

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

1 **Zainab Altai^{a,b*}, Andrew T.M. Phillips^c, Jason Moran^a, Xiaojun Zhai^d, Qichang Mei^{e,f,g}, Bernard**
2 **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

6 ^c Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Imperial College London, London, United
7 Kingdom

8 ^d School of Computer Science and Electronic Engineering, University of Essex, United Kingdom

9 ^e Faculty of Sports Science, Ningbo University, Ningbo, China.

10 ^f Research Academy of Grand Health, Ningbo University, Ningbo, China.

11 ^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 za21920@essex.ac.uk; 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
26 patients. This study aims to identify effective exercises for enhancing bone health and develop a neural
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,
31 and low. Results showed that running at all intensities produced significantly higher strains compared
32 to walking ($1985 \pm 802 \mu\epsilon$ tensile, $5053 \pm 181 \mu\epsilon$ compressive, $p < 0.001$), with peak tensile strains
33 reaching $3731 \mu\epsilon$ and compressive strains up to $9541 \mu\epsilon$. Low-intensity unilateral hopping also yielded
34 significantly higher strains ($3003 \mu\epsilon$, $p < 0.001$) than walking, suggesting its osteogenic potential. In
35 contrast, squat jumps, countermovement jumps, and bilateral hopping generated lower peak strains.
36 The neural network model demonstrated high prediction accuracy, achieving correlations up to 0.97
37 and root mean square errors as low as $145.20 \mu\epsilon$. 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

41 Femoral neck fractures are the most common osteoporotic fractures, leading to high morbidity and
42 mortality rates, with 50% of patients losing independent mobility and up to 30% mortality within six
43 months^{1,2}. Additionally, the related costs place a significant strain on healthcare systems. The number
44 of men and women at high risk of experiencing a major osteoporotic fracture is projected to increase
45 from 157 million in 2010 to 319 million by 2040³. Therefore, reducing the risk of osteoporotic hip
46 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
49 and jumping, are particularly promising for stimulating femoral neck adaptation^{5,6}. It has been reported
50 that normal walking⁷ is not associated with bone mineral density (BMD) changes in the femoral neck
51 whereas jogging combined with walking⁸, running, and jumping^{9,10} were the most effective in
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
55 traditional low-intensity approaches, which prioritize safety^{11,12}. A comprehensive meta-analysis
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 lumbar spine and femoral neck in
59 postmenopausal women. The analysis revealed that high-intensity exercise was significantly more
60 effective in increasing lumbar spine BMD compared to moderate- and low-intensity exercises, with
61 mean differences of 0.031 g/cm², 0.012 g/cm², and 0.010 g/cm², respectively¹². However, at the femoral
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.
66 Previous computational modeling studies have simulated the femoral neck response to various
67 exercises, represented by mechanical strains, enabling the ranking of exercises based on their
68 osteogenic potential¹⁴. The osteogenic response is triggered in areas where strain exceeds habitual
69 loading levels, typically associated with normal walking^{15,16}. A review by Martelli et al.¹⁴ reported that
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
72 by the same author found that vertical and squat jumps produced lower femoral neck strains than
73 walking, while one-leg long jumps resulted in higher strains¹⁶. These inconsistent findings highlight
74 potential concerns regarding the impact of high-intensity exercises on joint health, raising safety
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.

78 Currently, no clinical method exists to directly measure the in-vivo mechanical response of the femoral
79 neck for a certain type of locomotion. In biomechanical research, the “gold standard” non-invasive
80 approach for predicting femoral neck response (strains) is musculoskeletal modeling (MSK) combined
81 with finite element analysis (FE)^{16–22}. The coupled MSK-FE model integrates two critical types of data:
82 (1) three-dimensional (3D) bone architecture and density from medical imaging, such as computed
83 tomography (CT) or magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), for the FE modeling component, and (2)
84 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
86 models have the potential to significantly enhance fracture risk assessments, guide more effective
87 treatment strategies, and improve rehabilitation protocols for clinicians, practitioners, and
88 physiotherapists^{23,24}. However, the MSK-FE method is resource-intensive, requiring specialized
89 equipment, expertise, and considerable time, make it unsuitable for routine clinical use. Therefore,
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).

