

1 **Title**

2 Load modulation affects pediatric lower limb joint moments during a step-up task

3

4 **Authors and affiliations**

5 Vatsala Goyal^{a,b}

6 vatsalagoyal2022@u.northwestern.edu

7 Keith E. Gordon^{b,c}

8 keith-gordon@northwestern.edu

9 Theresa Sukal-Moulton^{b,d}

10 theresa-moulton@northwestern.edu

11

12 ^aDepartment of Biomedical Engineering

13 Northwestern University

14 2145 Sheridan Road, E310

15 Evanston, Illinois, USA 60208

16

17 ^bDepartment of Physical Therapy and Human Movement Sciences

18 Northwestern University

19 645 N. Michigan Ave, Ste 1100

20 Chicago, Illinois, USA 60611

21

22 ^cEdward Hines, Jr. Veterans Administration Hospital

23 Department of Veteran Affairs

24 5000 5th Ave

25 Hines, Illinois, USA 60141

26

27 ^dDepartment of Pediatrics

28 Northwestern University

29 255 E. Chicago Avenue, Box 86

30 Chicago, Illinois, USA 60611

31

32 **Corresponding author**

33 Theresa Sukal-Moulton, PT, DPT, PhD

34 Department of Physical Therapy and Human Movement Sciences

35 Northwestern University

36 645 N. Michigan Ave, Ste 1100

37 Chicago, Illinois, USA 60611

38 Telephone: (312) 503-3342

39 Email: theresa-moulton@northwestern.edu

40

41 **Keywords**

42 Pediatrics, Lower Limbs, Step Up, Biomechanics, Joint Moments

43

44 **Word Count:** 3,464

45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67

Abstract: Performance in a single step has been suggested to be sensitive measure of movement quality in pediatric clinical populations. Although there is less information available in children with typical development, researchers have postulated the importance of analyzing the effect of body weight modulation on the initiation of stair ascent, especially during single limb stance where upright stability is most critical. The purpose of this study was to investigate the effect of load modulation from -20% to +15% of body weight on typical pediatric lower limb joint moments during a step-up task. Fourteen participants between 5-21 years with no known history of neurological or musculoskeletal concerns were recruited to perform multiple step-up trials. Peak extensor support and hip abduction moments were identified during the push-off and pull-up stance phases. Linear regressions were used to determine the relationship between peak moments and load. Mixed effects models were used to estimate the effect of load on hip, knee, and ankle percent contributions to peak support moments. There was a positive linear relationship between peak support moments and load in both stance phases, where these moments scaled with load. There was no relationship between peak hip abduction moments and load. While the ankle and knee were the primary contributors to the support moments, the hip contributed more than expected in the pull-up phase. Clinicians can use these results to contextualize movement differences in pediatric clinical populations including cerebral palsy and highlight potential target areas for rehabilitation for populations such as adolescent athletes.

68 **Introduction**

69 Body weight modulation, including providing partial support of a person's body
70 weight (Celestino et al., 2014; Chergo et al., 2007; Kurz et al., 2011; Phillips et al.,
71 2007; Provost et al., 2007) and addition of external loads (Dodd et al., 2003; McBurney
72 et al., 2003; Simão et al., 2014), is broadly used in research and clinical practice. This
73 method is often adopted for individuals with neurodevelopmental disorders during
74 steady-state gait training (Celestino et al., 2014; Chergo et al., 2007; Kurz et al., 2011;
75 Phillips et al., 2007; Provost et al., 2007; Simão et al., 2014). The evidence is less
76 robust for the effect of body weight modulation on the initiation of stair ascent.
77 Researchers have postulated the importance of analyzing this specific movement
78 because the first step up requires larger lower limb joint moments compared to
79 subsequent steps (Wang and Gillette, 2018). This analysis may be especially important
80 for pediatric clinical populations, for which a single step up can be a sensitive measure
81 of movement quality (Stania et al., 2017).

82 The handful of studies that have investigated lower limb moments of a step-up
83 task have all been in adults, and even fewer studies have explored the effect of load
84 modulation (Goyal et al., 2022; Wang and Gillette, 2018). It has been confirmed that
85 substantial hip abduction moments are necessary to maintain mediolateral stability and
86 considerable sagittal plane extensor moments are required to keep the body upright in
87 adults (Goyal et al., 2022; Novak and Brouwer, 2011; Wang and Gillette, 2018). There
88 is a need for a robust biomechanical model defining how these joint moments change
89 across multiple load conditions in a typical pediatric population, especially during single
90 limb stance where upright stability is most critical. This model would serve to

91 contextualize movement differences in pediatric populations with neurodevelopmental
92 disorders and highlight potential target areas for training during clinical therapy.

