

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

# Experimental quantification of soft tissue deformation in quasi-static single leg flexion using biplanar imaging

## AUTHORS

Bhriku K. Lahkar<sup>1,\*</sup>, Pierre-Yves Rohan<sup>1</sup>, Jean-Jacques Yaacoub<sup>1</sup>, Helene Pillet<sup>1</sup>,  
Xavier Bonnet<sup>1</sup>, Patricia Thoreux<sup>1,2</sup>, Wafa Skalli<sup>1</sup>

## AFFILIATIONS

<sup>1</sup> *Institut de Biomécanique Humaine Georges Charpak, Arts et Métiers Sciences et Technologies, Paris, France*

<sup>2</sup> *Université Sorbonne Paris Nord, Bobigny, France*

\*Corresponding author: Bhriku K. Lahkar

*Institut de Biomécanique Humaine Georges Charpak, Arts et Métiers ParisTech, 151*

*Boulevard de l'Hôpital, 75013 Paris, France*

E-mail address: *bhriku\_kumar.lahkar@ensam.eu*

Tel: +33 611745748

27 **Abstract**

28 Soft tissue deformation(STD) causes the most prominent source of error in skin marker (SM)  
29 based motion analysis, commonly referred to as Soft Tissue Artifact (STA). To compensate  
30 for its effect and to accurately assess *in vivo* joint kinematics, quantification of STD in three-  
31 dimension (3D) is essential. In the literature, different invasive and radiological approaches  
32 have been employed to study how STA propagates in joint kinematics. However, there is  
33 limited reference data extensively reporting distribution of the artifact itself in 3D.

34 The current study was thus aimed at quantifying STD in 10 subjects along three  
35 anatomical directions. Biplanar X-ray system was used to determine true bone and SM  
36 positions while the subjects underwent quasi-static single leg flexion.

37 STD exhibited inter-subject similarity. A non-uniform distribution was observed at  
38 the pelvis, thigh and shank displaying maximum at the thigh (up to 18.5 mm) and minimum  
39 at the shank (up to 8 mm). STD at the pelvis and thigh displayed inter-marker similarity. STD  
40 at the pelvis was found direction independent, showing similar distribution in all the 3  
41 directions. However, the thigh and shank exhibited higher STD in the proximal-distal  
42 direction of the bone embedded anatomical reference frame. These findings may provide  
43 more insights while interpreting motion analysis data as well to effectively strategize STA  
44 compensation methods.

45 **Keywords**

46 Soft tissue deformation, Skin marker-based motion analysis, Biplanar X-ray

47

48

49

50

51

52

## 53 **1. Introduction**

54 Skin Marker (SM) based motion analysis is the most common non-invasive method for  
55 estimating skeletal position and orientation in 3D space. Accuracy of such method is mainly  
56 limited by relative movement between soft tissues and the underlying bone, commonly  
57 known as Soft Tissue Artifact (STA). In order to compensate for it and to accurately estimate  
58 *in vivo* skeletal position during motion, knowledge of Soft Tissue Deformation (STD) pattern  
59 during motion is critical (Benoit et al., 2006; Stagni et al., 2005).

60 Several invasive (e.g., bone pins (Benoit et al., 2006; Reinschmidt et al., 1997)) and  
61 radiological studies (e.g., fluoroscopy (D'Isidoro et al., 2020; Stagni et al., 2005), biplanar X-  
62 ray (Südhoff et al., 2007; Tashman and Anderst, 2002), MRI ((Akbarshahi et al., 2010;  
63 Sangeux et al., 2006)) have been proposed to characterize STD during different motor tasks.  
64 Most of the studies concluded that STD is dependent on an individual subject, type of  
65 performed activity, marker configuration as well as locations. For instance, few studies have  
66 found that kinematic error due to STD is greater at the thigh than the shank, suggesting  
67 location- and segment- specific scheme to compensate for the artefact (Akbarshahi et al.,  
68 2010; Benoit et al., 2006; Stagni et al., 2005). Nevertheless, these studies primarily focused  
69 on quantifying the kinematic errors caused by STD rather than STD itself.

