

Manuscript Number: GAIPOS-D-13-00696R1

Title: The comparison of normative reference data from different gait analysis services

Article Type: Original Paper

Keywords: Kinematics; Kinetics; Normative-Datasets Comparison; Standardization between Services.

Corresponding Author: Mrs. Ornella Rita Pinzone, MSc

Corresponding Author's Institution: University of Salford

First Author: Ornella Rita Pinzone, MSc

Order of Authors: Ornella Rita Pinzone, MSc; Michael H Schwartz, PhD; Pam Thomason, B Phty, M Physio; Richard Baker, PhD CEng CSci

Abstract: Comparison of normative data between gait analysis services offers the potential to harmonise data collection protocols. This paper presents a method for such a comparison based on an assumption that the root mean square difference from the inter-service mean is a reflection of systematic differences in protocols and that the average standard deviation includes a component attributable to within-centre measurement variability.

Substantial normative datasets from two highly respected clinical services were compared. The RMS difference for the difference from the inter-centre mean was less than 1.7° for all kinematic variables apart from hip rotation (2.9°) and foot progression (2.1°), less than 0.1Nm/kg for all joint moments and than 0.21W/kg for all joint powers. The two centres showed very similar normative standard deviations.

The data demonstrates a high degree of consistency between data from two highly regarded gait analysis services and establishes a baseline against which other services can assess their performance. An electronic appendix includes data to facilitate this comparison.

THE COMPARISON OF NORMATIVE REFERENCE DATA FROM DIFFERENT GAIT ANALYSIS SERVICES

Ornella Pinzone¹, Michael H. Schwartz^{2,3}, Pam Thomason⁴, Richard Baker¹

¹University of Salford, UK

²Gillette Children's Specialty Healthcare, St. Paul, MN, USA,

³University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, USA,

⁴Royal Children's Hospital, Melbourne, Australia.

e-mail: O.Pinzone@salford.ac.uk

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

ABSTRACT

Comparison of normative data between gait analysis services offers the potential to harmonise data collection protocols. This paper presents a method for such a comparison based on an assumption that the root mean square difference from the inter-service mean is a reflection of systematic differences in protocols and that the average standard deviation includes a component attributable to within-centre measurement variability.

Substantial normative datasets from two highly respected clinical services were compared. The RMS difference for the difference from the inter-centre mean was less than 1.7° for all kinematic variables apart from hip rotation (2.9°) and foot progression (2.1°), less than 0.1Nm/kg for all joint moments and than 0.21W/kg for all joint powers. The two centres showed very similar normative standard deviations.

The data demonstrates a high degree of consistency between data from two highly regarded gait analysis services and establishes a baseline against which other services can assess their performance. An electronic appendix includes data to facilitate this comparison.

1
2
3
4 **1. INTRODUCTION**

5
6 In the past it has been considered acceptable for clinical gait analysis services to vary in their
7
8 data capture protocols and reference datasets were collected to allow for these differences [1-
9
10 3]. As the clinical gait analysis matures, there is a growing requirement for standardization
11
12 between services [4, 5]. This has been underlined by two articles [6, 7] emphasising the
13
14 differences between laboratories in 3d gait analysis data, raising concern within the
15
16 orthopaedic community [8, 9]. The rationale for collecting reference datasets in the future
17
18 should thus be to harmonise protocols through comparison between different services. This
19
20 study describes a mechanism for such a comparison and illustrates this by comparing data
21
22 from two internationally regarded gait analysis services.
23
24
25
26
27