93 The purpose of this study was to investigate the effect of body weight load
94 modulation from -20% body weight (BW) to +15% BW in 5% increments on typical
95 pediatric lower limb joint moments during a step-up task. Based on previous literature,
96 we hypothesized that 1) extensor support moments would incrementally increase with
97 load during the stance phases of a step up, 2) hip abduction moments would
98 incrementally increase with load during the stance phases of a step up, and 3) the knee
99 and ankle joints would drive increases in extensor support moments. We also
100 performed a secondary analysis to understand the relationship between age and leg
101 length and the kinetic performance of a step-up task.

102 **Methods**

103 **I. Participant Summary**


104 Participants were recruited as a sample of convenience through word-of-mouth
105 and flyers. Individuals were included in the study if they were between the ages of 5-21
106 years with no known history of neurological or musculoskeletal concerns that would
107 affect their ambulation or ability to participate in the study. We sampled from a wide age
108 range to capture step-up performance across the pediatric population. This study was
109 approved by Northwestern University's Institutional Review Board. Participants under
110 the age of 18 provided verbal or written assent along with parent/guardian written
111 consent. Participants who were 18+ years provided informed written consent
112 themselves.

113 **II. Experimental Set-Up**

114 Participants performed a series of trials that involved stepping up onto a raised
115 platform. A 2x2 cluster of four force plates (AMTI, Watertown, MA) captured participant
116 ground reaction forces at a frequency of 1000 Hz. To independently capture joint
117 biomechanics from the right and left lower limbs, two 10.2-cm tall platforms were placed
118 on two side-by-side anterior force plates. We purposefully chose a low step height in
119 order to replicate this experiment in the future with pediatric clinical populations, who
120 may have a difficult time completing the protocol on a higher platform (Goyal et al.,
121 2022). A 10-camera motion capture system (Qualisys, Göteborg, Sweden) recorded
122 participant kinematics at a frequency of 100 Hz using a modified Cleveland Clinic
123 marker set (Kaufman et al., 2016). Markers were placed on thirty-four total landmarks of
124 the trunk (sternum, C7 vertebrae, T10 vertebrae), pelvis (sacrum, bilateral posterior
125 superior iliac spines), and lower extremities (bilateral greater trochanters, lateral femoral
126 epicondyles, lateral malleoli, calcanei, second and fifth metatarsals, and thigh and
127 shank four-marker clusters).

128 During step-up trials, participant body weight (BW) was modulated using the
129 Zero-G Bodyweight Support System (Aretch LLC, Ashburn, VA) to subtract weight or a
130 weighted vest to add weight. There were six total load conditions: three unweighted
131 conditions of -20%, -15%, and -10% of BW and three weighted conditions of +5%,
132 +10%, and +15% of BW. The weighted conditions were chosen based on loads
133 common for children's backpacks (Bryant and Bryant, 2014; Perrone et al., 2018).
134 Available weights included $\frac{1}{3}$, $\frac{2}{3}$, $\frac{1}{2}$, and 1-lb bars, which were distributed evenly
135 around the vest. The unweighted conditions represented a similar range to the weighted

136 conditions; we did not test a -5% condition due to technical limitations of the Zero-G,
137 which requires a minimum of 10 lbs to be removed from the user.



138 **Figure 1.** (A) The push-off stance phase of the step-up task, between leading foot lift-off
139 and leading foot initial contact with the step. (B) The pull-up stance phase of the step-up
140 task, between trailing foot lift-off and trailing foot initial contact with the step.
141

142 III. Experimental Protocol

143 Participants filled out the Waterloo Footedness Questionnaire – Revised (Elias et
144 al., 1998) and completed timed single-limb stance tests to determine lower limb
145 dominance. During the experiment, participants started in a standing position with their
146 feet split between the two force plates posterior to the platforms (Figure 1A).
147 Participants were instructed to step up onto the platforms at a self-selected walking
148 speed and, after a slight pause at the top, were instructed to step back down to the
149 starting position. Participants completed three blocks of trials, where they were
150 instructed to lead a series of step-ups with either their dominant foot or their non-

151 dominant foot. The first block was a no-load condition, where participants completed 15
152 steps per leading foot. The second and third blocks were randomized and consisted of
153 either weighted or unweighted conditions. Within these blocks, the load conditions were
154 randomized and participants completed 10 steps per leading foot. To ensure participant
155 safety and minimize fall risk, participants were connected to an overhead trolley with a
156 harness.