93 Machine learning has become a leading technological trend in recent biomechanical research²⁵. The
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
98 units (IMU))²⁶, requiring less expert intervention and eliminating the need for expensive equipment.
99 Multiple machine learning studies have estimated ground reaction force (GRF)^{27,28}, joint moments<sup>29–
100 34</sup>, and internal joint forces^{35,36} during various locomotion tasks, using measures such as accelerations
101 and gyroscopes that are (or can be) measured by IMU sensors. Wouda et al.²⁷ used an artificial neural
102 network to estimate vertical GRF during running using accelerations and lower limb joint angles. The
103 network demonstrated a high correlation (>0.90) with the actual GRF time series. Guo et al.²⁸ used
104 Nonlinear System Identification (NARMAX) model from directly measured acceleration data without
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
107 a neural network with two hidden layers, similar to Wouda et al.²⁷, to estimate knee joint forces during
108 various exercises, including walking, running at different speeds, cutting maneuvers, one-leg jump,
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
112 respectively (Stetter et al., 2019). Matijevich et al.³⁶ estimated peak tibial force during running using
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
118 study by Haribaba and Basu³⁷ evaluated various machine learning models, including neural networks,
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
134 statistical differences in the predicted strains compared to normal walking at a self-selected speed.
135 Exercises that produce significantly higher strains than walking are considered more effective for
136 promoting bone health, assuming that osteogenic responses occur where exercise induced strain
137 surpasses that of regular walking^{14,15}. The second aim of the study is to develop a neural network using
138 XCM architecture model capable of estimating femoral neck strains during various ballistic exercises
139 using IMU sensors data represented by acceleration and gyroscope measurements. While previous
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
144 on prediction accuracy has not been discussed yet³⁸. Therefore, we further investigate the effect of
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
150 rely on expensive data and specialized expertise, and open new possibilities for using these predictions
151 in clinical settings, potentially aiding in the design of effective preventive interventions, such as
152 exercise regimes targeting bone health enhancement.

153 **2. Material and methods**


154 *2.1. Participants and data collection and processing*

155 Motion capture and musculoskeletal data of the current study has been used from our previously
156 published study³⁹ (first article of this series). In summary, a cohort of forty (20 males and 20 females)
157 active participants were recruited with age range of 18 to 70 years old (mean \pm SD: age of 40.3 ± 13.1
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
163 of walking, running, countermovement jump, squat jump, unilateral hopping, and bilateral hopping
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

182 Seven Blue Trident IMU sensors (Vicon Motion Systems Ltd, Oxford, UK, 225Hz, filtered at 200 Hz
183 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

189 Figure 1. Framework followed in this study to predict the femoral neck strains using 1) typical
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
196 dimensional geometry of the femur and muscle and joint forces estimated by the musculoskeletal model
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).

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

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

208 2.2. *Musculoskeletal models*

209 A generic musculoskeletal model (gait2392)⁴⁰ was modified by removing the torso and associated
210 muscles (Figure 1 (B1)). Details of the musculoskeletal models can be found in Altai et al.³⁹. In
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
220 directions were determined using the muscle force direction plugin in OpenSim⁴². Muscle force
221 directions together with muscle forces from static optimization were used to calculate muscle force
222 components in x, y, and z. Hip, knee and ankle contact forces were calculated using joint reaction
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)
228 Client software⁴⁴, which contains data from the Victorian Institute of Forensic Medicine (Melbourne,
229 VIC, Australia). Using a generic lower-body shape model from the database, the full femur position
230 and general size (surface mesh) were reconstructed from the anatomical landmarks of the participant's
231 motion capture data following the method described in Zhang et al.⁴⁴. First, a generic whole lower body
232 shape model was registered to the marker set defined in the static trial. Then, the atlas femur mesh was
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
238 modulus of 18.6 MPa and a 0.3 Poisson's ratio⁴⁶. Figure 1 (C1) summarize the steps for generating the
239 finite element model.