28 **2. MATERIALS and METHODS**

29
30 The normative reference data (means and standard deviations) in routine use at two gait
31
32 analysis services, (Gillette Children's Specialty Healthcare, GCSH, and the Royal Children's
33
34 Hospital, Melbourne, RCH) were compared. The normative reference data were created using
35
36 data from 81 patients, with an age range between 4 and 17 years at one centre, and 31
37
38 patients, with age between 6 and 17 years at the other centre. All data had been collected at
39
40 self-selected walking speed, with a Vicon kinematic measuring system (Oxford, UK) and
41
42 AMTI force plates (Watertown, MA, USA). The length of the walkways were respectively 8
43
44 m and 15 m. Knee Alignment Devices (KAD) were used in static calibration. Trajectories had
45
46 been filtered with a Woltring spline filter [10] and then processed using Plug-in Gait [11]
47
48 software (Vicon, Oxford, UK). Data were sampled to 51 values during the gait cycle;
49
50 however there is no particular reason to believe this method would be sensitive to this value.
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 Means (m_{ijt} , i refers to service, j to gait variable and t to % of gait cycle) and standard
58
59 deviations (s_{ijt}) of the clinically important kinematic and kinetics variables from the two gait
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 analysis services were plotted together to visualize the level of agreement (**Error! Reference**
5 **source not found.** and **Error! Reference source not found.**). Assuming that the two cohorts
6 walked similarly, then differences in the mean measurements reflect systematic differences in
7 measurement technique between the two centres. Although comparing one mean to the other
8 appears an obvious choice for comparisons, each service is interested not in how it compares
9 with the other, but how it compares with the true mean for the population. Given that there is
10 no reason to suspect that one set of measurements is “better” than the other, the grand mean
11 between the services (M_{jt}) is actually the best estimate of the true mean. Given that
12 differences in technique are likely to be characteristic of the service rather than the
13 participants, a simple mean was preferred to a mean weighted by number of participants.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

$$M_{jt} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^N m_{ijt}$$

30
31
32
33
34
35
36 Where N is the number of services (2 in this case).
37
38
39

40 Systematic differences were then quantified by considering the difference between the mean
41 for each service and the grand mean $\Delta_{ijt}(= m_{ijt} - M_{jt})$. This approach has the advantage that
42 the method can be extended to the comparison of any number of services.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 Three parameters are assumed to be of interest: $RMS\Delta$, $mean\Delta$, and $SD\Delta$.
51
52
53
54

$$RMS\Delta_{ij} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=0}^n \Delta_{ijt}^2}$$

55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

$$mean\Delta_{ij} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=0}^n \Delta_{ijt}$$

$$SD\Delta_{ij} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=0}^n (\Delta_{ijt} - mean\Delta_{ij})^2}$$

Where n is the number of time points across the gait cycle. The absolute maximum value of Δ_{ijt} was also calculated. If only two services are being compared $\Delta_{1jt} = -\Delta_{2jt}$ by definition, and only one set of results need to be reported. (Note also that $RMS\Delta^2 = mean\Delta^2 + SD\Delta^2$).

The offset percentage (OP, with $= 100 \cdot \frac{mean\Delta^2}{RMS\Delta^2}$) was also calculated for kinematic parameters and represents the proportion of the mean square that arises from the fixed offset. This is useful because high values of OP will tend to indicate the direct effect of differences in protocols for the placement of markers on segments adjacent to the joint and in the plane the angle is measured in [4]. Low values will tend to indicate secondary effects of more distant markers or in a different plane. This distinction may be useful in investigating and correcting the source of discrepancies.

The standard deviations (s_{ijt}) represent the variability of measurement at each centre. They tend to be relatively constant over the gait cycle and the average value is thus taken as the representative measure for each variable. This is a combination of physiological variability and measurement error and the smaller this value, the more consistently a specific protocol has been applied. These values from different services are meaningful in this context in their own right (as opposed to the means m_{ijt} , which are only meaningful in this context when compared) and are simply reported separately for each centre.

1
2
3
4
5
6 **3. RESULTS**
7

8 There were no statistically significant differences between body mass, height and leg length at
9
10 the two centres. There were differences in absolute walking speed ($p < 0.0001$) with patients
11
12 from centre 2 walking 10% faster on average than patients from centre 1.
13

14 A qualitative analysis of the kinematics graphs (**Error! Reference source not found.**) shows
15
16 that agreement is generally good. There are small differences in pelvic rotation, hip flexion
17
18 and knee flexion with slightly larger differences in internal hip rotation, ankle dorsiflexion
19
20 and foot progression during swing. The statistical parameters (Table 1) reflect these with the
21
22 largest differences (*RMSΔ*) of between 2° and 3° in hip rotation and foot progression. Kinetic
23
24 data also show generally good agreement, but detailed scrutiny suggests some differences in
25
26 hip and knee extensor moment data and all the power graphs.
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 **4. DISCUSSION and CONCLUSIONS**
34