157 **III. Data Processing and Analysis**

158 Data were first visually inspected in Qualisys Track Manager (Qualisys,
159 Göteborg, Sweden) to verify that the markers were appropriately labeled. Data were
160 then imported into Visual 3D (C-Motion, Germantown, MD). Marker and ground reaction
161 force data were interpolated to fill in small gaps and filtered using a low-pass 4th-order
162 Butterworth filter with a 6 Hz cutoff frequency to remove high-frequency fluctuations
163 (Goyal et al., 2022). We performed inverse dynamics calculations in Visual 3D to
164 calculate hip, knee, and ankle joint moments in the sagittal and frontal plane. To
165 account for the step height during these calculations, the two corresponding force plates
166 were modified virtually to create raised force platforms. We used ground reaction force
167 data to identify four gait events occurring during each step-up: leading limb lift-off,
168 leading limb initial contact on the step, trailing limb lift-off, and trailing limb initial contact
169 on the step (Goyal et al., 2022).

170 Further processing was done in MATLAB (MathWorks, Inc., Natick, MA). We
171 identified hip abduction and extensor support moments (the sum of hip, knee, and ankle
172 sagittal plane moments). All joint moment data were divided by participant body weight
173 for comparison during statistical analyses. We plotted joint moment profiles for each

174 individual trial during two single-limb stance phases: 1) the push-off phase, between
175 leading foot lift-off and leading foot initial contact (Figure 1A) and 2) the pull-up phase,
176 between trailing foot lift-off and trailing foot initial contact (Figure 1B). Any trials that
177 were two standard deviations outside of the average stance phase length were not
178 considered for further analysis.

179 **IV. Statistical Analysis**

180 Statistical analysis was performed in Stata IC 14.1 (StataCorp LLC, College
181 Station, TX), and significance was set at $p < 0.05$. The push-off and pull-up stance
182 phases were considered separately in all statistical analyses. Visual inspection of the
183 histogram distributions of residuals was used to confirm the normality of the data. We
184 considered the outcome measures of peak hip abduction moments, peak support
185 moments, and individual hip, knee, and ankle percent contributions to peak support
186 moments. The latter was calculated by dividing hip, knee, and ankle moments at the
187 time of peak support moment by the peak support moment. For the no-load condition,
188 we ran mixed effects models to estimate the fixed effect of the limb dominance (2 levels:
189 dominant, non-dominant) and a random effect of participant on these outcomes. In a
190 secondary analysis, we also ran Pearson's correlations to evaluate the strength of the
191 relationships between peak moments and the continuous variables of age and leg
192 length.

193 For the six load conditions, peak hip abduction moments and peak support
194 moments were averaged and normalized to their average values in the no-load
195 condition to facilitate comparison across participants. We first ran a linear mixed effects
196 model to determine if there were differences between the dominant and non-dominant

197 limbs at each individual load level (interaction term). If not, the data were then
198 combined. Linear regressions were used on these outcome measures to determine the
199 relationship between normalized peak moments and load. For the outcome measures of
200 individual joint percent contributions to peak support moments, we used linear mixed
201 effects models with two fixed effects of load (-20%, -15%, -10%, 0%, +5%, +10%, and
202 +15% of BW) and limb (dominant, non-dominant) and a random effect of participant.
203 Bonferroni corrections were used to correct for multiple comparisons in post-hoc
204 analyses. In another secondary analysis, we calculated the individual slopes of peak
205 moments vs. load for each participant. We then ran Pearson's correlations between
206 these slopes and age and leg length.

207 **Results**


208 **I. Participant Metrics**

209 Fourteen individuals participated in the study (7 female). As the statistical
210 analysis included repeated measures for each participant, the average effective sample
211 size calculated was 25 participants. Thirteen participants were right-foot dominant and
212 one was left-foot dominant. Participant metrics included a mean age of 12.8 ± 4.2 years,
213 a mean weight of 53.2 ± 28.1 kg, and a mean height of 1.54 ± 0.19 m. Two participants
214 were unable to complete the +15% load condition because the calculated BW
215 percentage exceeded the available weights. Four participants were unable to complete
216 the -10% condition and one participant was unable to complete the -15% condition
217 because their weight was too low to meet the minimum weight removal requirements of
218 the Zero-G.


219 **II. Push-Off Phase**

220 For the no-load condition, the effect of limb dominance was not significant for any
221 outcome measures (Figure 2A). Average peak hip abduction moments were +0.730
222 Nm/kg and average peak support moments were -0.791 Nm/kg. There was a large
223 ankle plantarflexion contribution of 112% to peak support moments. This served to
224 offset a small hip flexion contribution of 3.81% and a small knee flexion contribution of
225 8.62%, resulting in a net extension moment.

