 0.031 g/cm², 0.012 g/cm², and 0.010 g/cm², respectively¹². However, at the femoral 61 62 neck, low- and moderate-intensity exercise were equally effective, showing a mean difference of 0.011 63 g/cm², while high-intensity exercise had no significant effect. In contrast, another study has showed 64 that 6 months of unilateral, high-impact exercise of multidirectional hops completed daily increased 65 the mean femoral neck BMD by 0.81% in postmenopausal women aged between 55 and 70 years¹³. Previous computational modeling studies have simulated the femoral neck response to various 66 exercises, represented by mechanical strains, enabling the ranking of exercises based on their 67 osteogenic potential¹⁴. The osteogenic response is triggered in areas where strain exceeds habitual 68 loading levels, typically associated with normal walking^{15,16}. A review by Martelli et al.¹⁴ reported that 69 70 fast walking, but not necessarily running, optimally loads the femoral neck, while high-intensity jumps 71 and hopping generate higher strains in the femoral neck than walking^{15,17}. However, a previous study by the same author found that vertical and squat jumps produced lower femoral neck strains than 72 73 walking, while one-leg long jumps resulted in higher strains¹⁶. These inconsistent findings highlight potential concerns regarding the impact of high-intensity exercises on joint health, raising safety 74 75 considerations. Therefore, a comprehensive understanding of the mechanical response of the femoral 76 neck to various ballistic exercises across different intensity levels is critical for designing effective

77 preventive interventions for bone health.

Currently, no clinical method exists to directly measure the in-vivo mechanical response of the femoral neck for a certain type of locomotion. In biomechanical research, the "gold standard" non-invasive approach for predicting femoral neck response (strains) is musculoskeletal modeling (MSK) combined with finite element analysis (FE)^{16–22}. The coupled MSK-FE model integrates two critical types of data: (1) three-dimensional (3D) bone architecture and density from medical imaging, such as computed tomography (CT) or magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), for the FE modeling component, and (2) muscle and joint contact forces, typically estimated through inverse dynamics and static optimization,

85 based on 3D motion capture data, for the MSK modeling component. The predictions from MSK-FE models have the potential to significantly enhance fracture risk assessments, guide more effective 86 treatment strategies, and improve rehabilitation protocols for clinicians, practitioners, and 87 physiotherapists^{23,24}. However, the MSK-FE method is resource-intensive, requiring specialized 88 equipment, expertise, and considerable time, make it unsuitable for routine clinical use. Therefore, 89 90 there is a critical need for a rapid, cost-effective, and user-friendly non-invasive method that can 91 accurately predict in-vivo femoral neck strains during various locomotion modes (e.g., ballistic 92 exercises).

Machine learning has become a leading technological trend in recent biomechanical research²⁵. The 93 94 extensive availability of large datasets from wearable sensors has driven significant advancements in 95 estimating variables that traditionally required costly lab setups, such as ground reaction forces and 96 other derived metrics. Machine learning has demonstrated its ability to accurately predict various 97 kinetic and kinematic variables merely from wearable sensor measurements (e.g., Inertial measurement units (IMU)²⁶, requiring less expert intervention and eliminating the need for expensive equipment. 98 Multiple machine learning studies have estimated ground reaction force (GRF)^{27,28}, joint moments^{29–} 99 ³⁴, and internal joint forces^{35,36} during various locomotion tasks, using measures such as accelerations 100 101 and gyroscopes that are (or can be) measured by IMU sensors. Wouda et al.²⁷ used an artificial neural network to estimate vertical GRF during running using accelerations and lower limb joint angles. The 102 103 network demonstrated a high correlation (>0.90) with the actual GRF time series. Guo et al.²⁸ used Nonlinear System Identification (NARMAX) model from directly measured acceleration data without 104 105 including joint kinematics to estimate vertical GRF during walking. Their model achieved a prediction 106 error as low as 3.8% when compared to GRF data obtained from pressure insoles. Stetter et al.³⁵ used a neural network with two hidden layers, similar to Wouda et al.²⁷, to estimate knee joint forces during 107 various exercises, including walking, running at different speeds, cutting maneuvers, one-leg jump, 108 109 and counter-movement jump, using data from two IMU sensors. The results showed a good agreement 110 between the estimated joint forces and those calculated through inverse dynamics for vertical and 111 anterior-posterior knee forces with correlation coefficients ranging from 0.60 to 0.94, and 0.64 to 0.90 respectively (Stetter et al., 2019). Matijevich et al.³⁶ estimated peak tibial force during running using 112 113 various machine learning techniques, including neural networks and LASSO (Least Absolute 114 Shrinkage and Selection Operator) regression. They converted lab-based data into signals that could 115 be feasibly measured with IMU sensors and a pressure-sensing insole, achieving an estimation 116 accuracy with a root mean-squared error (RMSE) of 0.25 ± 0.07 body weights and an absolute percent 117 error between lab-based measured forces and machine learning estimated forces of 2.6 %. A very recent study by Haribaba and Basu³⁷ evaluated various machine learning models, including neural networks, 118 119 in conjunction with FE data to accelerate the prediction of the mechanical response (represented by 120 strains) in the acetabulum of a healthy hip joint and periprosthetic bone in total hip joint replacement 121 during walking gait. The study utilized different input features, such as bone condition, body weight, 122 fin size, and loading conditions. A strong correlation was found between the predicted FE strains and 123 those estimated by the neural network, with a coefficient of determination of 0.87 and RMSE of 0.04. 124 These studies demonstrate the feasibility of neural networks to estimate the internal loadings of lower 125 limb joint structures. In a recent study, we presented eXplainable convolutional neural network (XCM) 126 to estimate lower limb joint moments, including hip joint, from data from four IMU sensors of various 127 locomotion tasks³¹. Excellent agreement was found between the XCM estimated and the MSK inverse 128 dynamics calculated hip joint moments with a correlation coefficient of 0.98.

129 This study has two primary aims. The first aim is to investigate the osteogenic response of the femoral 130 neck to various ballistic exercises, including walking, running, countermovement jumps, squat jumps,

131 unilateral hopping, and bilateral hopping, at three different intensity levels-low, moderate, and high-132 using MSK-FE modeling. We will rank the tested exercises based on the predicted peak first principal 133 strain (tensile strain) and third principal strain (compressive strain) at the femoral neck and analyze the statistical differences in the predicted strains compared to normal walking at a self-selected speed. 134 135 Exercises that produce significantly higher strains than walking are considered more effective for promoting bone health, assuming that osteogenic responses occur where exercise induced strain 136 surpasses that of regular walking^{14,15}. The second aim of the study is to develop a neural network using 137 XCM architecture model capable of estimating femoral neck strains during various ballistic exercises 138 using IMU sensors data represented by acceleration and gyroscope measurements. While previous 139 140 studies have estimated joint kinematics and kinetics during various locomotion modes, no research to 141 date has directly estimated the mechanical response of the bone in joints (bone strains) using a body-142 worn sensor setup. In previous studies, the number of IMU sensors and their measurement locations 143 are often determined heuristically, and the impact underlying the selection of these parameter values on prediction accuracy has not been discussed yet³⁸. Therefore, we further investigate the effect of 144 145 using a reduced number of IMU sensors on model prediction accuracy. That will be done based on data 146 from: (1) a comprehensive set of seven IMU sensors covering the entire lower body range of motion 147 (trunk, left and right thigh, shank and foot), and (2) a reduced IMU sensor configuration of three sensors 148 positioned around the region of interest only, the hip joint (trunk, and left and right thigh). The results 149 of this study could help overcome current limitations in predicting femoral neck strains, which typically rely on expensive data and specialized expertise, and open new possibilities for using these predictions 150 in clinical settings, potentially aiding in the design of effective preventive interventions, such as 151 152 exercise regimes targeting bone health enhancement.