240 Muscle forces were estimated by the musculoskeletal models and applied to the finite element model
241 as point loads at the external surface of the femur. A list of included muscles can be found in Table
242 3.SM. in the supplementary materials. The location of the attachment points of each muscle was
243 estimated by the musculoskeletal model and used to allocate the point of application of the force in the
244 finite element model. Forces were then applied at the closest surface mesh node to the point of
245 application estimated by the musculoskeletal model^{20,21}. The distance between the point of application
246 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
250 estimated by the musculoskeletal model was not disturbed. The most distal node of the medial condyle
251 was fixed in all directions, while the displacement of the most distal node at the lateral condyle was
252 constrained in the anterior-posterior and vertical (superior-inferior) directions. A third node in the
253 patella groove was constrained anteroposteriorly^{20,47}. These constraints were chosen to replicate the
254 basic movements involved in the tested exercises, which are flexion-extension and rotation at the hip
255 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
258 joint contact force curve as well as the first and last timesteps, ensuring full coverage of the trial period.
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
261 local effects of the load⁴⁹. The location of the peak strains within the femoral neck region was also
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
268 dataset (2 variables represented by first and third principal strains) for the neural network model, while
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 $1729 \times 42 \times 101$, 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 $1729 \times 2 \times 101$, 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.

281 To assess the ability of the neural network to predict femoral neck strains for all tested exercises using
282 a reduced number of IMU sensors, a subset of the predictor dataset was generated. This included data
283 of three sensors (right thigh, left thigh, and trunk). The predictor subset data was also organized into a
284 3D array shape $1729 \times 18 \times 101$ (18 variables represented by accelerations and gyroscope of three IMU
285 sensors in three directions x, y, and z) while the outcome dataset was kept the same with 2D array
286 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
293 time and captures the interaction between different time series. The output feature maps from these
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 ($r \leq 0.35$), moderate ($0.35 < r \leq 0.67$), strong ($0.67 < r \leq 0.90$)
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

329 Exercises with various intensity levels were ranked with respect to the averaged peak first principal
330 strain and averaged peak third principal strain (in macrostrains ($\times 10^6$)) of the femoral neck predicted
331 by MSK-FE as shown in Figure 2. Exercises with a significant difference ($p < 0.05$) compared to
332 habitual walking at self-selected speed were marked with an asterisk. The estimates of the lower and
333 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
 335 of the average peak values for the first and third principal strains over the entire trial period for each
 336 exercise type and intensity level are reported in Table 1.



337

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


344 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
 346 body weight, and of the peak first (e1) and third (e3) principal strains at the femoral neck predicted by
 347 the MSK-FE models for various exercise types and levels.

Exercise	vGRF	JCFhip	e1 ($\mu\epsilon$)	e3 ($\mu\epsilon$)
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

348 Not all exercises demonstrated statistically significant differences in predicted peak strains compared
 349 to walking. Only running at all three intensity levels—fast speed 5.26 m/sec (3731 ± 1472 $\mu\epsilon$ and 9541
 350 ± 3610 $\mu\epsilon$ for first and third principal strains, respectively), moderate speed 4.25 m/sec (3534 ± 1197

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

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




375

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


378 3.2. Strains predicted by neural network model

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



385

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).



389

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

392

393 Table 2. Performance of XCM neural network in predicting first and third principal strains using two
 394 datasets: 1) data of seven IMU sensors, and 2) data of three IMU sensors, relative differences between
 395 the two also reported.