70 As far as the authors are aware of, one study dealt with quantification of STD at  
71 different marker locations and directions in 20 healthy volunteers (Gao and Zheng, 2008).  
72 But, due to technical limitations preventing access to the bone position, STA quantification  
73 was reported as inter-marker movement instead of marker movement relative to true bone  
74 positions. Hence, there is still a lack of reference data on subject-, location- and direction-  
75 specific STD, which may provide insight for effective STA compensation strategies for SM  
76 based motion analysis.

77 Amongst the different methods devised for compensating STA, multi-body  
78 optimization (MBO) method is increasingly used. It generally assigns a weight matrix  
79 reflecting the STA error distribution among the markers adhered to a segment (Lu and  
80 O'Connor, 1999). Moreover, recently our group has proposed a finite element (FE) based  
81 novel approach to compensate for STA of the lower limb and successfully evaluated in a  
82 population of 66 subjects (Lahkar et al., 2020, under review). The FE model facilitates to  
83 incorporate STA correction stiffness at each marker location, and stiffness can be calibrated  
84 based on information of local STD at each marker location and along each anatomical  
85 direction. However, owing to lack of STD data, arbitrary values were assigned for the  
86 stiffness parameters.

87 The current study was thus aimed at quantifying soft tissue deformation on the pelvis,  
88 thigh and shank at each marker location and in three anatomical directions during single-leg  
89 quasi-static knee flexion using low dose biplanar radiography.

## 90 **2. Materials and methods**

### 91 *2.1 Data collection*

92 The retrospective data included in the study recruited ten volunteers (age range: 23-40 years;  
93 weight range: 63-89 kg, height range: 1.7-1.9 m), 6 months after ACL reconstruction  
94 following approval of a relevant ethical committee. Patients with a large osteochondral defect  
95 ( $>1\text{cm}^2$ ), operated for a meniscal suture and multi-ligament knee injury, or diagnosed with a  
96 neuromuscular disorder which could impair motion, were excluded from this study. The  
97 mean IKDC (International Knee Documentation Committee) score for the subjects was  
98  $79.7\pm 7.2$ . This score ranges from 0 to 100, with higher scores representing lower levels of  
99 symptoms and higher levels of function and sports activity (Irrgang et al., 2001).

## Biplanar X-ray data and 3D models




Fig. 1. 3D digital models of the pelvis, femur and tibia and their respective skin adhered markers at positions: pose 1 (free standing), pose 2 (20° knee flexion) and pose 3 (40° knee flexion) built from orthogonal radiographs. Marker nomenclature is shown at pose 1 for the pelvis:  $SP_1$  to  $SP_4$ , for the thigh  $ST_1$  to  $ST_8$  and for the shank:  $SS_1$  and  $SS_8$ . L: lateral and F: frontal view

100

101           Subjects were equipped with a total of 20 retro-reflective skin markers (pelvis: 4,  
102 thigh: 8 and shank: 8) according to the Plug-in Gait<sup>®</sup> method (Davis et al., 1991). Three pairs  
103 of bi-planar radiographs (EOS Imaging, France) were acquired in three configurations for  
104 each subject (Fig. 1). First, a pair of radiograph was taken in the free-standing position.  
105 Then, two sequential pairs of radiographs at approximately 20° and 40° of knee flexion were  
106 acquired while each subject performed a quasi-static single-leg knee flexion. For the sake of  
107 clarity, three sequential postures will be hereafter termed as respectively pose 1, pose 2 and  
108 pose 3 for free-standing, 20° and 40° of knee flexion.

109           3D digital models of bones (pelvis, femur and tibia) were first obtained at free-  
110 standing position using a 3D reconstruction algorithm developed previously by (Chaibi et al.,  
111 2012) for femur and tibia and (Mitton et al., 2006) for the pelvis. The 3D models were then  
112 projected on the frontal and lateral radiographs. The positions of the bony contours were

113 manually adjusted until the contours exactly matched those of the radiographs at each pose.  
114 3D location of skin markers at each pose was also computed from biplanar radiographs using  
115 the same procedure. Anatomical reference ( $R_{anat}$ ) frames for the femur and tibia was defined  
116 following the definition reported in (Schlatterer et al., 2009), and for the pelvis, in (Dubois,  
117 2014).  $x$ ,  $y$  and  $z$  axes of the  $R_{anat}$  frames are along antero-posterior, proximal-distal and  
118 medial-lateral direction respectively.