153 **2. Material and methods**

154 2.1. Participants and data collection and processing

Motion capture and musculoskeletal data of the current study has been used from our previously 155 published study³⁹ (first article of this series). In summary, a cohort of forty (20 males and 20 females) 156 active participants were recruited with age range of 18 to 70 years old (mean ±SD: age of 40.3±13.1 157 158 years; height 1.71 ± 0.08 m; and mass 68.44 ± 11.67 kg). All participants were healthy with no lower 159 limb joint replacement or serious injury within the last year of the recruitment. Ethical approval was 160 obtained from the University of Essex Faculty of Science & Health Ethics Subcommittee (ETH2021-161 1155). A written consent form was obtained from all participants before participating. Each participant 162 attended one session in the biomechanics labs of the University of Essex, where three successful trials of walking, running, countermovement jump, squat jump, unilateral hopping, and bilateral hopping 163 164 were collected at three different self-reported intensity levels (maximum, medium or intermediate, and 165 minimum). Details of the characteristics of each exercise can be found in the supplementary materials 166 (Table 2.SM.).

167 Figure 1 shows the overall workflow of the current study. For each participant, thirty-eight retro-168 reflective markers were attached to the lower body (twenty-two individual markers were attached to 169 the left and right superior iliac spines, anterior superior iliac spines and posterior superior iliac spines, 170 medial and lateral femoral condyles, medial and lateral malleoli, lateral and posterior aspects of the 171 calcaneus, the first and fifth metatarsals while tracking clusters consisting of four markers were 172 attached to the distal lateral aspect of the thigh and the shank). Marker trajectories were recorded using 173 fourteen 3D motion capture cameras (Vicon. Ltd., Oxford, UK, 200 Hz, filtered at 18 Hz with a zero-174 lag second order low pass Butterworth). Ground reaction forces were collected using two-floor force 175 plates (Kistler, Winterthur, Switzerland, 2000 Hz, filtered at 50 Hz with a zero-lag 2nd order low pass

176 Butterworth) positioned side by side. To verify the musculoskeletal model's muscle force predictions,

177 five electromyography (EMG) sensors (Norixon, AZ., USA, 2000 Hz, high-pass filtered 30 Hz, 4th

178 order Butterworth, rectified and low-pass filtered at 10 Hz) were attached unilaterally to the dominant

179 side of each participant targeting five different muscles: gluteus maximus, gluteus medius, rectus

180 femoris, biceps femoris, and soleus following SENIAM guidance. Details of the data can be found in

181 Altai et al.³⁹

Seven Blue Trident IMU sensors (Vicon Motion Systems Ltd, Oxford, UK, 225Hz, filtered at 200 Hz
with 2nd order low-pass Butterworth) were placed on the lower body segments of the left and right

184 sides: posterior trunk, lateral shank, lateral thigh, and foot as shown in Figure 1 (A1). For each IMU

185 sensor, accelerations and gyroscope data were recorded in the three planes of motion; sagittal, coronal

- 186 (frontal), and transverse planes (represented by three axes x, y, and z), which were then used as the
- 187 predictors for the neural network models.



188

Figure 1. Framework followed in this study to predict the femoral neck strains using 1) typical 189 190 musculoskeletal - finite element modelling pipeline (represented by A1, B1, and C1) and 2) the 191 proposed neural network model (represented by A2 and B2). The typical modelling pipeline starts by 192 collecting anatomical landmarks trajectories, ground reaction forces and electromyography signals in 193 a 3D motion capture laboratory setting (A1), then musculoskeletal model is built using the collected 194 data and generic model in OpenSim to estimated muscle and joint reaction forces using inverse 195 dynamic and static optimization methods (B1), finally, finite element model is generated from three dimensional geometry of the femur and muscle and joint forces estimated by the musculoskeletal model 196 197 to predict the femoral neck stains (first and third principal strains). The proposed pipeline predicts first 198 and third principal stains merely from inertial measurement unit data (represented by accelerations and 199 gyroscopes of the lower body segments) (A2) using neural network model (B2).

All trials were processed in Vicon Nexus (V 2.12.1) and then the time of interest of each trail was segmented using Visual 3D (C-motion Inc., Germantown, MD, USA) as follows: walking and running from heal strike to toe-off of the same foot – a step, countermovement jump from the initial stand just

before the take-off to the lowest position of the pelvis after landing, squat jump from the lowest position of the pelvis just before the take-off to the lowest position of the pelvis after landing, and for bilateral and unilateral hopping from the foot on to foot off the force plate of the same leg). The time of interest for all trials was defined using the dominant side of the participant. Data from all trials were then time normalized to 101 time points for musculoskeletal modelling.

208 2.2. Musculoskeletal models

A generic musculoskeletal model (gait2392)⁴⁰ was modified by removing the torso and associated 209 muscles (Figure 1 (B1)). Details of the musculoskeletal models can be found in Altai et al.³⁹. In 210 211 summary, the modified lower extremity model consisted of 13 body segments, 18 degrees of freedom 212 (DOF), and 86 Hill-type musculotendon actuators. The hip was modelled as a ball and socket joint (3 213 DOF), while the knee was modeled as a sliding hinge joint (1 DOF rotational joint with translation 214 coupled to the knee flexion angle), and the ankle and subtalar as revolute joints (1 DOF). Using 215 OpenSim⁴¹, each model was scaled to match the subject's anthropometric characteristics based on 216 marker data of anatomical landmarks at the hip, knee and ankle during a static trial. Joint angles and 217 moments were estimated using inverse kinematics and inverse dynamics, respectively, while static 218 optimization was used to estimate muscle forces by minimizing the sum of squared muscle activations. 219 Muscle attachment locations were extracted using a custom MATLAB (R2022b) script while force directions were determined using the muscle force direction plugin in OpenSim⁴². Muscle force 220 221 directions together with muscle forces from static optimization were used to calculate muscle force components in x, y, and z. Hip, knee and ankle contact forces were calculated using joint reaction 222 223 analysis⁴³. The estimated muscle forces were then applied to the finite element models using the 224 extracted muscle attachment location.

225 2.3. Finite element models

226 Since personalized medical images were not available, the three-dimensional geometry of the full 227 femur for each participant was generated using the open-source Musculoskeletal Atlas Project (MAP) Client software⁴⁴, which contains data from the Victorian Institute of Forensic Medicine (Melbourne, 228 229 VIC, Australia). Using a generic lower-body shape model from the database, the full femur position and general size (surface mesh) were reconstructed from the anatomical landmarks of the participant's 230 motion capture data following the method described in Zhang et al.⁴⁴. First, a generic whole lower body 231 shape model was registered to the marker set defined in the static trial. Then, the atlas femur mesh was 232 233 morphed into the femoral landmarks according to a femur statistical shape model⁴⁵. The generated 234 surface meshes of all participants were then imported into ANSYS (SpaceClaim 2023R1, PA, USA) 235 to generate three-dimensional solid geometries, which were then meshed using 10-nodes tetrahedral 236 elements in ANSYS (ICEM CFD 2023R1, PA, USA) with an average element size of 3mm^{20,21}. 237 Homogeneous linear elastic isotropic material properties were defined for the bone with an elastic modulus of 18.6 MPa and a 0.3 Poisson's ratio⁴⁶. Figure 1 (C1) summarize the steps for generating the 238 239 finite element model.

Muscle forces were estimated by the musculoskeletal models and applied to the finite element model as point loads at the external surface of the femur. A list of included muscles can be found in Table 3.SM. in the supplementary materials. The location of the attachment points of each muscle was estimated by the musculoskeletal model and used to allocate the point of application of the force in the finite element model. Forces were then applied at the closest surface mesh node to the point of application estimated by the musculoskeletal model^{20,21}. The distance between the point of application of the forces estimated by the musculoskeletal model and the closest nodes in the finite element model

247 was less than the element size (3mm), except for three femurs, those were therefore excluded from the 248 analysis leaving a cohort of 37 participants. The finite element models were kinematically constrained 249 at the distal end of the femur to prevent rigid body motion ensuring that the equilibrium of the forces estimated by the musculoskeletal model was not disturbed. The most distal node of the medial condyle 250 was fixed in all directions, while the displacement of the most distal node at the lateral condyle was 251 252 constrained in the anterior-posterior and vertical (superior-inferior) directions. A third node in the patella groove was constrained anteroposteriorly^{20,47}. These constraints were chosen to replicate the 253 254 basic movements involved in the tested exercises, which are flexion-extension and rotation at the hip

and knee joints; and abduction-adduction predominantly at the hip joint⁴⁸.