Task	e1 ($\mu\epsilon$)			e3 ($\mu\epsilon$)		
	RMSE	relRMSE (%)	r	RMSE	relRMSE (%)	r
1) Using seven IMU sensors						
Walking	182.85 \pm 104.81	8.96 \pm 3.80	0.96 \pm 0.04	381.37 \pm 119.22	8.01 \pm 2.25	0.97 \pm 0.02
Running	550.70 \pm 412.97	17.86 \pm 12.13	0.83 \pm 0.27	1278.70 \pm 797.85	16.51 \pm 11.07	0.84 \pm 0.26
Unilateral Hopping	309.18 \pm 164.55	14.02 \pm 9.74	0.95 \pm 0.13	841.99 \pm 578.01	14.22 \pm 11.05	0.95 \pm 0.08
Bilateral Hopping	169.15 \pm 96.73	24.26 \pm 15.06	0.81 \pm 0.25	452.68 \pm 255.16	25.36 \pm 15.02	0.83 \pm 0.20
Counter Jumps	145.20 \pm 75.02	14.96 \pm 11.34	0.93 \pm 0.11	400.26 \pm 233.87	16.37 \pm 12.41	0.88 \pm 0.22
Squat Jumps	238.84 \pm 300.41	23.52 \pm 16.64	0.80 \pm 0.21	522.66 \pm 719.28	22.64 \pm 15.64	0.78 \pm 0.26
Mean	278.70 \pm 281.05	18.21 \pm 13.58	0.87 \pm 0.21	683.61 \pm 641.99	18.22 \pm 13.55	0.86 \pm 0.22
2) Using three IMU sensors						
Walking	220.48 \pm 124.98	10.73 \pm 4.11	0.95 \pm 0.04	446.26 \pm 110.66	9.78 \pm 4.01	0.94 \pm 0.07
Running	531.22 \pm 363.79	17.08 \pm 11.27	0.85 \pm 0.22	1532.62 \pm 1026.49	19.49 \pm 12.18	0.81 \pm 0.25
Unilateral Hopping	333.26 \pm 240.89	14.05 \pm 9.87	0.95 \pm 0.10	898.75 \pm 453.46	14.99 \pm 7.88	0.93 \pm 0.13
Bilateral Hopping	191.70 \pm 120.74	25.94 \pm 13.76	0.81 \pm 0.21	507.65 \pm 295.52	28.55 \pm 15.81	0.78 \pm 0.26
Counter Jumps	156.78 \pm 94.28	15.47 \pm 11.39	0.92 \pm 0.17	437.26 \pm 224.95	18.80 \pm 14.24	0.87 \pm 0.19
Squat Jumps	248.91 \pm 298.53	23.43 \pm 13.30	0.79 \pm 0.18	623.66 \pm 749.58	27.25 \pm 18.78	0.72 \pm 0.28
Mean	289.85 \pm 274.46	18.55 \pm 12.98	0.87 \pm 0.19	783.52 \pm 728.63	20.95 \pm 14.91	0.83 \pm 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
 398 and when using data from a reduced set of three IMU sensors (Table 2). When using data from seven
 399 IMU sensors, the highest correlation for the first and third principal strain was observed for walking (r
 400 $= 0.96 \pm 0.04$ and $r = 0.97 \pm 0.04$, respectively) and for unilateral hopping ($r = 0.95 \pm 0.13$ and $r = 0.95$
 401 ± 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 ($r = 0.80 \pm 0.21$ and $r = 0.78 \pm 0.26$,
 403 respectively). Across all exercises, the RMSE for first principal strains ranged between 145.20 ± 75.02
 404 $\mu\epsilon$ (counter movement jump) and $550.70 \pm 412.97 \mu\epsilon$ (running), whereas for third principal strains,
 405 that was between $400.26 \pm 233.87 \mu\epsilon$ (counter movement jump) and $1278.70 \pm 797.85 \mu\epsilon$ (running).
 406 The relRMSE ranged between $8.96 \pm 3.80\%$ (walking) and $24.26 \pm 15.06\%$ (bilateral hopping) for the

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
435 intensity), did not show statistically significant differences compared to walking, yet still produced
436 higher strain values. The reduced strain in faster hopping was associated with lower ground reaction
437 forces and joint contact forces (Table 1) compared to slower hopping which may explain the reduction
438 in the strain values. Our findings align with previous studies¹⁵⁻¹⁷. Similar trends were observed by
439 Pellikaan et al.¹⁵ with peak femoral neck strains during unilateral hopping and various running speeds
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 $\mu\epsilon$ at 2.5 m/sec) compared to our
442 prediction (tensile strain 3389 $\mu\epsilon$ at 2.98 m/sec), and during hopping (tensile strain 10373 $\mu\epsilon$ 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
445 et al.'s study¹⁵ involved postmenopausal women with an average age of 63, whereas our cohort
446 consisted of highly active, younger males and females, with an average age of 40 ranging from 18
447 years to 70 years old. Anderson and Madigan⁵³ showed that younger participants (aged 25 ± 4 years)
448 exhibited 9% higher ground reaction forces and 18% higher hip contact forces, and 59% larger peak
449 strains in early stance phase compared to older participants (aged 79 ± 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 ($\approx 2500 \mu\epsilon$ in their study, compared to our range of 1164 $\mu\epsilon$ to 1693 $\mu\epsilon$) and squat jumps (≈ 1800
458 $\mu\epsilon$ in their study, compared to 1132 $\mu\epsilon$ to 1664 $\mu\epsilon$ in ours) when compared to walking ($\approx 2700 \mu\epsilon$).
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.