35 This paper describes a quantitative method for comparing normative datasets for different gait
36
37 analysis services. This has been illustrated with the comparison of two datasets but the
38
39 method can be extended to as many datasets as desired. Differences are generally small with
40
41 only two kinematic parameters having an *RMSΔ* above 2° which McGinley et al. [5]
42
43 suggested as acceptable (although four parameters showed maximum differences of greater
44
45 than 2°).
46
47
48
49
50

51 From Table 1, it can be seen that the two variables showing the largest offsets, hip rotation
52
53 and foot progression, also show a large offset percentage suggesting a simple difference in
54
55 marker placement protocol. Hip rotation is known to be highly dependent on the placement of
56
57 knee alignment devices [12, 13], foot progression will be dependent on the alignment of
58
59 forefoot and heel markers during the static calibration [4]. The process by which marker data
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 is incorporated into the calculation of kinetic variables is considerably more complex than for
5
6 the kinematic data and none of the offset percentages is particularly high. It is probable that
7
8 the offset percentage will be less useful in explaining the source of discrepancies between
9
10 datasets for the kinetic data as for the kinematic data.
11
12
13
14

15 The main limitation of the method is that it assumes that characteristics of the two reference
16
17 cohorts are similar and that differences reflect measurement technique. The age, weight,
18
19 height and gender match of both samples is good and factors such as socio-economic and
20
21 ethnic background (mainly Caucasian) are likely to be similar. There is some evidence of
22
23 differences in temporal and spatial parameters between specific ethnic groups [14] and this
24
25 should be considered as an additional source of variation if very different groups are being
26
27 compared.
28
29
30
31
32

33 There are differences in speed between the two cohorts and the small differences in pelvic
34
35 rotation, hip and knee dorsiflexion appear to be consistent with the speed related changes
36
37 reported by Schwartz et al. [15]. These differences are small though (in comparison to the
38
39 overall standard deviations) and controlling for speed is probably not required. There are also
40
41 small differences in timing events between the two approaches. This is likely to have a small
42
43 effect on the overall results, leading to a small overestimate in the true variability.
44
45
46

47 Differences in the standard deviations between the services are generally small. Whilst this is
48
49 reassuring, the way in which the physiological variability (p) and measurement variability
50
51 (m) combine to produce the overall variability ($s = \sqrt{p^2 + m^2}$) means that this measure will
52
53 be relatively insensitive to changes in measurement variability that are equal to or less than
54
55 the physiological variability. Specific studies [e.g. 16] are required to give confidence that
56
57 repeatability is acceptable.
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

The means and standard deviations of the two centres and the characteristics of the two reference cohorts are lodged as an electronic appendix allowing any centre to compare its measurements against these benchmarks.