256 Due to the high computational cost of the finite element models, only ten of the 101 timesteps were 257 simulated for each trial. These time steps were carefully selected to include the peak point of the hip joint contact force curve as well as the first and last timesteps, ensuring full coverage of the trial period. 258 259 At each of the ten timesteps, the peak first and third principal strains at the femoral neck were averaged 260 across the surface nodes using a circle of 3mm radius, to follow the continuum hypothesis avoiding local effects of the load⁴⁹. The location of the peak strains within the femoral neck region was also 261 262 analyzed. All finite element simulations were performed in a local workstation using ANSYS 263 Mechanical (APDL 2023R1, PA, USA). The computing time was on average one minute per timestep. 264 The peak predicted strains at each of the ten times steps were then used as the outcomes in the neural 265 network models.

266 2.4. Neural network models

267 First and third principal strains data predicted by the finite element models were used as the outcome dataset (2 variables represented by first and third principal strains) for the neural network model, while 268 269 data of IMU sensors were the predictors (42 variables represented by accelerations and gyroscope of 270 seven IMU sensors in three directions x, y, and z). Since neural networks are data hungry and to match 271 time-series data of the predictors (101 timesteps), both first and third principal strains data were 272 interpolated to regenerate 101 timesteps for each trial. Trials data of all exercises of all participants 273 were combined for both the predictor and outcome datasets. The total number of observations in the 274 dataset was 1729 corresponding to 1729 trials. The predictor dataset was organized into a 3D array 275 shape 1729×42×101, where the second dimension was the number of predictors (accelerations and 276 gyroscopes), and the third dimension was the number of time points. The outcome dataset was 277 organized into a 2D array shape 1729×2×101, where the second dimension was the number of 278 outcomes (first and third principal strains), and the third dimension was the number of time points. 279 Each dataset was then split into training (75%, n = 1296) and testing (25%, n = 433) ensuring that the 280 training and testing datasets were split with the same percentage for each exercise.

To assess the ability of the neural network to predict femoral neck strains for all tested exercises using a reduced number of IMU sensors, a subset of the predictor dataset was generated. This included data of three sensors (right thigh, left thigh, and trunk). The predictor subset data was also organized into a 3D array shape $1729 \times 18 \times 101$ (18 variables represented by accelerations and gyroscope of three IMU sensors in three directions x, y, and z) while the outcome dataset was kept the same with 2D array shape $1729 \times 2 \times 101$ (2 variables represented by first and third principal strains).

287 The neural network architecture was inspired by our previous work³¹ using eXplainable convolutional 288 neural network XCM⁵⁰. This neural network architecture has been shown to better predict 289 biomechanical data from IMU sensors compared to other neural network architectures³¹. Figure 1 (2B) 290 shows the XCM neural network model, the upper part of the XCM uses 2D convolution filters to extract

291 features per observed variable and is composed of a 2D convolutional block, batch normalization, and 292 ReLU activation layers. The lower part uses 1D convolution filters to extract information relative to time and captures the interaction between different time series. The output feature maps from these 293 294 two parts are concatenated to form a feature map, which is passed through a 1D convolution block and 295 global average pooling before performing classification with a softmax layer. The cyclical learning 296 rate method was used to find the appropriate learning rate. The loss was plotted with respect to an 297 increasing value of the learning rate. The learning rate was chosen to be in the interval that resulted in 298 the lowest loss, which was found to be between 1e-1 and 2e-1. The learning rate took the value of 1e-299 1 at the first epoch and then gradually increased to reach a final value of 2e-1 at the last epoch (500 300 epoch). Analyses were performed in Python (version 3.9.0), with packages (Numpy v1.20.3, Pandas 301 v1.3.4, Scipy v1.7.1) and models were trained using Tsai (version 0.3.1) from fastai with Google 302 Collab.

303 *2.5. Analysis*

304 For the finite element predictions, initially, the curve of the peak femoral neck first and third principal 305 strains in macrostrains along each trial period were found. Curves were then averaged across repetitive 306 trials. The peak value of these averaged trials was then determined. The mean and standard deviation 307 of the peak values for each exercise were then calculated and reported across all subjects. A repeated 308 measure 2-way ANOVA was performed on the peaks of the first and third principal strains of all 309 subjects to test the significant difference of femoral neck strains under various exercises compared to 310 walking using the General Linear Model in SPSS (Chicago, USA). The dependent variable was the 311 first and third principal strains, whilst the independent variables were the various exercise types and 312 intensities. Where significance was found (significance level $\alpha = 0.05$), Bonferroni post hoc test was 313 conducted to quantify pairwise differences.

314 For the neural network predictions, for each exercise (including the three different levels), the 315 agreement between the first and third principal strains estimated by the finite element models against 316 their predicted values by the neural network model was derived from Pearson's correlation coefficients 317 $(r)^{51}$, which were categorized as weak (r ≤ 0.35), moderate (0.35 $\le r \le 0.67$), strong (0.67 $\le r \le 0.90$) 318 and excellent (r > 0.90). Additionally, the Root Mean Squared Error (RMSE) (Equ.1 SM. In 319 supplementary materials), relative RMSE (relRMSE) (Equ.2 SM. In supplementary materials) 320 expressed as a percentage (%) of the average peak-to-peak amplitude for the outcomes⁵² were 321 determined to assess the accuracy of the neural network model predictions. RMSE, relRMSE, and r 322 were assessed for each trial of each exercise and each participant, then means and standard deviations 323 were then found for each exercise across all participants. The same analysis was conducted for: 1) the 324 full set of seven IMU sensors and 2) the subset of three IMU sensors. Then relative difference between 325 the two were evaluated to analysis the performance of the neural network with only three sensors 326 compared to seven sensors.

327 **3. Results**

328 *3.1. Strains predicted by finite element model*

Exercises with various intensity levels were ranked with respect to the averaged peak first principal strain and averaged peak third principal strain (in macrostrains ($\times 10^6$)) of the femoral neck predicted by MSK-FE as shown in Figure 2. Exercises with a significant difference (p < 0.05) compared to habitual walking at self-selected speed were marked with an asterisk. The estimates of the lower and upper limits and p-values as well as the results from a repeated measure 2-way ANOVA for General

334 Linear Model were reported in supplemental material (Table 1.SM.). The mean and standard deviation

of the average peak values for the first and third principal strains over the entire trial period for each

exercise type and intensity level are reported in Table 1.



337

Figure 2. Box plot of large significant difference of peak first principal strain (left) and peak third principal strain (right) of the femoral neck under different levels of various ballistic exercises compared to walking at a self-selected speed indicated by the horizontal line. Asterisks denote the exercises with significant difference (*p < 0.05) compared to walking. Peak strains are ranked from left to right for the first principal strains and right to left for the third principal strains for the highest to the lowest estimated values for all included exercises.

- Table 1. Mean and standard deviation of the average peaks (throughout the entire trial period) of the
- 345 vertical ground reaction force (vGRF) and hip joint reaction force (JCFhip), both normalized by the
- body weight, and of the peak first (e1) and third (e3) principal strains at the femoral neck predicted by

Exercise	vGRF	JCFhip	e1 (µɛ)	e3 (µɛ)	
Walking	1.28±0.09	6.31±1.23	1985 ± 802	5053 ± 181	
Running Fast	2.51±0.26	8.21±1.32	3731 ± 1472	9541 ± 3610	
Running Moderate	2.62±0.27	9.47±2.17	3534 ± 1197	9127 ± 2972	
Running Natural (slow)	2.62±0.30	11.56±4.1	3389 ± 1321	8613 ± 2975	
Counter Movement Jumps Max	1.05±0.15	4.06±1.33	1693 ± 1072	4190 ± 2470	
Counter Movement Jumps Med	1.08 ± 0.14	4.47±1.45	1392 ± 769	3377 ± 1742	
Counter Movement Jumps Min	1.03±0.11	5.83±2.21	1164 ± 935	2715 ± 1148	
Squat Jumps Max	1.22±0.18	4.18±1.52	1664 ± 935	3977 ± 2071	
Squat Jumps Med	1.18±0.13	4.59±1.44	1302 ± 825	3003 ± 1310	
Squat Jumps Min	1.19±0.14	5.63±2.38	1132 ± 744	2476 ± 1092	
Unilateral Hopping Max	2.36±0.27	7.65±1.43	2439 ± 1061	6342 ± 2473	
Unilateral Hopping Med	2.59±0.25	7.56±1.46	2729 ± 1112	7076 ± 2858	
Unilateral Hopping Min	2.59±0.22	6.98±1.14	3003 ± 1189	7755 ± 3040	
Bilateral Hopping Max	1.63±0.29	3.50±0.74	723 ± 407	1878 ± 926	
Bilateral Hopping Med	1.76±0.24	3.18±0.57	795 ± 377	2050 ± 826	
Bilateral Hopping Min	1.73±0.22	2.93±0.76	935 ± 459	2344 ± 1090	

347 the MSK-FE models for various exercise types and levels.