461 The higher strains observed during running, unilateral hopping, and walking, compared to
462 countermovement, squat jumps, and bilateral hopping can be attributed to the nature of the exercises.
463 When landing on both feet, impact forces are distributed across both legs, on the other hand, walking,
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
467 unilateral hopping. This finding is also supported by several previous clinical trial studies, which
468 indicated that fast walking programs^{54,55} and hopping exercises^{56,57} can lead to an increase in femoral
469 neck BMD in elderly populations.

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
477 3), aligning with previous findings^{15,17,20}. These results indicate that, when assessing femoral neck
478 loading, the traditional assumption that the mechanical load correlates directly with ground reaction
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 $\text{relRMSE} \leq 15\%$) to good ($r > 0.78$ and $\text{relRMSE} \leq 25\%$) for all the ballistic
488 exercises analyzed. Among these, walking demonstrated the highest estimation accuracies ($r = 0.96$
489 and $\text{relRMSE} = 8.96\%$, $r = 0.97$ and $\text{relRMSE} = 8.01\%$ 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 $\text{relRMSE} = 23.52\%$, $r = 0.78$ and $\text{relRMSE} = 22.64\%$ 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 $\text{relRMSE} = 17.86\%$, $r = 0.84$ and
500 $\text{relRMSE} = 16.07\%$ 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
504 al.³⁵ and Fluit et al.⁶¹. Stetter et al.³⁵ observed a similar reduction in the accuracy of knee joint force
505 predictions made by a neural network model for walking, which was associated with higher variability
506 in knee joint forces, compared to running. Similarly, Fluit et al.⁶¹ observed similar changes in
507 estimation accuracy when they assessed a prediction model for ground reaction forces and moments
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
511 generalized data; instead, it should be population specific if precise accuracy is required. However, the
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 $\text{relRMSE} = 14.02\%$, $r = 0.81$ and $\text{relRMSE} = 24.26\%$ respectively).
516 This has also been observed in Setter et al. study³⁵, where model accuracy for predicting knee joint
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
520 the distribution of the total external load on both legs. Stetter et al.³⁵ suggested that incorporating an
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 ($r = 0.95$, $\text{relRMSE} <$
526 16%) to good ($r = 0.72$, $\text{relRMSE} < 16\%$) across all tested exercises, following similar trends as with
527 seven IMUs. Walking showed the largest reduction in prediction accuracy, with relative differences
528 compared to the seven-sensor setup as $r = 0.32\%$, $\text{relRMSE} = 19.62\%$, and $\text{RMSE} = 20.58\%$ for first
529 principal strains, and $r = 2.28\%$, $\text{relRMSE} = 22.13\%$, and $\text{RMSE} = 17.02\%$ 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
533 training data plays a key role in improving neural network training efficiency and test accuracy⁶².
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
540 measurement information, but to predict ground reaction forces during walking and running^{28,38,63}. For
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
552 significantly influence the estimation of internal loading⁶⁴. As a result, our MSK-FE predictions may
553 not entirely capture the individual variations among participants, which could also impact the accuracy
554 of the neural network predictions⁶². This limitation was primarily due to the lack of available data,
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
558 volunteers^{16,65,66}, synthetic model¹⁹, or generic scaled bone model⁶⁷, similar to the approach followed
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, 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**