## 119 2.2 Quantification of STD

120 STD quantification on the pelvis, thigh and shank was performed based on two different  
121 schemes in line with the literature.

122 First, as a Soft Tissue Element (STE) deformation at each marker location as  
123 introduced in our previous work (Lahkar et al., 2020, under review). The overall procedure is  
124 briefly explained and illustrated in figure 1 below.




Fig. 2. Scheme 1: Schematic representation of Soft Tissue Element (STE) deformation. Skin  $\{S_i (i = 1,2,3)\}$  and subcutaneous marker ( $SC_i$ ) locations are expressed in bone  $R_{anat}$  frames in all the poses.  $D_1$  (1 mm),  $D_2$  and  $D_3$  are Euclidean distances between skin and subcutaneous marker at pose 1, pose 2 and pose 3 respectively. Shown only for a single marker.

125

126 3D position of the skin markers ( $S_i$ ) in all the poses were first computed from the  
127 biplanar X-ray data and expressed in the respective bone  $R_{anat}$  frames. From the skin  
128 markers, a set of virtual markers referred to as subcutaneous markers ( $SC_i$ ), were defined 1  
129 mm beneath the skin marker following the methodology elaborated in (Lahkar et al., 2020,

130 under review) and illustrated in Fig. 2(A). All the soft tissue deformation effect at the marker  
 131 level is reported to the STE, which connects the  $S_i$  to the corresponding  $SC_i$ . The connection  
 132 between the  $SC_i$  and the corresponding bone segment was assumed to be rigid. Due to the  
 133 rigidity assumption, the locations of the subcutaneous markers in  $R_{anat}$  frame remained the  
 134 same in all the poses ( $SC_1=SC_2=SC_3$ ). Thus the absolute differences between skin and  
 135 subcutaneous marker locations at pose 2 and pose 3 were computed and expressed in  $R_{anat}$   
 136 frames along  $x$ ,  $y$  and  $z$  direction (Fig. 2(B) and 2(C)). Eventually, from the directional  
 137 components, Euclidean distances were computed using equation 1.

$$138 \quad D_{i+1}(dx_{i+1}, dy_{i+1}, dz_{i+1}) = \|S_{i+1} - SC_1\|; i = 1, 2 \quad (1)$$

139 Second, STD was computed as a relative displacement of the skin markers at pose 2  
 140 and pose 3 with respect to pose 1 (reference pose) as illustrated in figure 3. From the  
 141 directional components, Euclidean distances were computed using equation 2.

$$142 \quad D_{i+1}(dx_{i+1}, dy_{i+1}, dz_{i+1}) = \|S_{i+1} - S_1\|; i = 1, 2 \quad (2)$$

143 where  $S_i$  is the 3D location of the skin marker at pose  $i$  obtained from biplanar X-ray data and  
 144 expressed in bone  $R_{anat}$  frames.  $D_{i+1}$  is the relative displacement of the skin markers at pose  
 145 ( $i+1$ ).

146




Fig. 3. Scheme 2: STA as a skin marker relative displacement.  
 Schematic representation of skin marker  $\{S_i(i = 1,2,3)\}$  locations expressed in bone  $R_{anat}$  frames  
 in all the poses. Shown only for a single marker.

147

148 STA quantification in both the schemes was performed using a customized Matlab  
149 routine (Mathworks, Massachusetts, United States).

### 150 *2.3 Statistical analysis*

151 Statistical analysis on the collected data was performed using both the schemes to test 4  
152 hypotheses.

153 *STD is subject-specific:* Deformation data at all marker locations were pooled together **per**  
154 **subject** per pose to check inter-individual similarity/variability.

155 *STD is segment-specific:* Deformation data for all the subjects and at all marker locations **per**  
156 **segment** per pose were pooled together to check inter-segment variability/similarity among  
157 pelvis, thigh and shank.

158 *STD is location-specific:* Deformation data for all the subjects **per marker location** per pose  
159 within a segment were pooled together to check inter-marker location variability/similarity  
160 within segments.