348 Not all exercises demonstrated statistically significant differences in predicted peak strains compared

to walking. Only running at all three intensity levels—fast speed 5.26 m/sec $(3731 \pm 1472 \,\mu\epsilon \text{ and } 9541 \,\mu\epsilon)$

 $\pm 3610 \ \mu\epsilon$ for first and third principal strains, respectively), moderate speed 4.25 m/sec (3534 ± 1197

351 $\mu\epsilon$ and 9127 ± 2972 $\mu\epsilon$), and natural speed 2.98 m/sec (3389 ± 1321 $\mu\epsilon$ and 8613 ± 2975 $\mu\epsilon$)—and 352 unilateral hopping at low intensity with a 0.31 sec stance duration (3003 \pm 1189 µE) produced 353 significantly higher peak strains (P < 0.001) than walking at a self-selected speed of 1.59 m/sec (1985) \pm 802 us and 5053 \pm 181 us for first and third principal strains, respectively). This indicates that, 354 among the exercises tested, running at any intensity and low-intensity unilateral hopping have the 355 356 potential to stimulate an osteogenic response in the femoral neck. In contrast, bilateral hopping at all 357 intensity levels—maximum with stance duration of 0.19 sec ($723 \pm 407 \ \mu\epsilon$ and $1878 \pm 926 \ \mu\epsilon$), medium with stance duration of 0.21 sec ($795 \pm 377 \ \mu\epsilon$ and $2050 \pm 826 \ \mu\epsilon$), and minimum with stance duration 358 359 of 0.25 sec (935 \pm 459 µ ϵ and 2344 \pm 1090 µ ϵ)—generated significantly lower peak strains than 360 walking (P < 0.001). Similarly, the low-intensity squat jump with a 0.21 m jump height (1132 \pm 744 $\mu\epsilon$ and 2476 \pm 1092 $\mu\epsilon$) and countermovement jump with a 0.23 m jump height (1164 \pm 935 $\mu\epsilon$ and 361 362 $2715 \pm 1148 \ \mu\epsilon$) showed lower peak strains, with P-values of < 0.016 and < 0.028, respectively, for the first principal strain, and P < 0.001 for the third principal strain. While no significant differences 363 were observed between walking and the squat jump at moderate and high intensities (0.28 m and 0.33 364 m jump heights, respectively) or the countermovement jump at moderate and high intensities (0.26 m 365 and 0.32 m jump heights, respectively) (Table 1.SM). These findings suggest that neither of the two 366 367 tested jump types nor bilateral hopping, at any intensity level, have the potential to induce an osteogenic 368 response in the femoral neck.

The distribution of the first and third principal strains across the femoral head region under all tested exercises is shown in Figure 3 for a presentative case. Under walking and running, peak strains were located at the superior aspect of the femoral neck, noting that the second peak strains region where at the inferior aspect region. For both types of jumping and hopping exercises, peak strain locations shifted toward the inferior aspect of the femoral neck. Changing exercise intensity did not show any

are effect on the peak strain location at the femoral neck region.



375

Figure 3. Distribution of the first and third principal strains predicted by MSK-FE model at the femoral
 neck under various ballistic exercises of a representative case.

378 *3.2. Strains predicted by neural network model*

Figure 4 illustrates the mean curves for the first and third principal strains, as estimated by the neural network model for all exercises, using a comprehensive set of seven IMU sensors, while Figure 5 shows the predicted strains using a reduced set of three IMU sensors. These are compared with predictions from the MSK-FE model. An overview of the neural network model's estimated accuracy across all exercises is provided in Table 2. The relative differences in neural network model accuracy of the reduced set of IMU compared to the comprehensive set, are also reported for all exercises.



386 Figure 4. Mean first and third principal strains curves predicted by the XCM neural network compared to the original curves estimated by

- 387 the finite element models for the different tested exercises using seven IMU sensors (trunk, right thigh, left thigh, right shank, left shank,
- 388 right foot, and left foot).

385



389

Figure 5. Mean first and third principal strains curves predicted by the XCM neural network compared to the original curves estimated by the finite element models for the different tested exercises using three IMU sensors (trunk, right thigh, and left thigh).

392

393	Table 2. Performan	ce of XCM neura	l network in	predicting	first and thir	d principal	strains us	sing two
								<u> </u>

datasets: 1) data of seven IMU sensors, and 2) data of three IMU sensors, relative differences between

the two also reported.

Task	e1 (µɛ)			e3(µɛ)			
1886	RMSE	relRMSE (%)	r	RMSE	relRMSE (%)	r	
1) Using seven IMU sensors							
Walking	182.85 ± 104.81	8.96 ± 3.80	0.96 ± 0.04	381.37 ± 119.22	8.01 ± 2.25	0.97 ± 0.02	
Running	550.70 ± 412.97	17.86 ± 12.13	0.83 ± 0.27	1278.70 ± 797.85	16.51 ± 11.07	0.84 ± 0.26	
Unilateral Hopping	309.18 ± 164.55	14.02 ± 9.74	0.95 ± 0.13	841.99 ± 578.01	14.22 ± 11.05	0.95 ± 0.08	
Bilateral Hopping	169.15 ± 96.73	24.26 ± 15.06	0.81 ± 0.25	452.68 ± 255.16	25.36 ± 15.02	0.83 ± 0.20	
Counter Jumps	145.20 ± 75.02	14.96 ± 11.34	0.93 ± 0.11	400.26 ± 233.87	16.37 ± 12.41	0.88 ± 0.22	
Squat Jumps	238.84 ± 300.41	23.52 ± 16.64	0.80 ± 0.21	522.66 ± 719.28	22.64 ± 15.64	0.78 ± 0.26	
Mean	278.70 ± 281.05	18.21 ± 13.58	0.87 ± 0.21	683.61 ± 641.99	18.22 ± 13.55	0.86 ± 0.22	
2) Using three IMU sensors							
Walking	220.48 ± 124.98	10.73 ±4.11	0.95 ± 0.04	446.26 ± 110.66	9.78 ± 4.01	0.94 ± 0.07	
Running	531.22 ± 363.79	17.08 ± 11.27	0.85 ± 0.22	1532.62 ± 1026.49	19.49 ± 12.18	0.81 ± 0.25	
Unilateral Hopping	333.26 ± 240.89	14.05 ± 9.87	0.95 ± 0.10	898.75 ± 453.46	14.99 ± 7.88	0.93 ± 0.13	
Bilateral Hopping	191.70 ± 120.74	25.94 ± 13.76	0.81 ± 0.21	507.65 ± 295.52	28.55 ± 15.81	0.78 ± 0.26	
Counter Jumps	156.78 ± 94.28	15.47 ± 11.39	0.92 ± 0.17	437.26 ± 224.95	18.80 ± 14.24	0.87 ± 0.19	
Squat Jumps	248.91 ± 298.53	23.43 ± 13.30	0.79 ± 0.18	623.66 ± 749.58	27.25 ± 18.78	0.72 ± 0.28	
Mean	289.85 ± 274.46	18.55 ± 12.98	0.87 ± 0.19	783.52 ± 728.63	20.95 ± 14.91	0.83 ± 0.23	
Relative difference (%)							
Walking	20.58	19.67	0.32	17.02	22.13	2.28	
Running	3.54	4.33	2.37	19.86	18.05	4.13	
Unilateral Hopping	7.79	0.17	0.38	6.74	5.47	2.64	
Bilateral Hopping	13.33	6.92	0.56	12.14	12.56	5.26	
Counter Jumps	7.97	3.44	0.92	9.24	14.86	1.98	
Squat Jumps	4.22	0.40	1.31	19.32	20.37	7.89	
Mean	4.00	1.87	0.01	14.62	15.03	4.11	