- 596 1. Boonen, S. *et al.* Osteoporosis and osteoporotic fracture occurrence and prevention in the
597 elderly: a geriatric perspective. *Best Pract. Res. Clin. Endocrinol. Metab.* **22**, 765–785 (2008).
- 598 2. Goldacre, M. J. Mortality after admission to hospital with fractured neck of femur: database
599 study. *BMJ* **325**, 868–869 (2002).
- 600 3. Odén, A., McCloskey, E. V., Kanis, J. A., Harvey, N. C. & Johansson, H. Burden of high fracture
601 probability worldwide: secular increases 2010–2040. *Osteoporos. Int.* **26**, 2243–2248 (2015).
- 602 4. Kitagawa, T., Hiraya, K., Denda, T. & Yamamoto, S. A comparison of different exercise
603 intensities for improving bone mineral density in postmenopausal women with osteoporosis: A
604 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Bone Reports* **17**, 101631 (2022).
- 605 5. Allison, S. J. *et al.* The Influence of High-Impact Exercise on Cortical and Trabecular Bone
606 Mineral Content and 3D Distribution Across the Proximal Femur in Older Men: A Randomized
607 Controlled Unilateral Intervention. *J. Bone Miner. Res.* **30**, 1709–1716 (2015).
- 608 6. Multanen, J. *et al.* Effect of progressive high-impact exercise on femoral neck structural strength
609 in postmenopausal women with mild knee osteoarthritis: a 12-month RCT. *Osteoporos. Int.* **28**,
610 1323–1333 (2017).
- 611 7. Nikander, R. *et al.* Targeted exercise against osteoporosis: A systematic review and meta-
612 analysis for optimising bone strength throughout life. *BMC Med.* **8**, 47 (2010).
- 613 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).
- 615 9. Manaye, S. *et al.* The Role of High-intensity and High-impact Exercises in Improving Bone
616 Health in Postmenopausal Women: A Systematic Review. *Cureus* **15**, 1–8 (2023).
- 617 10. Vainionpaa, A., Korpelainen, R., Leppaluoto, J. & Jamsa, T. Effects of high-impact exercise on
618 bone mineral density: a randomized controlled trial in premenopausal women. *Osteoporos. Int.*
619 **16**, 191–197 (2005).
- 620 11. Kistler-Fischbacher, M., Weeks, B. K. & Beck, B. R. The effect of exercise intensity on bone in
621 postmenopausal women (part 1): A systematic review. *Bone* **143**, 115696 (2021).
- 622 12. Kistler-Fischbacher, M., Weeks, B. K. & Beck, B. R. The effect of exercise intensity on bone in
623 postmenopausal women (part 2): A meta-analysis. *Bone* **143**, 115697 (2021).
- 624 13. Hartley, C., Folland, J. P., Kerslake, R. & Brooke-Wavell, K. High-Impact Exercise Increased
625 Femoral Neck Bone Density With No Adverse Effects on Imaging Markers of Knee
626 Osteoarthritis in Postmenopausal Women. *J. Bone Miner. Res.* **35**, 53–63 (2020).
- 627 14. Martelli, S. *et al.* Modelling Human Locomotion to Inform Exercise Prescription for
628 Osteoporosis. *Curr. Osteoporos. Rep.* **18**, 301–311 (2020).
- 629 15. Pellikaan, P., Giarmatzis, G., Vander Sloten, J., Verschueren, S. & Jonkers, I. Ranking of
630 osteogenic potential of physical exercises in postmenopausal women based on femoral neck
631 strains. *PLoS One* **13**, e0195463 (2018).
- 632 16. Martelli, S., Kersh, M. E., Schache, A. G. & Pandy, M. G. Strain energy in the femoral neck
633 during exercise. *J. Biomech.* **47**, 1784–1791 (2014).
- 634 17. Kersh, M. E., Martelli, S., Zebaze, R., Seeman, E. & Pandy, M. G. Mechanical loading of the
635 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).
- 638 19. Viceconti, M. *et al.* Are spontaneous fractures possible? An example of clinical application for
639 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).
- 642 21. Altai, Z., Montefiori, E. & Li, X. Effect of muscle forces on femur during level walking using a
643 virtual population of older women. *High Perform. Comput. Drug Discov. Biomed.* 335–349
644 (2023) doi:10.1007/978-1-0716-3449-3_15.
- 645 22. Babil, A. Y. *et al.* Effect of different constraining boundary conditions on simulated femoral
646 stresses and strains during gait. *Sci. Rep.* **14**, 10808 (2024).
- 647 23. Smith, S. H. L., Coppack, R. J., van den Bogert, A. J., Bennett, A. N. & Bull, A. M. J. Review
648 of musculoskeletal modelling in a clinical setting: Current use in rehabilitation design, surgical