226 There were no significant differences in normalized peak moments between the
227 dominant and non-dominant limbs at each individual load level. The linear relationship
228 between peak hip abduction moments and load was not significant in the push-off
229 stance phase. In contrast, the linear relationship between peak support moments and
230 load was significant ($p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.278$), with a coefficient of +0.817 and an intercept
231 of +0.973 (Figure 3A). As for individual percent contributions to peak support moments,
232 the effect of load was only significant for hip percent contributions to peak support
233 moments ($p = 0.001$). However, there were no significant pairwise comparisons (Figure
234 4A, 4C, 4E).



235
 236 **Figure 2.** Representative kinetic (A and C) and kinematic (B and D) profiles from one
 237 participant during a no-load step up for the trailing leg (A and B) and the leading leg (C
 238 and D). On each x-axis, 0% corresponds to the start of a step-up trial at leading leg lift-
 239 off while 100% corresponds to the end of the trial at trailing leg initial contact with the
 240 step. On each y-axis, a positive magnitude indicates joint flexion/abduction while a
 241 negative magnitude indicates joint extension/adduction. Average hip abduction
 242 moments are in red. Individual lower limb sagittal plane moments are in gray, including
 243 the hip (gray dash), knee (gray dash-dot), and ankle (gray dot). The sum of these
 244 individual joint moments equals the extensor support moments shown in blue. Shaded
 245 regions represent one standard deviation. The black boxes on plots A and C indicate
 246 the push-off and pull-up stance phases, respectively.
 247



248
 249 **Figure 3.** Peak support moments vs. load for the (A) push-off and (B) pull-up stance
 250 phases. All values are divided by their respective values in the no-load condition. The
 251 linear regression for both stance phases showed a significant relationship between the


252 two variables, with $y = 0.817x + 0.973$ for the push-off phase ($R^2 = 0.278$) and $y =$
253 $0.933x + 1.02$ for the pull-up phase ($R^2 = 0.498$).

254 **III. Pull-Up Phase**

255 The effect of limb dominance was not significant for any outcome measures in
256 the no-load condition (Figure 2C). Average peak hip abduction moments were +0.607
257 Nm/kg and average peak support moments were -1.20 Nm/kg. Average individual joint
258 percent contributions to peak support moments were 15.9% hip extension, 66.5% knee
259 extension, and 17.6% ankle plantarflexion.

260 There were no significant differences in normalized peak moments between the
261 dominant and non-dominant limbs at each individual load level. The linear relationship
262 between peak hip abduction moments and load was again not significant in the pull-up
263 stance phase. In contrast, the linear relationship between peak support moments and
264 load was significant ($p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.498$), with a coefficient of +0.933 and an intercept
265 of +1.02 (Figure 3B).

266 The effect of load was significant for hip and knee percent contributions to peak
267 support moments (both $p < 0.001$). Pairwise comparisons revealed that hip contributions
268 were significantly larger for +0%, +5%, +10%, and +15% compared to -20%, -15%, and
269 -10%, while knee contributions were significantly larger for -20%, -15%, and -10%
270 compared to +0% +5%, +10%, and +15% ($p < 0.001$ for all). Despite these opposing
271 changes, the knee remained the primary contributor to peak support moments across all
272 load conditions (Figure 4B, 4D, 4F). The interaction between limb dominance and load
273 was also significant for knee percent contributions ($p = 0.003$). There were no significant
274 pairwise comparisons between the dominant and non-dominant limbs at each individual
275 load level (supplementary materials S1).




276
277
278
279
280
281
282

Figure 4. Individual hip (orange), knee (yellow), and ankle (green) percent contributions to peak extensor support moment at the time of peak support moment for all loading conditions. A negative percent contribution represents a joint moment in flexion, while a positive percent contribution represents a joint moment in extension. Significant pairwise comparisons are shown by black brackets (corrected $p < 0.001$).