Data is presented as mean \pm standard deviations. $\mu\epsilon$ is macrostrains. Relative difference is the percentage of the relative differences of the neural network predictions using data of the three IMU sensors in respect to using data of seven IMU sensors

396 The predicted strain curves by the neural network revealed strong to excellent correlations for both 397 the first and third principal strains when using data from a comprehensive set of seven IMU sensors and when using data from a reduced set of three IMU sensors (Table 2). When using data from seven 398 399 IMU sensors, the highest correlation for the first and third principal strain was observed for walking (r $= 0.96 \pm 0.04$ and $r = 0.97 \pm 0.04$, respectively) and for unilateral hopping (r = 0.95 \pm 0.13 and r = 0.95) 400 401 \pm 0.08, respectively) with excellent correlations. The lowest correlation was for the squat jump, but 402 still with good correlation for both first and third principal strains (r = 0.80 ± 0.21 and r = 0.78 ± 0.26 , 403 respectively). Across all exercises, the RMSE for first principal strains ranged between 145.20 ± 75.02 404 $\mu\epsilon$ (counter movement jump) and 550.70 ± 412.97 $\mu\epsilon$ (running), whereas for third principal strains, that was between $400.26 \pm 233.87 \ \mu\epsilon$ (counter movement jump) and $1278.70 \pm 797.85 \ \mu\epsilon$ (running). 405 The relRMSE ranged between $8.96 \pm 3.80\%$ (walking) and $24.26 \pm 15.06\%$ (bilateral hopping) for the 406

407 first principal strain and between $8.01 \pm 2.25\%$ (walking) and $25.36 \pm 15.02\%$ (bilateral hopping) for 408 the third principal strain.

409 Similar trends were observed when using data of a reduced set of three IMU sensors with very small

410 reduction in the neural network estimated accuracy in respect to using data of a comprehensive set of

411 seven IMU sensors. The relative difference for the RMSE ranged from 4% (running and squat jumps)

- 412 to 21% (walking) for the first principal strains and from 7% (unilateral hopping) to 20% (running) for
- 413 the first principal strains. Details of the relative differences of all exercises can be found in Table 2.

414 **4. Discussion**

415 This study had two primary aims: first, to investigate the osteogenic response of the femoral neck to 416 various ballistic exercises and intensity levels by predicting strains using the gold-standard MSK-FE 417 modeling approach; and second, to investigate the ability of a neural network model to estimate the 418 predicted strains only from body-worn IMU sensors, thereby bypassing the expensive and time-419 consuming MSK-FE modeling approach traditionally used in biomechanical research. Our results 420 demonstrated that running at any speed (from slow jogging to fast sprinting), and unilateral hopping 421 with longer stance durations, have the potential to stimulate an osteogenic response in the femoral neck. 422 In contrast, jumping on both legs, regardless of intensity level, did not show such potential. While the 423 neural network demonstrated excellent accuracy in predicting MSK-FE-derived strains based solely 424 from IMU sensors data, highlighting its promising potential for clinical integration. By using femoral 425 neck strains as an indicator of femoral neck health, this method could enhance fracture risk assessment 426 and inform more targeted interventions, offering a practical and efficient alternative for routine clinical 427 use.

428 Our MSK-FE predictions showed that not all ballistic exercises tested in this study induced 429 significantly higher femoral neck strains compared to walking. Among the various exercises and 430 intensity levels, fast running (5.26 m/sec), moderate running (4.25 m/sec), slow running (2.98 m/sec), 431 and unilateral hopping with the longest stance duration (0.25 sec, categorized as a low intensity level) 432 generated statistically higher femoral neck strains than walking at 1.59 m/sec (P < 0.001), indicating a 433 potential osteogenic effect of the femoral neck. However, bilateral hopping at faster speeds, 434 characterized by shorter stance durations (0.28 sec for moderate intensity and 0.31 sec for high intensity), did not show statistically significant differences compared to walking, yet still produced 435 higher strain values. The reduced strain in faster hopping was associated with lower ground reaction 436 forces and joint contact forces (Table 1) compared to slower hopping which may explain the reduction 437 in the strain values. Our findings align with previous studies^{15–17}. Similar trends were observed by 438 Pellikaan et al.¹⁵ with peak femoral neck strains during unilateral hopping and various running speeds 439 440 (1.95 m/sec to 2.5 m/sec) exceeding those during walking at 1.11 m/sec. However, they reported 441 noticeably higher strain values during running (tensile strain 5412 µɛ at 2.5 m/sec) compared to our 442 prediction (tensile strain 3389 µɛ at 2.98 m/sec), and during hopping (tensile strain 10373 µɛ vs. our 443 prediction of 3003 $\mu\epsilon$). These discrepancies can be attributed to several factors, including modelling 444 methodology and differences in participant demographics, which very likely played a role. Pellikaan et al.'s study¹⁵ involved postmenopausal women with an average age of 63, whereas our cohort 445 consisted of highly active, younger males and females, with an average age of 40 ranging from 18 446 years to 70 years old. Anderson and Madigan⁵³ showed that younger participants (aged 25 ± 4 years) 447 exhibited 9% higher ground reaction forces and 18% higher hip contact forces, and 59% larger peak 448 449 strains in early stance phase compared to older participants (aged 79 \pm 5 years) walking at the same 450 speed. In contrast to running and unilateral hopping, other exercises (countermovement jumps, squat 451 jumps, and bilateral hopping) generated lower peak strains compared to walking. Bilateral hopping at

452 all intensities, as well as both jump types at their minimum intensity levels, produced significantly 453 lower strains than walking (P < 0.001), indicating that these exercises are not recommended for 454 promoting an osteogenic effect in the femoral neck. Even at maximum intensity, jumping exercises 455 still produced lower strains than walking with no statistical differences compared to walking. Our 456 findings align with those of Martelli et al. ¹⁶, who also reported lower tensile strain peaks for vertical 457 jumps (\approx 2500 µ ϵ in their study, compared to our range of 1164 µ ϵ to 1693 µ ϵ) and squat jumps (\approx 1800 458 µ ϵ in their study, compared to 1132 µ ϵ to 1664 µ ϵ in ours) when compared to walking (\approx 2700 µ ϵ).

459 Kersh et al.¹⁷ also reported lower strain overall the femoral neck region than walking during landing

460 on both feet from a light jump in place.

The higher strains observed during running, unilateral hopping, and walking, compared to 461 462 countermovement, squat jumps, and bilateral hopping can be attributed to the nature of the exercises. When landing on both feet, impact forces are distributed across both legs, on the other hand, walking, 463 464 running, and unilateral hopping involve periods where ground reaction forces act on a single limb. 465 Consequently, our findings suggest that exercises involving bilateral jumps may be less effective in 466 promoting femoral neck health compared to exercises involving unilateral jumps like running and unilateral hopping. This finding is also supported by several previous clinical trial studies, which 467 indicated that fast walking programs^{54,55} and hopping exercises^{56,57} can lead to an increase in femoral 468 neck BMD in elderly populations. 469

470 We observed that activities generating relatively similar ground reaction forces can produce relatively 471 different levels and distributions of strain in the femoral neck. For instance, high-intensity unilateral 472 hopping resulted in 34% higher peak strain compared to walking, and slow speed running (low 473 intensity) produced 41% more strain than walking, despite both activities having roughly equivalent 474 peak vertical ground reaction forces (Table 1). Forward propelling activities such as walking and 475 running exerted maximal load on the superior region of the femoral neck, the thinnest part of the cortex, 476 while, jumping in place shifted the peak strain towards the inferior aspect of the femoral neck (Figure 3), aligning with previous findings 15,17,20 . These results indicate that, when assessing femoral neck 477 loading, the traditional assumption that the mechanical load correlates directly with ground reaction 478 479 force⁵⁸ requires reconsideration. The type of activity itself is a key determinant of femoral neck loads. 480 We propose that the distinct anatomical arrangements and activation patterns of muscle groups around 481 the hip contribute to varying mechanical stimuli on the femoral neck. For example, the gluteus 482 maximus exerts direct effects on neighboring bone regions, while muscles like the semimembranosus 483 influence hip-joint reaction forces indirectly. Additionally, muscles not spanning the hip may still 484 contribute to these forces, albeit to a lesser extent, by dynamically accelerating body segments through 485 musculoskeletal coupling^{59,60}.