- 649 decision making and healthcare interventions. *Clin. Biomech.* **83**, 105292 (2021).
- 650 24. Parashar, S. K. & Sharma, J. K. A review on application of finite element modelling in bone
651 biomechanics. *Perspect. Sci.* **8**, 696–698 (2016).
- 652 25. Zago, M., Kleiner, A. F. R. & Federolf, P. A. Editorial: Machine Learning Approaches to Human
653 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).
- 656 27. Wouda, F. J. *et al.* Estimation of Vertical Ground Reaction Forces and Sagittal Knee Kinematics
657 During Running Using Three Inertial Sensors. *Front. Physiol.* **9**, 1–14 (2018).
- 658 28. Guo, Y. *et al.* A New Proxy Measurement Algorithm with Application to the Estimation of
659 Vertical Ground Reaction Forces Using Wearable Sensors. *Sensors* **17**, 2181 (2017).
- 660 29. Stetter, B. J., Krafft, F. C., Ringhof, S., Stein, T. & Sell, S. A machine learning and wearable
661 sensor based approach to estimate external knee flexion and adduction moments during various
662 locomotion tasks. *Front. Bioeng. Biotechnol.* **8**, (2020).
- 663 30. Derie, R. *et al.* Tibial Acceleration-Based Prediction of Maximal Vertical Loading Rate During
664 Overground Running: A Machine Learning Approach. *Front. Bioeng. Biotechnol.* **8**, 1–10
665 (2020).
- 666 31. Altai, Z. *et al.* Performance of multiple neural networks in predicting lower limb joint moments
667 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).
- 670 33. Wang, C. *et al.* Real-time estimation of knee adduction moment for gait retraining in patients
671 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).
- 675 35. Stetter, B. J., Ringhof, S., Krafft, F. C., Sell, S. & Stein, T. Estimation of Knee Joint Forces in
676 Sport Movements Using Wearable Sensors and Machine Learning. *Sensors* **19**, 3690 (2019).
- 677 36. Matijevich, E. S., Scott, L. R., Volgyesi, P., Derry, K. H. & Zelik, K. E. Combining wearable
678 sensor signals, machine learning and biomechanics to estimate tibial bone force and damage
679 during running. *Hum. Mov. Sci.* **74**, 102690 (2020).
- 680 37. Nimmal Haribabu, G. & Basu, B. Implementing Machine Learning approaches for accelerated
681 prediction of bone strain in acetabulum of a hip joint. *J. Mech. Behav. Biomed. Mater.* **153**,
682 106495 (2024).
- 683 38. Lim, H., Kim, B. & Park, S. Prediction of Lower Limb Kinetics and Kinematics during Walking

- 684 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).
- 691 42. van Arkel, R. J., Modenese, L., Phillips, A. T. M. & Jeffers, J. R. T. Hip abduction can prevent
692 posterior edge loading of hip replacements. *J. Orthop. Res.* **31**, 1172–1179 (2013).
- 693 43. Steele, K. M., DeMers, M. S., Schwartz, M. H. & Delp, S. L. Compressive tibiofemoral force
694 during crouch gait. *Gait Posture* **35**, 556–560 (2012).
- 695 44. Zhang, J. *et al.* The MAP Client: User-Friendly Musculoskeletal Modelling Workflows. in
696 *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence*
697 *and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)* vol. 8789 182–192 (2014).
- 698 45. Zhang, J., Hislop-Jambrich, J. & Besier, T. F. Predictive statistical models of baseline variations
699 in 3-D femoral cortex morphology. *Med. Eng. Phys.* **38**, 450–457 (2016).
- 700 46. Peters, A. E., Akhtar, R., Comerford, E. J. & Bates, K. T. Tissue material properties and
701 computational modelling of the human tibiofemoral joint: a critical review. *PeerJ* **6**, e4298
702 (2018).
- 703 47. Polgár, K., Gill, H. S., Viceconti, M., Murray, D. W. & O’Connor, J. J. Strain distribution within
704 the human femur due to physiological and simplified loading: Finite element analysis using the
705 muscle standardized femur model. *Proc. Inst. Mech. Eng. Part H J. Eng. Med.* **217**, 173–189
706 (2003).
- 707 48. O’Rahilly, R. *et al.* Chapter 18: Posture and locomotion. in *Basic Human Anatomy* (ed.
708 Dartmouth Medical School) (2008).
- 709 49. Helgason, B. *et al.* A modified method for assigning material properties to FE models of bones.
710 *Med. Eng. Phys.* **30**, 444–453 (2008).
- 711 50. Fauvel, K., Lin, T., Masson, V., Fromont, É. & Termier, A. Xcm: An explainable convolutional
712 neural network for multivariate time series classification. *Mathematics* **9**, 1–21 (2021).
- 713 51. Johnson, W. R., Alderson, J., Lloyd, D. & Mian, A. Predicting athlete ground reaction forces
714 and moments from spatio-temporal driven CNN models. *IEEE Trans. Biomed. Eng.* **66**, 689–
715 694 (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