161 *STD is direction-specific:* Deformation component **in a particular anatomical direction** ( $x$ ,  
162  $y$  or  $z$ ) per pose, for all the subjects and at all marker locations within a segment were pooled  
163 together to check if deformation is dependent on anatomical directions within segments.

164 Normality of the distributions were first assessed using the Shapiro-Wilk test.  
165 According to the outcomes of normality test, ANOVA or nonparametric Kruskal-Wallis  
166 (KW) test was performed to observe intergroup differences using the built-in MATLAB  
167 functions. We also performed pairwise comparisons with Student t-test or nonparametric  
168 Man-Whitney  $U$  test (with Bonferroni's correction). For all the tests, the significance level  
169 was set to 0.05 (\*) and 0.01 (\*\*) *a priori*.

170

171



172

173 **3. Results**

174 Results obtained with both the schemes were similar, with mean differences between the  
 175 schemes less than 1 mm (appendix 1). Therefore, the results of the statistical analysis are  
 176 shown only for scheme 1, where deformation at each marker location is presented as STE  
 177 deformation.

178




Fig. 4. Boxplot for subject-specific STD presented at pose 2 and pose 3.  $P_1$  to  $P_{10}$  are number of subjects. Only significant parameters are presented in the table.

179

180 Figure 4 illustrates STD (i.e., median, quartiles, minimum, maximum and outliers) per  
 181 subject ( $P_1$  to  $P_{10}$ ) per pose. Results of the KW test showed, the null hypothesis that STD for  
 182 each subject comes from the same distribution cannot be accepted ( $p < 0.05$ ). The pairwise test  
 183 showed that there is a significant difference in STD between subjects  $P_2$  and  $P_5$  at pose 2.  
 184 Similarly, subjects  $P_1$  and  $P_6$ , and  $P_4$  and  $P_6$  displayed significantly dissimilar STD at pose 3  
 185 only. Subjects  $P_1$ - $P_4$  and  $P_7$ - $P_{10}$  showed inter-subject similarity among them. Overall, higher  
 186 STD was observed for the subjects  $P_2$ ,  $P_6$  and  $P_7$  at pose 3, exhibiting maximum value up to  
 187 45 mm for  $P_7$ .

188

189




Fig. 5. Boxplot for segment-specific STA presented at pose 2 and pose 3. Only significant parameters are presented in the table. P: Pelvis, T: Thigh and S: Shank

190

191 Figure 5 represents STD per segment per pose for all the subjects. KW test revealed  
 192 that STD across all the segments was distinctly different ( $p < 0.05$ ). Among the segments,  
 193 STD for the thigh was observed significantly higher at both the poses with values (median)  
 194 13.5 mm and 18.5 mm respectively. Lowest STD (median: 5 mm) was observed for the shank at  
 195 pose 2. STD at the pelvis was found around 13 mm (median). Few outliers were observed at  
 196 both the poses, particularly for the thigh and shank.

197 Figure 6 depicts STD at each marker location (left column figures) and per anatomical  
 198 direction (right column figures) within a segment. In the case of location-specific analysis,  
 199 STD at each marker location of pelvis appeared similar ( $p > 0.05$ ) for both the poses with  
 200 values (median) within 11 mm to 13 mm. Similarly, for the shank, no significant difference in  
 201 STD among different locations were seen ( $p > 0.05$ ). For the thigh, only  $ST_1$  and  $ST_4$   
 202 displayed significantly dissimilar STD at both the poses, with the highest STD (median: 26  
 203 mm) for  $ST_4$  and the lowest (median: 15 mm) for  $ST_1$  at pose 3.




Fig. 6. Boxplot for location-specific STD (left column) and direction-specific (right column) presented at pose 2 and pose 3 for the pelvis, thigh and shank. Only significant parameters are presented in the tables. Anatomical reference frames ( $R_{anat}$ ) are also highlighted on the bone segments in different colours according to different axes. Green: proximal-distal direction, red: antero-posterior direction, blue: lateral-medial direction.

204

205

In the case of direction-specific analysis, a similar ( $p>0.05$ ) STD was observed across

206

the three anatomical directions of the pelvis  $R_{anat}$  frame. STD along proximal-distal

207

direction (in bone embedded  $R_{anat}$  frame) of the thigh was observed distinctly higher in both

208

the poses, while showing similar values along antero-posterior and lateral-medial direction.