486 In general, agreement between neural network predictions and MSK-FE predictions ranged from 487 excellent (r > 0.90 and relRMSE \leq 15%) to good (r > 0.78 and relRMSE \leq 25%) for all the ballistic 488 exercises analyzed. Among these, walking demonstrated the highest estimation accuracies (r = 0.96489 and relRMSE = 8.96%, r = 0.97 and relRMSE = 8.01% for first and third principal strains respectively). 490 while there was a pronounced drop in estimation accuracies of the squat jump predictions (r = 0.80 and 491 relRMSE = 23.52%, r = 0.78 and relRMSE = 22.64% for first and third principal strains respectively). 492 One potential reason for the superior predictive power of walking is that it is performed at a consistent, 493 self-selected intensity level, while other exercises are performed across three distinct intensity levels 494 (maximum, medium, and minimum), which introduces a higher degree of variation in the movement 495 dynamics. This variability could make it more challenging for the neural network model to generalize 496 and predict accurately across all intensities. The increased variability in execution during squat jumps

497 is further reflected in the high standard deviation for both the first and third principal strains across the 498 cohort, indicating a wider dispersion in strain values among participants (Figure 4 and Figure 5). 499 Similarly, running showed lower predictive accuracies (r = 0.83 and relRMSE = 17.86%, r = 0.84 and 500 relRMSE = 16.07% for first and third principal strains respectively). The reduction in accuracy for 501 running can also be attributed to the high inter-individual variability in predicted strain values, which 502 is a common characteristic of more dynamic and explosive movements. This trend between predictive 503 accuracy reduction and higher rate of data variation is consistent with findings reported by Setter et al.³⁵ and Fluit et al.⁶¹. Stetter et al.³⁵ observed a similar reduction in the accuracy of knee joint force 504 predictions made by a neural network model for walking, which was associated with higher variability 505 in knee joint forces, compared to running. Similarly, Fluit et al.⁶¹ observed similar changes in 506 estimation accuracy when they assessed a prediction model for ground reaction forces and moments 507 508 during various daily activities using 3D full-body motion analysis. This suggests that the performance 509 of a machine learning model is sensitive to the consistency of movement and the level of variability in 510 the data it is trained on. Furthermore, this may indicate that the model should not be trained on generalized data; instead, it should be population specific if precise accuracy is required. However, the 511 512 reduction in model accuracy observed in our study was minimal. Future studies should further 513 investigate the impact of data variability on machine learning prediction accuracy.

514 Distinct differences in neural network estimation accuracy were seen between unilateral hopping and 515 bilateral hopping (r = 0.96 and relRMSE = 14.02 %, r = 0.81 and relRMSE = 24.26% respectively). This has also been observed in Setter et al. study³⁵, where model accuracy for predicting knee joint 516 517 forces was lower for two-leg jumps than for one-leg jumps (r for take-off = 0.92 vs. 0.60; r for landing 518 = 0.84 vs. 0.61). One reason for the reduced estimation accuracy for bilateral hopping may be the 519 bipedal characteristic of the movement. Potential inaccuracies in the strain estimations are caused by the distribution of the total external load on both legs. Stetter et al.³⁵ suggested that incorporating an 520 521 activity recognition approach could help mitigate these limitations. By selecting individualized 522 prediction models based on specific movement categories, the model could account for the distinct 523 characteristics of different movement types and improve accuracy.

524 Reducing the training data for the neural network model by using only three IMU sensors instead of 525 seven had minimal impact on prediction accuracy, which remained excellent (r = 0.95, relRMSE < 16%) to good (r = 0.72, relRMSE < 16%) across all tested exercises, following similar trends as with 526 527 seven IMUs. Walking showed the largest reduction in prediction accuracy, with relative differences 528 compared to the seven-sensor setup as r = 0.32%, relRMSE = 19.62%, and RMSE = 20.58% for first 529 principal strains, and r = 2.28%, relRMSE = 22.13%, and RMSE = 17.02% for third principal strains. 530 This again may be due to the imbalance in the data size between walking (fewer trial numbers) and 531 other exercises, especially, when using minimal training data size. This imbalance could lead to a 532 neural network bias toward other exercises, reducing walking prediction accuracy. Type and size of training data plays a key role in improving neural network training efficiency and test accuracy⁶². 533 534 Additionally, by excluding sensors from the shank and foot, important biomechanical data—such as 535 foot strike patterns, ankle movements, and shank rotation-are not captured, limiting the model's 536 ability to fully understand lower limb mechanics and so struggle to capture important biomechanical 537 details. However, in general, the reduction in accuracy of our neural network was minimal, and the 538 performance remained nearly as high as when using seven IMU sensors. Our finding is supported by a 539 number of recent studies which used artificial neural network with a limited amount of IMU measurement information, but to predict ground reaction forces during walking and running^{28,38,63}. For 540 541 example, Guo et al.²⁸ used a single IMU measurements taken at the sacrum to predicted the vertical 542 ground reaction forces and reported an average prediction error of less than 5.0% for walking. Ngoh et

543 al.⁶³ demonstrated that neural network predict vertical ground reaction forces with one uniaxial IMU 544 sensor located at the foot with average errors ranging between the 0.10 and 0.18 of body weight at 545 different running speeds. It may be important to note that a full set of IMUs may be beneficial where 546 high precision is required, depending on the application. However, if the goal is to obtain an indication 547 of strain patterns and levels during a specific exercise, our results suggest that a reduced set of IMU 548 sensors can still provide sufficient accuracy. This may be especially advantageous when considering 549 cost, data size, and time.

550 One of the main limitations of the current study is that strain data predicted by the MSK-FE model 551 were not fully personalized. Multi-level personalization of neuromusculoskeletal models can significantly influence the estimation of internal loading⁶⁴. As a result, our MSK-FE predictions may 552 553 not entirely capture the individual variations among participants, which could also impact the accuracy of the neural network predictions⁶². This limitation was primarily due to the lack of available data, 554 555 particularly the absence of medical images necessary to create personalized FE models for each 556 participant. A full set of personalized data, required of such modelling pipeline, has been and still is a 557 big challenge in the biomechanical field. Previous studies have relied on body-matched volunteers^{16,65,66}, synthetic model¹⁹, or generic scaled bone model⁶⁷, similar to the approach followed 558 559 in our study. In the future, our model can be tested with personalized data as it becomes available. 560 Another limitation is that hyperparameter tuning has not been explored in the current study, hence, our 561 findings can provide a more conservative estimation of the predictive performance of the neural 562 network. Lastly, the characteristics of the participants (e.g., sex and age group) may be important 563 determinants in model prediction accuracy. A machine-learned model used for prediction purposes 564 must be trained on data that has similar characteristics to the data needed to be predicted. Yet, although 565 our cohort included a large age group ranging from 18 to 70 years, all participants were healthy and 566 active individual who exercise regularly which was confirmed by the relatively lower variation in the 567 estimated joint forces and strains.

568 In this work, the increased strain observed in activities like running and unilateral hopping, compared 569 to walking, suggests these exercises could form the basis for early intervention strategies aimed at 570 enhancing bone health and mitigating fracture risk over the course of a lifetime, particularly in 571 individuals at risk of osteoporosis. These findings emphasize the potential benefits of incorporating 572 high-impact, weight-bearing exercises into preventive and therapeutic programs to stimulate bone 573 adaptation and improve skeletal strength. Additionally, we demonstrate that combining IMU sensor 574 data with neural network modeling provides an efficient and accurate method for predicting femoral 575 neck strain during ballistic exercises. This approach is significantly faster than traditional MSK-FE 576 modeling, which can take hours or days due to complex processes like model scaling, 3D 577 reconstruction, and meshing. This makes it an accessible, scalable tool for both clinical and sports 578 applications, reducing reliance on specialized expertise and high-end computational resources. 579 Moreover, this method opens the possibility for near-real-time biomechanical analysis, facilitating 580 timely and practical insights into bone health and injury prevention in various settings.