- 719 bone mineral density on strains in the proximal femur during controlled walking. *J Appl*
720 *Biomech.* **29**, 505–516 (2013).
- 721 54. Howe, T. E. *et al.* Exercise for preventing and treating osteoporosis in postmenopausal women.
722 *Cochrane Database Syst. Rev.* **2011**, 1–167 (2011).
- 723 55. Ma, D., Wu, L. & He, Z. Effects of walking on the preservation of bone mineral density in
724 perimenopausal and postmenopausal women. *Menopause* **20**, 1216–1226 (2013).
- 725 56. Allison, S. J. *et al.* The Influence of High-Impact Exercise on Cortical and Trabecular Bone
726 Mineral Content and 3D Distribution Across the Proximal Femur in Older Men: A Randomized
727 Controlled Unilateral Intervention. *J. Bone Miner. Res.* **30**, 1709–1716 (2015).
- 728 57. Allison, S. J., Folland, J. P., Rennie, W. J., Summers, G. D. & Brooke-Wavell, K. High impact
729 exercise increased femoral neck bone mineral density in older men: A randomised unilateral
730 intervention. *Bone* **53**, 321–328 (2013).
- 731 58. Kohrt, W. M., Ehsani, A. A. & Birge, S. J. Effects of Exercise Involving Predominantly Either
732 Joint-Reaction or Ground-Reaction Forces on Bone Mineral Density in Older Women. *J. Bone*
733 *Miner. Res.* **12**, 1253–1261 (1997).
- 734 59. Correa, T. A., Crossley, K. M., Kim, H. J. & Pandy, M. G. Contributions of individual muscles
735 to hip joint contact force in normal walking. *J. Biomech.* **43**, 1618–1622 (2010).
- 736 60. Pandy, M. G. & Andriacchi, T. P. Muscle and Joint Function in Human Locomotion. *Annu. Rev.*
737 *Biomed. Eng.* **12**, 401–433 (2010).
- 738 61. Fluit, R., Andersen, M. S., Kolk, S., Verdonschot, N. & Koopman, H. F. J. M. Prediction of
739 ground reaction forces and moments during various activities of daily living. *J. Biomech.* **47**,
740 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).
- 744 63. Ngoh, K. J.-H., Gouwanda, D., Gopalai, A. A. & Chong, Y. Z. Estimation of vertical ground
745 reaction force during running using neural network model and uniaxial accelerometer. *J.*
746 *Biomech.* **76**, 269–273 (2018).
- 747 64. Davico, G. *et al.* Multi-level personalization of neuromusculoskeletal models to estimate
748 physiologically plausible knee joint contact forces in children. *Biomech. Model. Mechanobiol.*
749 **21**, 1873–1886 (2022).
- 750 65. Martelli, S., Pivonka, P. & Ebeling, P. R. Femoral shaft strains during daily activities:
751 Implications for atypical femoral fractures. *Clin. Biomech.* **29**, 869–876 (2014).
- 752 66. Edwards, W. B., Miller, R. H. & Derrick, T. R. Femoral strain during walking predicted with
753 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