283 **IV. Secondary Analyses: Age & Leg Length**

284 As there was no significant effect of limb dominance on peak moments, the
285 values for the dominant and non-dominant lower limbs were collapsed for the secondary
286 analyses. For the no-load condition, Pearson's correlation analysis between peak hip
287 abduction moments and age was significant in the push-off ($r = +0.830$, $p < 0.001$) and
288 pull-up stance phases ($r = +0.833$, $p < 0.001$). This analysis was also significant between
289 peak hip abduction moments and leg length in push-off ($r = +0.753$, $p < 0.001$) and pull-
290 up ($r = +0.770$, $p < 0.001$). In summary, the magnitude of peak hip abduction increased
291 with age and with leg length (Figure 5A, 5B). Pearson's correlation analysis was
292 significant between peak support moments and age in the push-off ($r = +0.304$,
293 $p < 0.001$) and pull-up stance phases ($r = +0.358$, $p < 0.001$). This analysis was also
294 significant between peak support moments and leg length in push-off ($r = +0.265$,
295 $p < 0.001$) and pull-up ($r = +0.217$, $p < 0.001$). The magnitude of peak support moment
296 decreased with age and leg length (Figure 5C, 5D). For the load conditions, there were
297 no significant correlations between the individual participant slopes of peak moments
298 vs. load and age and leg length.



299
300 **Figure 5.** Peak hip abduction moments (red) and peak support moments (blue) vs. age
301 for the no-load condition during the push-off and pull-up stance phases. Each point
302 represents an individual no-load trial. All moment values are divided by participant
303 weight, and colored arrows on the far left show the direction of increasing moment
304 magnitude. Pearson's correlation was significant for all relationships, with r-values of (A)
305 +0.830, (B) +0.833, (C) +0.304, and (D) +0.358. Results indicate that the magnitude of
306 peak hip abduction increases with age, while the magnitude of peak support moment
307 decreases with age.

308 Discussion

309 We investigated the effect of modulating body weight load from -20% to +15% on
310 lower limb biomechanical strategies in pediatric individuals during a step-up task. There
311 was a positive linear relationship between peak support moments and load in the push-
312 off and pull-up stance phases, where these moments scaled with load. There was no
313 relationship between peak hip abduction moments and load in either stance phase.
314 While the ankle and knee were the primary contributors to the support moments, the hip
315 contributed more than expected during weighted conditions in the pull-up phase. In a

316 secondary analysis, we also found a significant positive correlation between peak hip
317 abduction moments and age and leg length during the no-load condition.

318 Peak hip abduction moments during the no-load condition of our step-up task
319 were similar to what has been reported in stair ascent (Novak and Brouwer, 2013, 2011;
320 Strutzenberger et al., 2011). Our hypothesis that hip abduction moments would
321 incrementally increase with load in both stance phases of a step-up task was not
322 supported. Contrary to our results, significant increases in hip abduction moments
323 between no-load and +20% of BW have been quantified during the initial step up in
324 adults (Wang and Gillette, 2018). Hip abductor muscle activations have also been
325 shown to significantly increase between -30% of body weight and no-load during regular
326 gait (Mun et al., 2017). One possible explanation for our findings may be that hip
327 abduction moments generated in the no-load condition were at a magnitude that
328 supported mediolateral stability across all loading conditions. Alternatively, participants
329 may have altered their stepping behavior during unweighted conditions, similar to what
330 has been seen in adults during treadmill walking (Dragunas and Gordon, 2016). It would
331 be interesting to use these results as a comparator to outcome measures for pediatric
332 populations with conditions such as patellofemoral pain syndrome, where the hip
333 abductors are weak (Xie et al., 2023).

334 Peak support moments during the no-load condition of our step-up task were
335 slightly lower than what has been reported in stair ascent (Novak and Brouwer, 2013,
336 2011; Strutzenberger et al., 2011), most likely due to the lower step height in our study.
337 Supporting our hypothesis, peak support moments significantly increased with load
338 incrementally in both stance phases of a step-up task. Previous studies quantifying

339 peak vertical ground reaction forces during the push-off and pull-up phases of stair
340 ascent within narrow ranges of load modulation are consistent with our results
341 (Bannwart et al., 2019; Hong and Li, 2005). This experimental paradigm may be
342 beneficial for gait rehabilitation approaches targeting the lower limb extensors,
343 particularly for individuals with cerebral palsy who have weak lower limb extensors
344 (Wiley and Damiano, 1998). Hip, knee, and ankle percent contributions to peak support
345 moments can reveal which joints are driving these changes in response to load.