581 **5.** Author Contributions

- 582 Conceptualization—ZA, BL; Data Curation-ZA, Formal Analysis—ZA, BL, Funding Acquisition—
- 583 BL, AP, JM Methodology—ZA, BL, Project Administration—BL, Software—ZA, Supervision—AP,
- 584 JM, BL, Validation—AP, JM, QM, BL, Visualization—ZA, Writing—Original Draft Preparation—
- 585 ZA, Writing—Review and Editing-All authors.

586 6. Conflict of Interest

587 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

588 **7. Acknowledgments**

589 This work was supported by The Academy of Medical Sciences, UK, Springboard Award 590 (SBF006\1019).

591 **8. Supplementary Material**

592 The Supplementary Material for this article can be found online with the article.

593 9. Data Availability Statement

594 All data produced in the present study are available upon reasonable request to the authors.

595 10. References

- 5961.Boonen, S. *et al.* Osteoporosis and osteoporotic fracture occurrence and prevention in the597elderly: a geriatric perspective. *Best Pract. Res. Clin. Endocrinol. Metab.* 22, 765–785 (2008).
- Goldacre, M. J. Mortality after admission to hospital with fractured neck of femur: database study. *BMJ* 325, 868–869 (2002).
- 6003.Odén, A., McCloskey, E. V., Kanis, J. A., Harvey, N. C. & Johansson, H. Burden of high fracture601probability worldwide: secular increases 2010–2040. Osteoporos. Int. 26, 2243–2248 (2015).
- Kitagawa, T., Hiraya, K., Denda, T. & Yamamoto, S. A comparison of different exercise
 intensities for improving bone mineral density in postmenopausal women with osteoporosis: A
 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Bone Reports* 17, 101631 (2022).
- Allison, S. J. *et al.* The Influence of High-Impact Exercise on Cortical and Trabecular Bone
 Mineral Content and 3D Distribution Across the Proximal Femur in Older Men: A Randomized
 Controlled Unilateral Intervention. *J. Bone Miner. Res.* **30**, 1709–1716 (2015).
- 6. Multanen, J. *et al.* Effect of progressive high-impact exercise on femoral neck structural strength
 in postmenopausal women with mild knee osteoarthritis: a 12-month RCT. *Osteoporos. Int.* 28,
 1323–1333 (2017).
- 611 7. Nikander, R. *et al.* Targeted exercise against osteoporosis: A systematic review and meta612 analysis for optimising bone strength throughout life. *BMC Med.* 8, 47 (2010).
- 8. Martyn-St James, M. & Carroll, S. A meta-analysis of impact exercise on postmenopausal bone

- 614 loss: the case for mixed loading exercise programmes. *Br. J. Sports Med.* **43**, 898–908 (2009).
- Manaye, S. *et al.* The Role of High-intensity and High-impact Exercises in Improving Bone
 Health in Postmenopausal Women: A Systematic Review. *Cureus* 15, 1–8 (2023).
- 10. Vainionpaa, A., Korpelainen, R., Leppaluoto, J. & Jamsa, T. Effects of high-impact exercise on
 bone mineral density: a randomized controlled trial in premenopausal women. *Osteoporos. Int.*16, 191–197 (2005).
- Kistler-Fischbacher, M., Weeks, B. K. & Beck, B. R. The effect of exercise intensity on bone in
 postmenopausal women (part 1): A systematic review. *Bone* 143, 115696 (2021).
- Kistler-Fischbacher, M., Weeks, B. K. & Beck, B. R. The effect of exercise intensity on bone in postmenopausal women (part 2): A meta-analysis. *Bone* 143, 115697 (2021).
- Hartley, C., Folland, J. P., Kerslake, R. & Brooke-Wavell, K. High-Impact Exercise Increased
 Femoral Neck Bone Density With No Adverse Effects on Imaging Markers of Knee
 Osteoarthritis in Postmenopausal Women. *J. Bone Miner. Res.* 35, 53–63 (2020).
- Martelli, S. *et al.* Modelling Human Locomotion to Inform Exercise Prescription for
 Osteoporosis. *Curr. Osteoporos. Rep.* 18, 301–311 (2020).
- Pellikaan, P., Giarmatzis, G., Vander Sloten, J., Verschueren, S. & Jonkers, I. Ranking of
 osteogenic potential of physical exercises in postmenopausal women based on femoral neck
 strains. *PLoS One* 13, e0195463 (2018).
- Martelli, S., Kersh, M. E., Schache, A. G. & Pandy, M. G. Strain energy in the femoral neck
 during exercise. *J. Biomech.* 47, 1784–1791 (2014).
- Kersh, M. E., Martelli, S., Zebaze, R., Seeman, E. & Pandy, M. G. Mechanical loading of the
 femoral neck in human locomotion. *J. Bone Miner. Res.* 33, 1999–2006 (2018).
- 636 18. Geier, A. *et al.* Neuro-musculoskeletal flexible multibody simulation yields a framework for
 637 efficient bone failure risk assessment. *Sci. Rep.* 9, 1–15 (2019).
- Viceconti, M. *et al.* Are spontaneous fractures possible? An example of clinical application for
 personalised, multiscale neuro-musculo-skeletal modelling. *J. Biomech.* 45, 421–426 (2012).
- 640 20. Altai, Z. *et al.* Femoral neck strain prediction during level walking using a combined
 641 musculoskeletal and finite element model approach. *PLoS One* 16, e0245121 (2021).
- Altai, Z., Montefiori, E. & Li, X. Effect of muscle forces on femur during level walking using a
 virtual population of older women. *High Perform. Comput. Drug Discov. Biomed.* 335–349
 (2023) doi:10.1007/978-1-0716-3449-3_15.
- Bavil, A. Y. *et al.* Effect of different constraining boundary conditions on simulated femoral stresses and strains during gait. *Sci. Rep.* 14, 10808 (2024).

Smith, S. H. L., Coppack, R. J., van den Bogert, A. J., Bennett, A. N. & Bull, A. M. J. Review
of musculoskeletal modelling in a clinical setting: Current use in rehabilitation design, surgical

- 649 decision making and healthcare interventions. *Clin. Biomech.* **83**, 105292 (2021).
- Parashar, S. K. & Sharma, J. K. A review on application of finite element modelling in bone
 biomechanics. *Perspect. Sci.* 8, 696–698 (2016).
- Zago, M., Kleiner, A. F. R. & Federolf, P. A. Editorial: Machine Learning Approaches to Human
 Movement Analysis. *Front. Bioeng. Biotechnol.* 8, 2020–2022 (2021).
- 654 26. Mundt, M. *et al.* Estimation of Gait Mechanics Based on Simulated and Measured IMU Data
 655 Using an Artificial Neural Network. *Front. Bioeng. Biotechnol.* 8, 1–16 (2020).
- Wouda, F. J. *et al.* Estimation of Vertical Ground Reaction Forces and Sagittal Knee Kinematics
 During Running Using Three Inertial Sensors. *Front. Physiol.* 9, 1–14 (2018).
- Guo, Y. *et al.* A New Proxy Measurement Algorithm with Application to the Estimation of
 Vertical Ground Reaction Forces Using Wearable Sensors. *Sensors* 17, 2181 (2017).
- Stetter, B. J., Krafft, F. C., Ringhof, S., Stein, T. & Sell, S. A machine learning and wearable
 sensor based approach to estimate external knee flexion and adduction moments during various
 locomotion tasks. *Front. Bioeng. Biotechnol.* 8, (2020).
- 30. Derie, R. *et al.* Tibial Acceleration-Based Prediction of Maximal Vertical Loading Rate During
 Overground Running: A Machine Learning Approach. *Front. Bioeng. Biotechnol.* 8, 1–10
 (2020).
- Altai, Z. *et al.* Performance of multiple neural networks in predicting lower limb joint moments
 using wearable sensors. *Front. Bioeng. Biotechnol.* 11, 1215770 (2023).
- 668 32. Camargo, J., Molinaro, D. & Young, A. Predicting biological joint moment during multiple
 669 ambulation tasks. *J. Biomech.* 134, 111020 (2022).
- Wang, C. *et al.* Real-time estimation of knee adduction moment for gait retraining in patients
 with knee osteoarthritis. *IEEE Trans. Neural Syst. Rehabil. Eng.* 28, 888–894 (2020).
- 672 34. Dorschky, E. *et al.* CNN-Based Estimation of Sagittal Plane Walking and Running
 673 Biomechanics From Measured and Simulated Inertial Sensor Data. *Front. Bioeng. Biotechnol.*674 8, 1–14 (2020).
- Stetter, B. J., Ringhof, S., Krafft, F. C., Sell, S. & Stein, T. Estimation of Knee Joint Forces in
 Sport Movements Using Wearable Sensors and Machine Learning. *Sensors* 19, 3690 (2019).
- Matijevich, E. S., Scott, L. R., Volgyesi, P., Derry, K. H. & Zelik, K. E. Combining wearable
 sensor signals, machine learning and biomechanics to estimate tibial bone force and damage
 during running. *Hum. Mov. Sci.* 74, 102690 (2020).
- Nimmal Haribabu, G. & Basu, B. Implementing Machine Learning approaches for accelerated
 prediction of bone strain in acetabulum of a hip joint. *J. Mech. Behav. Biomed. Mater.* 153, 106495 (2024).
- 683 38. Lim, H., Kim, B. & Park, S. Prediction of Lower Limb Kinetics and Kinematics during Walking