1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1. Chester VL, Tingley M, and Biden EN, Comparison of two normative paediatric gait databases. *Dynamic medicine : DM*, 2007;6:8.
2. Kadaba MP, Ramakrishnan HK, Wootten ME, Gainey J, Gorton G, and Cochran GV, Repeatability of kinematic, kinetic, and electromyographic data in normal adult gait. *J Orthop Res*, 1989;7:849-860.
3. Ounpuu O, Davis R, and Deluca P, Joint kinetics: Methods, interpretation and treatment decision-making in children with cerebral palsy and myelomeningocele. *Gait and Posture*, 1996;4:62-78.
4. Baker R, *Measuring Walking: A Handbook of Clinical Gait Analysis*. London: Mac Keith Press; 2013
5. McGinley JL, Baker R, Wolfe R, and Morris ME, The reliability of three-dimensional kinematic gait measurements: A systematic review. *Gait & Posture*, 2009;29:360-369.
6. Gorton GE, 3rd, Hebert DA, and Gannotti ME, Assessment of the kinematic variability among 12 motion analysis laboratories. *Gait Posture*, 2009;29:398-402.
7. Noonan K HS, Browne R, O'Brien S, Kayes K, Feinberg J., Inter-observer variability of gait analysis in patients with cerebral palsy. *Journal of Pediatric Orthopaedics* 2003;23:279–287.
8. JG W, Pro: interobserver variability of gait analysis. *Journal of Pediatric Orthopaedics*, 2003;23:288-289.
9. JR. G, Con: interobserver variability of gait analysis. *Journal of Pediatric Orthopaedics*, 2003;23:290–291.
10. Woltring HJ, On optimal smoothing and derivative estimation from noisy displacement data in biomechanics. *Human Movement Science*, 1985;4:229-245.
11. Davis RB, Ounpuu S, Tyburski D, and Gage J, A gait analysis data collection and reduction technique. *Human Movement Science*, 1991;10:575-587.
12. Schwartz MH and Rozumalski A, A new method for estimating joint parameters from motion data. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 2005;38:107-116.
13. Baker R, Finney L, and Orr J, A new approach to determine the hip rotations profile from clinical gait analysis data. *Human Movement Science*, 1999;18:655-667.
14. Al-Obaidi S, Wall JC, Al-Yaqoub A, and Al-Ghanim M, Basic gait parameters: a comparison of reference data for normal subjects 20 to 29 years of age from Kuwait and Scandinavia. *J Rehabil Res Dev*;40:361-366.
15. Schwartz MH, Rozumalski A, and Trost JP, The effect of walking speed on the gait of typically developing children. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 2008;41:1639-1650.
16. Schwartz MH, Trost JP, and Wervery RA, Measurement and management of errors in quantitative gait data. *Gait and Posture*, 2004;20:196-203.

Table 1: Summary data describing how data from one centre differs from combined data (kinematic data in degrees, moments in N-m/kg and powers in W/kg).

	Difference in mean measurements					Variability (Mean SD)	
	RMS Δ	Mean Δ	SD Δ	Max. Abs Δ	Offset percentage	Centre 1	Centre 2
Pelvic Tilt	0.13°	-0.08°	0.10°	0.23°	40%	5.2°	5.3°
Hip Flexion	1.06°	0.28°	1.03°	1.74°	7%	6.5°	7.0°
Knee Flexion	1.59°	0.00°	1.61°	3.19°	0%	6.4°	6.5°
Ankle Dorsiflexion	1.30°	-0.63°	1.15°	3.51°	23%	5.7°	4.2°
Pelvic Obliquity	0.40°	0.02°	0.40°	0.75°	0%	2.2°	2.3°
Hip Abduction	0.57°	0.08°	0.57°	0.94°	2%	3.2°	3.6°
Pelvic Rotation	0.72°	0.04°	0.72°	1.25°	0%	4.1°	4.1°
Hip Rotation	2.87°	-2.74°	0.87°	3.97°	91%	9.7°	7.0°
Foot Progression	2.13°	1.88°	1.02°	4.13°	77%	7.2°	6.9°
Hip Extensor Moment	0.09	0.05	0.08	0.21	30%	0.1	0.2
Knee Extensor Moment	0.05	-0.03	0.04	0.11	32%	0.1	0.1
Plantarflexor Moment	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.04	3%	0.1	0.1
Hip Abductor Moment	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.06	4%	0.1	0.1
Knee Abductor Moment	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.06	0%	0.1	0.1
Ankle Rotation Moment	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.03	12%	0.0	0.0
Hip Power	0.16	0.05	0.15	0.37	11%	0.3	0.3
Knee Power	0.17	0.04	0.17	0.50	5%	0.3	0.3
Ankle Power	0.21	-0.04	0.21	0.88	5%	0.3	0.3

7. Figure(s)



7. Figure(s)












Fig. 1: Mean and standard deviations between GCSH (grey) and RCH (black). Kinematics normative reference data.

Fig. 2: Mean and standard deviations between GCSH (grey) and RCH (black). Kinetics normative reference data.

8. Supplementary Material

[Click here to download 8. Supplementary Material: Appendix.xlsx](#)

HIGHLIGHTS

- The data forms a baseline against which other services can assess their performance.
- A method for comparison of normative data between gait analysis services is presented.
- Normative datasets from two highly respected clinical services showed close agreement.
- Both sets of kinematic and kinetic data are available for benchmarking purposes.