346 The effect of load modulation on individual sagittal plane moments were
347 expected in the push-off phase and unexpected in the pull-up phase. Similar to stair
348 ascent, ankle plantarflexion moments contributed the most to extensor support
349 moments in the push-off phase of a no-load step-up task (McFadyen and Winter, 1988;
350 Nadeau et al., 2003; Novak and Brouwer, 2011; Riener et al., 2002). Our results also
351 suggest that ankle moments scaled with peak support moments to remain the primary
352 contributor in the push-off phase across all load conditions. Indeed, the ankle has been
353 shown to be the most responsive joint to changes in body weight support (Goldberg and
354 Stanhope, 2013). In contrast, the knee is primarily responsible for vertical progression of
355 the body during stair negotiation (Costigan et al., 2002; McFadyen and Winter, 1988;
356 Nadeau et al., 2003; Novak and Brouwer, 2011; Riener et al., 2002). This was observed
357 in our calculated knee extension moments during the pull-up phase of a no-load step-up
358 task. Though knee moments remained the primary contributor to peak support moments
359 in this phase across all load conditions, these moments decreased when body weight
360 support was removed while hip extension moments proportionally increased. This
361 unexpected strategy may have been used to prevent overloading of the knee joint,

362 which can operate as high as 72% of maximum capacity during regular stair climbing in
363 young adults (Reeves et al., 2009). The hip and knee work in tandem during pull-up
364 (Riener et al., 2002), which may explain why the redistribution of extensor moments in
365 the weighted block is towards the hip. Using a step-up task with body weight support
366 may be useful for clinical interventions focused on strength and control of the knee and
367 ankle joints in pediatric populations with weaker distal joints, such as individuals with
368 cerebral palsy (Fowler et al., 2010; Wiley and Damiano, 1998). Alternatively, adding
369 external loads to a step-up task may be a worthwhile approach to train the hip joint in
370 pediatric populations such as adolescent athletes.

371 The magnitude of peak hip abduction moments increased with age and with leg
372 length in both stance phases. It is possible that step width may be driving this positive
373 correlation. Three lines of evidence support this suggestion: 1) step width increases with
374 age in children (Gill et al., 2016), 2) wider step widths increase the mediolateral moment
375 arm (Henderson et al., 2011), and 3) the mediolateral moment arm is positively
376 correlated with peak hip abduction moments (Vistamehr and Neptune, 2021). In
377 contrast, the magnitude of peak support moments slightly decreased with age and with
378 leg length in both stance phases, indicating that younger children with shorter limbs
379 used more relative extension moments to complete a step-up task. It's possible that
380 younger children are still exploring how to optimize gait and therefore generating more
381 extension than necessary to complete the task (Frost et al., 1997). For all participants,
382 the step height was approximately 10-19% of their leg length; children with shorter lower
383 limbs may have generated larger extension moments to complete a step up at a
384 relatively larger step height. Age and leg length did not play a factor in the slopes of

385 peak joint moments vs. load, suggesting that all participants had similar strategies when
386 responding to different loads. It may be that the biomechanics of responding to load are
387 developed at a young age and maintained through adolescence.

388 In summary, our study developed a model of the effect of load modulation from -
389 20% to +15% of BW on typical pediatric lower limb joint moments during a step-up task.
390 Limitations of the study include the resolution of load, the self-selected speed of each
391 participant, and the placement of some reflective markers on tight-fitting clothes rather
392 than directly on skin. One future direction is comparing this model to pediatric clinical
393 populations to describe the possible effects of atypical development or injuries and the
394 potential impact from interventions. Another future direction is translating the experiment
395 to a more natural environment, which includes testing participants without a harness
396 and varying the step height.

397

398 **Acknowledgements**

399 The authors would like to sincerely thank our research participants and their families for
400 their efforts and enthusiasm. We would also like to thank Tara Cornwell and Keri Han
401 for their help in experimental design and data analysis. This work was supported by the
402 American Heart Association [grant number 908832] to VG, National Institutes of Health
403 [grant number T32 HD007418] to VG, and a Northwestern University Department of
404 Biomedical Engineering Summer Undergraduate Research Award. The funding sources
405 had no role in the study design; in the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data; in
406 the writing of manuscript; and in the decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

407

408 **Conflict of Interest Statement**

409 The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

410

411 **References**

412 Bannwart, M., Rohland, E., Easthope, C.A., Rauter, G., Bolliger, M., 2019. Robotic body

413 weight support enables safe stair negotiation in compliance with basic locomotor

414 principles. *J. Neuroeng. Rehabil.* 16. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12984-019-0631-8>

415 Bryant, B.P., Bryant, J.B., 2014. Relative Weights of the Backpacks of Elementary-Aged

416 Children. *J. Sch. Nurs.* 30, 19–23. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059840513495417>

417 Celestino, M.L., Gama, G.L., Longuinho, G.S.C., Fugita, M., Barela, A.M.F., 2014.

418 Influence of body weight unloading and support surface during walking of children

419 with cerebral palsy. *Fisioter. em Mov.* 27, 591–599. <https://doi.org/10.1590/0103->

420 5150.027.004.ao11

421 Cherng, R.J., Liu, C.F., Lau, T.W., Hong, R. Bin, 2007. Effect of treadmill training with

422 body weight support on gait and gross motor function in children with spastic

423 cerebral palsy. *Am. J. Phys. Med. Rehabil.* 86, 548–555.