209

STD at the shank was appeared similar along antero-posterior and proximal-distal direction,

210 while revealing significantly lower values along the medial-lateral direction. Overall analysis  
211 showed higher STD at pose 3 as compared to pose 2.

212

#### 213 **4. Discussion**

214 In order to compensate for STA and to interpret SM-based motion analysis data,  
215 knowledge of Soft Tissue Deformation (STD) pattern in 3D is essential. Yet, there is a  
216 paucity of reference data in the literature comprehensively showing variability of STD among  
217 individuals, segments, marker locations and along the three anatomical directions. The  
218 purpose of this study was to quantify STD in 3D at the pelvis, thigh and shank for 10  
219 subjects. Two schemes were employed to quantify STD, although exhibited similar results.

220 The rationale behind employing two schemes is that both of them may serve two  
221 different communities; first, those particularly deal with compensation methods, and second  
222 those deal with STD quantification. The first scheme intends to address conventional STA  
223 compensation methods (such as MBO) that generally minimizes measured and model  
224 determined marker position. The subcutaneous markers are analogous to the model  
225 determined markers. This approach could also be helpful for finite element-based STA  
226 compensation method, where a deformable element connecting the skin and subcutaneous  
227 marker accounts for all soft tissue deformation (Lahkar et al., 2020, unpublished). The second  
228 scheme pertains to STD quantification methods, where soft tissue deformation is considered  
229 as a relative displacement of skin markers at different poses with respect to the reference  
230 pose.

231 Overall, soft tissue deformation displayed inter-subject similarity in most of the  
232 subjects showing a similar STD pattern. Although such observation is in contrast to the  
233 current prevailing idea of STD as subject-specific, yet found in accordance with one study  
234 which explained overshadowing of similarity by dissimilarity for few subjects (Gao and

235 Zheng, 2008). Secondly, segment-specific STD was observed exhibiting the highest  
236 deformation at the thigh followed by the pelvis and the shank (Akbarshahi et al., 2010;  
237 Walker, 2015). A similar observation was also reported in studies that measured higher  
238 kinematic error at the thigh (Sangeux et al., 2006; Stagni et al., 2005).

239         STD at the pelvis and shank exhibited no inter-marker variability. For the thigh, the  
240 marker ( $ST_4$ ) placed towards the hip joint showed significantly higher STD, where muscle  
241 thickness is higher (Rouhandeh and Joslin, 2018). Except  $ST_4$ , other markers at the displayed  
242 similar STD.

243         STA occurred in all the three directions of the bone embedded anatomical frames,  
244 however not uniform for the thigh and shank in particular. Soft tissue deformation in  
245 proximal-distal direction of the thigh and shank was distinctly higher. This is probably due to  
246 the orientation of the muscular structure of the thigh and shank, which contracts and relaxes  
247 during movement along its length. Deformation in the medial-lateral direction was noticed  
248 the lowest. A similar observation was also reported in the literature (Gao and Zheng, 2008).

249         This study, to the authors' knowledge, is the second attempt to use EOS low dose  
250 system, allowing to quantify STD in 3D. Previously, our group used EOS to investigate  
251 motion of lower limb attachment systems with respect to the underlying bone (Südhoff et al.,  
252 2007). It is to be noted that because of the limited acquisition volume within the EOS,  
253 markers present in the radiographs were not consistent throughout the subjects. Few markers  
254 couldn't be located in the radiographs of some subjects either in the orthogonal views or in  
255 the consecutive poses. Moreover, both due to limited acquisition volume and ethical reasons,  
256 the number of poses had to be limited. Also, we acknowledge that STD reported in this study  
257 doesn't include inertial effects, as the movement under consideration was quasi-static.  
258 Quantified STD is a consequence of both muscle contraction and skin sliding. Currently,  
259 other existing methods, such as invasive attachments and fluoroscopic measurements, have

260 been shown useful to quantify soft tissue deformation. But, invasive methods are prone to  
261 alter free soft tissue movement and therefore, may impact its results. Fluoroscopy is also not  
262 effective for capturing the entire lower limb, although efficient for local observations in  
263 dynamics. Hence, EOS in conjunction with skin markers can serve as a gold standard to  
264 locate actual bone positions as well to quantify STD for a limited range of motion.