- by a Single IMU on the Lower Back Using Machine Learning. *Sensors* **20**, 130 (2019).
- 685 39. Altai, Z. *et al.* Lower limb joint loading during high-impact activities: implication for bone
 686 health. *JBMR Plus* (2024) doi:10.1093/jbmrpl/ziae119.
- 687 40. Delp, S. L. *et al.* An interactive graphics-based model of the lower extremity to study 688 orthopaedic surgical procedures. *IEEE Trans. Biomed. Eng.* **37**, 757–767 (1990).
- 689 41. Delp, S. L. *et al.* OpenSim: Open-source software to create and analyze dynamic simulations of
 690 movement. *IEEE Trans. Biomed. Eng.* 54, 1940–1950 (2007).
- 42. van Arkel, R. J., Modenese, L., Phillips, A. T. M. & Jeffers, J. R. T. Hip abduction can prevent
 posterior edge loading of hip replacements. *J. Orthop. Res.* **31**, 1172–1179 (2013).
- 43. Steele, K. M., DeMers, M. S., Schwartz, M. H. & Delp, S. L. Compressive tibiofemoral force
 during crouch gait. *Gait Posture* 35, 556–560 (2012).
- 44. Zhang, J. et al. The MAP Client: User-Friendly Musculoskeletal Modelling Workflows. in *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)* vol. 8789 182–192 (2014).
- 45. Zhang, J., Hislop-Jambrich, J. & Besier, T. F. Predictive statistical models of baseline variations
 in 3-D femoral cortex morphology. *Med. Eng. Phys.* 38, 450–457 (2016).
- Peters, A. E., Akhtar, R., Comerford, E. J. & Bates, K. T. Tissue material properties and computational modelling of the human tibiofemoral joint: a critical review. *PeerJ* 6, e4298 (2018).
- Polgár, K., Gill, H. S., Viceconti, M., Murray, D. W. & O'Connor, J. J. Strain distribution within
 the human femur due to physiological and simplified loading: Finite element analysis using the
 muscle standardized femur model. *Proc. Inst. Mech. Eng. Part H J. Eng. Med.* 217, 173–189
 (2003).
- 707 48. O'Rahilly, R. *et al.* Chapter 18: Posture and locomotion. in *Basic Human Anatomy* (ed. Dartmouth Medical School) (2008).
- Helgason, B. *et al.* A modified method for assigning material properties to FE models of bones. *Med. Eng. Phys.* **30**, 444–453 (2008).
- Fauvel, K., Lin, T., Masson, V., Fromont, É. & Termier, A. Xcm: An explainable convolutional neural network for multivariate time series classification. *Mathematics* 9, 1–21 (2021).
- Johnson, W. R., Alderson, J., Lloyd, D. & Mian, A. Predicting athlete ground reaction forces
 and moments from spatio-temporal driven CNN models. *IEEE Trans. Biomed. Eng.* 66, 689–
 694 (2019).
- 716 52. Ren, L., Jones, R. K. & Howard, D. Whole body inverse dynamics over a complete gait cycle
 717 based only on measured kinematics. *J. Biomech.* 41, 2750–2759 (2008).
- 718 53. Anderson, D. E. & Madigan, M. L. Effects of age-related differences in femoral loading and

- bone mineral density on strains in the proximal femur during controlled walking. *J Appl Biomech.* 29, 505–516 (2013).
- 54. Howe, T. E. *et al.* Exercise for preventing and treating osteoporosis in postmenopausal women. *Cochrane Database Syst. Rev.* 2011, 1–167 (2011).
- 55. Ma, D., Wu, L. & He, Z. Effects of walking on the preservation of bone mineral density in perimenopausal and postmenopausal women. *Menopause* **20**, 1216–1226 (2013).
- 56. Allison, S. J. *et al.* The Influence of High-Impact Exercise on Cortical and Trabecular Bone
 Mineral Content and 3D Distribution Across the Proximal Femur in Older Men: A Randomized
 Controlled Unilateral Intervention. *J. Bone Miner. Res.* **30**, 1709–1716 (2015).
- Allison, S. J., Folland, J. P., Rennie, W. J., Summers, G. D. & Brooke-Wavell, K. High impact
 exercise increased femoral neck bone mineral density in older men: A randomised unilateral
 intervention. *Bone* 53, 321–328 (2013).
- 58. Kohrt, W. M., Ehsani, A. A. & Birge, S. J. Effects of Exercise Involving Predominantly Either
 Joint-Reaction or Ground-Reaction Forces on Bone Mineral Density in Older Women. *J. Bone Miner. Res.* 12, 1253–1261 (1997).
- 59. Correa, T. A., Crossley, K. M., Kim, H. J. & Pandy, M. G. Contributions of individual muscles
 to hip joint contact force in normal walking. *J. Biomech.* 43, 1618–1622 (2010).
- Pandy, M. G. & Andriacchi, T. P. Muscle and Joint Function in Human Locomotion. *Annu. Rev. Biomed. Eng.* 12, 401–433 (2010).
- Fluit, R., Andersen, M. S., Kolk, S., Verdonschot, N. & Koopman, H. F. J. M. Prediction of
 ground reaction forces and moments during various activities of daily living. *J. Biomech.* 47,
 2321–2329 (2014).
- 741 62. Zurada, J. M., Malinowski, A. & Cloete, I. Sensitivity analysis for minimization of input data
 742 dimension for feedforward neural network. in *Proceedings of IEEE International Symposium*743 *on Circuits and Systems ISCAS '94* vol. 6 447–450 (IEEE, 1994).
- Ngoh, K. J.-H., Gouwanda, D., Gopalai, A. A. & Chong, Y. Z. Estimation of vertical ground
 reaction force during running using neural network model and uniaxial accelerometer. *J. Biomech.* 76, 269–273 (2018).
- Davico, G. *et al.* Multi-level personalization of neuromusculoskeletal models to estimate
 physiologically plausible knee joint contact forces in children. *Biomech. Model. Mechanobiol.*21, 1873–1886 (2022).
- Martelli, S., Pivonka, P. & Ebeling, P. R. Femoral shaft strains during daily activities:
 Implications for atypical femoral fractures. *Clin. Biomech.* 29, 869–876 (2014).
- Edwards, W. B., Miller, R. H. & Derrick, T. R. Femoral strain during walking predicted with muscle forces from static and dynamic optimization. *J. Biomech.* 49, 1206–1213 (2016).
- 754 67. Xu, C. et al. An Integrated Musculoskeletal-Finite-Element Model to Evaluate Effects of Load

755 Carriage on the Tibia During Walking. J. Biomech. Eng. 138, (2016).

756