424 <https://doi.org/10.1097/PHM.0b013e31806dc302>

425 Costigan, P.A., Deluzio, K.J., Wyss, U.P., 2002. Knee and hip kinetics during normal

426 stair climbing. *Gait Posture* 16, 31–37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/S0966->

427 6362(01)00201-6

428 Dodd, K.J., Taylor, N.F., Graham, H.K., 2003. A randomized clinical trial of strength

429 training in young people with cerebral palsy. *Dev. Med. Child Neurol.* 45, 652–657.

430 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0012162203001221>

- 431 Dragunas, A.C., Gordon, K.E., 2016. Body weight support impacts lateral stability during
432 treadmill walking. *J. Biomech.* 49, 2662–2668.
433 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2016.05.026>
- 434 Elias, L.J., Bryden, M.P., Bulman-Fleming, M.B., 1998. Footedness is a better predictor
435 than is handedness of emotional lateralization. *Neuropsychologia* 36, 37–43.
436 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0028-3932\(97\)00107-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0028-3932(97)00107-3)
- 437 Fowler, E.G., Staudt, L.A., Greenberg, M.B., 2010. Lower-extremity selective voluntary
438 motor control in patients with spastic cerebral palsy: Increased distal motor
439 impairment. *Dev. Med. Child Neurol.* 52, 264–269. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8749.2009.03586.x)
440 [8749.2009.03586.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8749.2009.03586.x)
- 441 Frost, G., Dowling, J., Dyson, K., Bar-Or, O., 1997. Cocontraction in three age groups of
442 children during treadmill locomotion. *J. Electromyogr. Kinesiol.* 7, 179–186.
443 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1050-6411\(97\)84626-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1050-6411(97)84626-3)
- 444 Gill, S. V., Keimig, S., Kelty-Stephen, D., Hung, Y.C., DeSilva, J.M., 2016. The
445 relationship between foot arch measurements and walking parameters in children.
446 *BMC Pediatr.* 16, 2. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12887-016-0554-5>
- 447 Goldberg, S.J., Stanhope, S.J., 2013. Sensitivity of joint moments to changes in walking
448 speed and body-weight-support are interdependent and vary across joints. *J.*
449 *Biomech.* 46, 1176–1183.
- 450 Goyal, V., Dragunas, A., Askew, R.L., Sukal-Moulton, T., López-Rosado, R., 2022.
451 Altered biomechanical strategies of the paretic hip and knee joints during a step-up
452 task. *Top. Stroke Rehabil.* 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10749357.2021.2008596>
- 453 Henderson, E.R., Marulanda, G.A., Cheong, D., Temple, H.T., Letson, G.D., 2011. Hip

454 abductor moment arm - a mathematical analysis for proximal femoral replacement.
455 J. Orthop. Surg. Res. 6, 6. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1749-799X-6-6>

456 Hong, Y., Li, J.X., 2005. Influence of load and carrying methods on gait phase and
457 ground reactions in children's stair walking. Gait Posture 22, 63–68.
458 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2004.07.001>

459 Kaufman, K., Miller, E., Kingsbury, T., Russell Esposito, E., Wolf, E., Wilken, J., Wyatt,
460 M., 2016. Reliability of 3D gait data across multiple laboratories. Gait Posture 49,
461 375–381. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2016.07.075>

462 Kurz, M.J., Stuberger, W., Dejong, S.L., 2011. Body weight supported treadmill training
463 improves the regularity of the stepping kinematics in children with cerebral palsy.
464 Dev. Neurorehabil. 14, 87–93. <https://doi.org/10.3109/17518423.2011.552459>

465 McBurney, H., Taylor, N.F., Dodd, K.J., Graham, H.K., 2003. A qualitative analysis of
466 the benefits of strength training for young people with cerebral palsy. Dev. Med.
467 Child Neurol. 45, 658–663. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0012162203001233>

468 McFadyen, B.J., Winter, D.A., 1988. An integrated biomechanical analysis of normal
469 stair ascent and descent. J. Biomech. 21, 733–744. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-](https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9290(88)90282-5)
470 [9290\(88\)90282-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9290(88)90282-5)

471 Mun, K.R., Lim, S. Bin, Guo, Z., Yu, H., 2017. Biomechanical effects of body weight
472 support with a novel robotic walker for over-ground gait rehabilitation. Med. Biol.
473 Eng. Comput. 55, 315–326. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11517-016-1515-8>

474 Nadeau, S., McFadyen, B.J., Malouin, F., 2003. Frontal and sagittal plane analyses of
475 the stair climbing task in healthy adults aged over 40 years: What are the
476 challenges compared to level walking? Clin. Biomech. 18, 950–959.