265         The findings in the study may open up effective STA compensation strategies for SM-  
266 based motion analysis. Instead of assigning arbitrary STA correction stiffness, subjects with  
267 similar STD patterns can be grouped together to assign the same correction stiffness.  
268 Moreover, for such quasi-static activities, all the markers at the pelvis can be grouped  
269 together to assign the same stiffness values. Similar is the case for the shank. For the thigh,  
270 marker locations where STD was observed highest can be assigned with the lowest stiffness  
271 and vice versa. To be noted that while assigning stiffness values for the thigh and shank,  
272 different stiffness values need to be defined along different anatomical direction. In  
273 conclusion, although the STD data provided in this study may be beneficial for future STA  
274 compensation approaches, further study would be required in different dynamic activities.

275

276

277

## 278 **Conflict of Interest**

279 None

## 280 **Acknowledgments**

281 The authors are deeply grateful to the ParisTech BiomecAM chair program on subject-  
282 specific musculoskeletal modeling for financial support.

283

284

285

286 **Appendix 1**

287 **Scheme 1**

288 STD at pose 2 and pose 3 presented as Mean±1SD at each marker location and along x,y and  
 289 z direction of  $R_{anat}$  frame

Segment	Markers	Pose 2			Pose 3		
		x	y	z	x	y	z
Pelvis	SP1	7.9±6.1	2.2±2.1	4.3±2.9	3.8±1.8	7.1±6.5	8.9±3.3
	SP2	5.6±3.5	5.2±2.5	5.9±1.6	3.6±2.3	6.4±4.2	7.6±4.2
	SP3	8.5±5.5	4.3±1.6	5.9±2.9	6.9±4.4	5.9±2.8	4.6±4.1
	SP4	7.8±4.3	4.7±2.1	4.5±4.3	6.7±5.5	6.2±2.9	6.7±5.7
	ST1	4.6±2.7	7.1±3.3	2.4±2.1	7.5±4.5	9.9±4.7	1.6±1.3
	ST2	13.2±7.1	3.6±2.6	5.9±3.1	20.0±10.4	5.4±4.1	6.3±2.3
	ST3	3.4±2.2	11.0±6.0	9.8±5.6	7.3±8.2	16.7±4.2	5.2±3.9
	ST4	4.3±3.6	13.7±6.4	17.0±8.9	7.2±5.2	18.1±6.8	17.8±8.6
Thigh	ST5	5.4±3.6	11.4±5.4	7.3±3.4	3.3±1.7	16.8±5.6	6.2±6.2
	ST6	7.7±4.8	11.9±5.8	8.2±6.8	7.1±4.3	16.5±5.4	8.5±6.2
	ST7	8.7±4.6	11.8±5.4	1.5±1.3	5.0±2.4	14.2±6.9	2.6±3.0
	ST8	11.6±7.5	13.8±4.2	2.4±1.5	6.9±3.8	17.0±3.4	4.5±5.2
Shank	SS1	6.8±6.8	2.9±1.6	4.1±3.7	8.1±7.5	5.1±2.7	2.9±2.0
	SS2	5.0±7.9	1.9±2.1	1.6±1.6	6.6±8.2	1.9±1.0	1.8±1.8
	SS3	3.3±4.5	2.9±1.5	1.5±2.0	4.7±4.4	4.0±1.6	4.0±1.8
	SS4	1.6±2.2	6.7±4.7	4.0±1.6	3.5±2.9	8.0±4.9	8.0±5.1
	SS5	4.2±5.0	3.7±1.7	1.8±2.4	6.4±3.2	4.8±3.1	2.7±1.9
	SS6	5.1±4.9	3.3±2.1	1.5±1.2	6.3±5.5	4.5±3.1	4.5±4.2
	SS7	6.4±7.4	4.9±3.1	4.1±4.6	6.9±5.7	8.5±3.9	4.8±3.2
	SS8	4.0±4.4	5.8±2.9	2.5±2.6	5.4±8.1	9.9±3.0	1.5±0.9

290

291

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312 **Scheme 2**

313 STD at pose 2 and pose 3 presented as Mean±1SD at each marker location and along x,y and  
314 z direction of  $R_{anat}$  frame

315

Segment	Markers	Pose 2			Pose 3		
		x	y	z	x	y	z
Pelvis	SP1	7.7±6.0	2.2±1.9	4.3±2.9	3.5±2.1	7.3±6.6	8.9±3.3
	SP2	5.6±3.3	5.8±2.4	6.0±1.5	3.5±2.0	6.7±4.7	7.7±4.0
	SP3	7.7±5.3	4.2±1.4	5.9±3.4	6.4±3.8	5.7±2.8	4.6±4.7
	SP4	7.0±4.3	4.6±2.3	4.2±4.0	6.7±4.5	6.1±2.7	6.5±5.5
	ST1	4.5±2.8	7.1±3.3	3.0±2.5	7.7±4.7	9.9±4.7	2.0±1.4
	ST2	13.7±7.2	3.7±2.7	5.2±3.0	20.6±10.4	5.5±4.1	5.5±2.4
	ST3	3.0±2.1	11.1±6.0	9.9±5.6	7.1±8.7	16.7±4.2	5.3±3.4
	ST4	5.1±3.7	13.8±6.4	17.1±8.9	7.8±5.4	18.2±6.8	17.8±8.7
Thigh	ST5	4.9±3.6	11.4±5.4	7.8±3.5	3.1±1.7	16.8±5.6	6.5±6.3
	ST6	7.3±4.5	11.9±5.8	8.4±6.9	6.9±3.8	16.5±5.5	8.8±6.3
	ST7	8.4±4.8	11.7±5.4	1.8±1.5	4.7±2.6	14.1±6.9	3.1±3.2
	ST8	11.3±7.6	13.7±4.2	2.6±1.8	6.5±3.9	17.0±3.4	4.9±5.5
Shank	SS1	7.1±6.9	2.9±1.6	3.5±3.5	8.2±7.7	5.1±2.7	3.3±2.3
	SS2	5.1±8.1	1.9±2.1	1.8±2.0	6.7±8.4	1.9±1.0	1.2±1.5
	SS3	3.0±4.1	2.9±1.5	1.4±1.9	4.4±4.1	4.0±1.6	3.9±1.8
	SS4	2.6±2.2	6.6±4.7	3.7±1.7	4.3±3.2	8.0±4.9	7.9±4.9
	SS5	4.3±4.9	3.8±1.7	2.0±1.9	6.4±3.5	4.8±3.1	2.6±1.6
	SS6	5.2±4.9	3.4±2.1	1.2±0.8	6.6±5.6	4.5±3.1	4.0±4.2
	SS7	6.7±7.6	4.9±3.0	3.9±4.2	7.0±5.5	8.5±3.9	5.4±3.4
	SS8	3.9±4.6	5.8±2.9	2.2±2.0	5.5±7.9	9.9±3.0	1.7±1.2

316

317

318

319 **References**

320 Akbarshahi, M., Schache, A.G., Fernandez, J.W., Baker, R., Banks, S., Pandy, M.G., 2010. Non-  
321 invasive assessment of soft-tissue artifact and its effect on knee joint kinematics during  
322 functional activity. *J Biomech* 43, 1292–1301. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2010.01.002>

323 Benoit, D.L., Ramsey, D.K., Lamontagne, M., Xu, L., Wretenberg, P., Renström, P., 2006. Effect of  
324 skin movement artifact on knee kinematics during gait and cutting motions measured in vivo.  
325 *Gait Posture* 24, 152–164. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2005.04.012>

326 Cappozzo, A., Catani, F., Leardini, A., Benedetti, M.G., Della Croce, U., 1996. Position and  
327 orientation in space of bones during movement: Experimental artefacts. *Clin Biomech* 11, 90–  
328 100. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0268-0033\(95\)00046-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0268-0033(95)00046-1)

329 Chaibi, Y., Cresson, T., Aubert, B., Hausselle, J., Neyret, P., Hauger, O., de Guise, J.A., Skalli, W.,  
330 2012. Fast 3D reconstruction of the lower limb using a parametric model and statistical  
331 inferences and clinical measurements calculation from biplanar X-rays. *Comput Methods*  
332 *Biomech Biomed Engin* 15, 457–466. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10255842.2010.540758>