- 477 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0268-0033\(03\)00179-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0268-0033(03)00179-7)
- 478 Novak, A.C., Brouwer, B., 2013. Kinematic and kinetic evaluation of the stance phase of
479 stair ambulation in persons with stroke and healthy adults: A pilot study. *J. Appl.*
480 *Biomech.* 29, 443–452. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jab.29.4.443>
- 481 Novak, A.C., Brouwer, B., 2011. Sagittal and frontal lower limb joint moments during
482 stair ascent and descent in young and older adults. *Gait Posture* 33, 54–60.
483 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2010.09.024>
- 484 Perrone, M., Orr, R., Hing, W., Milne, N., Pope, R., 2018. The impact of backpack loads
485 on school children: A critical narrative review. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* 15,
486 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph15112529>
- 487 Phillips, J.P., Sullivan, K.J., Burtner, P.A., Caprihan, A., Provost, B., Bernitsky-
488 beddingfield, A., 2007. Ankle dorsiflexion fMRI in children with cerebral palsy
489 undergoing intensive body-weight-supported treadmill training: A pilot study. *Dev.*
490 *Med. Child Neurol.* 49, 39–44. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0012162207000102.x>
- 491 Provost, B., Dieruf, K., Burtner, P.A., Phillips, J.P., Bernitsky-Beddingfield, A., Sullivan,
492 K.J., Bowen, C.A., Toser, L., 2007. Endurance and gait in children with cerebral
493 palsy after intensive body weight-supported treadmill training. *Pediatr. Phys. Ther.*
494 19, 2–10. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.pep.0000249418.25913.a3>
- 495 Reeves, N.D., Spanjaard, M., Mohagheghi, A.A., Baltzopoulos, V., Maganaris, C.N.,
496 2009. Older adults employ alternative strategies to operate within their maximum
497 capabilities when ascending stairs. *J. Electromyogr. Kinesiol.* 19, e57–e68.
498 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jelekin.2007.09.009>
- 499 Riener, R., Rabuffetti, M., Frigo, C., 2002. Stair ascent and descent at different

- 500 inclinations. *Gait Posture* 15, 32–44.
- 501 Simão, C.R., Galvão, É.R.V.P., Fonseca, D.O. da S., Bezerra, D.A., Andrade, A.C. de,
502 Lindquist, A.R.R., 2014. Effects of adding load to the gait of children with cerebral
503 palsy: a three-case report. *Fisioter. e Pesqui.* 21, 67–73.
504 <https://doi.org/10.1590/1809-2950/470210114>
- 505 Stania, M., Sarat-Spek, A., Blacha, T., Kazek, B., Slomka, K.J., Emich-Widera, E.,
506 Juras, G., 2017. Step-initiation deficits in children with faulty posture diagnosed with
507 neurodevelopmental disorders during infancy. *Front. Pediatr.* 5, 1–7.
508 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fped.2017.00239>
- 509 Strutzenberger, G., Richter, A., Schneider, M., Mündermann, A., Schwameder, H.,
510 2011. Effects of obesity on the biomechanics of stair-walking in children. *Gait*
511 *Posture* 34, 119–125. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2011.03.025>
- 512 Vistamehr, A., Neptune, R.R., 2021. Differences in balance control between healthy
513 younger and older adults during steady-state walking. *J. Biomech.* 128, 110717.
514 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2021.110717>
- 515 Wang, J., Gillette, J.C., 2018. Carrying asymmetric loads during stair negotiation:
516 Loaded limb stance vs. unloaded limb stance. *Gait Posture* 64, 213–219.
517 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2018.06.113>
- 518 Wiley, M.E., Damiano, D.L., 1998. Lower-Extremity strength profiles in spastic cerebral
519 palsy. *Dev. Med. Child Neurol.* 40, 100–107. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8749.1998.tb15369.x)
520 8749.1998.tb15369.x
- 521 Xie, P., István, B., Liang, M., 2023. The Relationship between Patellofemoral Pain
522 Syndrome and Hip Biomechanics: A Systematic Review with Meta-Analysis.

523 Healthc. 11. <https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare11010099>

524