333 D’Isidoro, F., Brockmann, C., Ferguson, S.J., 2020. Effects of the soft tissue artefact on the hip joint  
334 kinematics during unrestricted activities of daily living. *J Biomech* 109717.  
335 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2020.109717>



- 336 Davis, R.B., Öunpuu, S., Tyburski, D., 1991. A gait analysis data collection and reduction technique.  
337 Hum Mov Sci 10, 575–587. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-9457\(91\)90046-Z](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-9457(91)90046-Z)
- 338 Dubois, G., 2014. Contribution à la modélisation musculo-squelettique personnalisée du membre  
339 inférieur combinant stéréoradiographie et ultrason.
- 340 Gao, B., Zheng, N. (Nigel), 2008. Investigation of soft tissue movement during level walking:  
341 Translations and rotations of skin markers. J Biomech 41, 3189–3195.  
342 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2008.08.028>
- 343 Irrgang, J.J., Anderson, A.F., Boland, A.L., Harner, C.D., Kurosaka, M., Neyret, P., Richmond, J.C.,  
344 Shelborne, K.D., 2001. Development and validation of the international knee documentation  
345 committee subjective knee form. Am J Sports Med 29, 600–613.  
346 <https://doi.org/10.1177/03635465010290051301>
- 347 Lu, T.W., O'Connor, J.J., 1999. Bone position estimation from skin marker co-ordinates using global  
348 optimisation with joint constraints. J Biomech 32, 129–134. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9290(98)00158-4)  
349 [9290\(98\)00158-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9290(98)00158-4)
- 350 Mitton, D., Deschênes, S., Laporte, S., Godbout, B., Bertrand, S., de Guise, J.A., Skalli, W., 2006. 3D  
351 reconstruction of the pelvis from bi-planar radiography. Comput Methods Biomech Biomed  
352 Engin 9, 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10255840500521786>
- 353 Reinschmidt, C., Van Den Bogert, A.J., Nigg, B.M., Lundberg, A., Murphy, N., 1997. Effect of skin  
354 movement on the analysis of skeletal knee joint motion during running. J Biomech 30, 729–732.  
355 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9290\(97\)00001-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9290(97)00001-8)
- 356 Rouhandeh, A., Joslin, C., 2018. Soft-tissue artefact assessment and compensation in motion analysis  
357 by combining motion capture data and ultrasound depth measurements. VISIGRAPP 2018 -  
358 Proc 13th Int Jt Conf Comput Vision, Imaging Comput Graph Theory Appl 4, 511–521.  
359 <https://doi.org/10.5220/0006624205110521>
- 360 Sangeux, M., Marin, F., Charleux, F., Dürselen, L., Ho Ba Tho, M.C., 2006. Quantification of the 3D  
361 relative movement of external marker sets vs. bones based on magnetic resonance imaging. Clin  
362 Biomech 21, 984–991. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2006.05.006>
- 363 Schlatterer, B., Suedhoff, I., Bonnet, X., Catonne, Y., Maestro, M., Skalli, W., 2009. Skeletal  
364 landmarks for TKR implantations: Evaluation of their accuracy using EOS imaging acquisition  
365 system. Orthop Traumatol Surg Res 95, 2–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.otsr.2008.05.001>
- 366 Stagni, R., Fantozzi, S., Cappello, A., Leardini, A., 2005. Quantification of soft tissue artefact in  
367 motion analysis by combining 3D fluoroscopy and stereophotogrammetry: A study on two  
368 subjects. Clin Biomech 20, 320–329. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2004.11.012>
- 369 Südhoff, I., Van Driessche, S., Laporte, S., de Guise, J.A., Skalli, W., 2007. Comparing three  
370 attachment systems used to determine knee kinematics during gait. Gait Posture 25, 533–543.  
371 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2006.06.002>
- 372 Tashman, S., Anderst, W., 2002. Skin motion artifacts at the knee during impact movements. Proc 7th  
373 Annu Meet Gait Clin Mov Anal Soc.
- 374 Walker, P.S., 2015. The design and pre-clinical evaluation of knee replacements for osteoarthritis. J  
375 Biomech 48, 742–749. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2014.12.012>
- 376