Original Article

Tibiofemoral Contact Forces during Walking, Running and Sidestepping

Authors: David J Saxby¹, Luca Modenese^{1,3,4}, Adam L Bryant⁵, Pauline Gerus², Bryce Killen¹, Karine Fortin⁵, Tim V Wrigley⁵, Kim L Bennell⁵, Flavia M Cicuttini⁶, David G Lloyd¹.

Affiliations:

¹Centre for Musculoskeletal Research, Menzies Health Institute Queensland, Griffith University, Australia

²Laboratory of Human Motion, Education and Health, University of Nice Sophia-Antipolis, Nice, France

³INSIGNEO institute for *in silico* medicine, University of Sheffield, UK

⁴Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Sheffield, UK

⁵Centre for Health, Exercise and Sports Medicine, University of Melbourne, Australia

⁶Department of Epidemiology and Preventive Medicine, Monash University, Australia

Manuscript word count: 2894

Corresponding author: David J Saxby, d.saxby@griffith.edu.au

Phone: +61755527066, Fax: +61755528674

Keywords: joint contact forces; EMG-driven model, gait analysis, sidestepping, joint stabilization.

Acknowledgements

We acknowledge the funding support for this research from the Australian National Health and Medical Research Council (to ALB, DGL, KLB and FMC) (grant # 628850) and National Health and Research Council Principal Research Fellowship (to KLB). DJS would like to acknowledge Griffith University for PhD scholarship and stipend awards and the International Society of Biomechanics for a PhD Matching Dissertation Grant. The authors would like to acknowledge Prof BJ Fregly of the University of Florida for contribution of Grand Challenge instrumented knee implant data (<https://simtk.org/home/kneeloads>), as well as Dr.'s Alasdair Dempsey and Nicole Grigg for their contributions to data acquisition.

Introduction

Instrumented prosthetic implants can directly measure knee contact forces *in vivo* [1, 2], but are costly and invasive. Consequently, surrogates of knee contact loading, such as the external knee adduction moment (KAM) [3], have received considerable research focus. The shape of the KAM has been shown to correlate with implant-measured medial tibiofemoral (MTF) contact force across the stance phase of walking [4, 5]. However, when the KAM was altered by a targeted intervention, concomitant changes to the MTF contact force did not necessarily occur [6]. Thus, the KAM may not be a robust surrogate of tibiofemoral contact loading during different gaits or control tasks.

Despite the limitations of the KAM, surrogates remain potentially useful if they can well estimate the tibiofemoral contact forces during different gaits or control tasks. Moreover, while single external measures (*i.e.* the KAM or vertical shank resultant force), have shown highly variable relationships with walking tibiofemoral contact forces [6, 7], combining several external measures in multiple regression models has been shown to improve the strength of the relationships [8, 9]. However, previous studies [8, 9] have examined only small numbers of individuals performing low-intensity activities, leaving unexplored the relationships between external measures and tibiofemoral contact forces during more vigorous gait tasks.

Healthy individuals engage in many different gait tasks, including sporting movements such as running and rapid changes of direction. To date, only one study [1] has reported knee contact forces during jogging from three elderly total knee arthroplasty patients who had received an instrumented prosthetic implant. Due to the slow speed of the jogging ($\sim 1.6 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$), age of the patients (>65) and the prosthetic knee, the knee contact forces were likely not representative of those experienced by younger adults performing similar or more vigorous

tasks. Moreover, as prosthetic, and now tissue engineered implants, are increasingly used in younger populations [10], there is a clear need to study the joint contact loading that arises during vigorous gait tasks in which younger populations commonly engage.

Neuromusculoskeletal computational models provide an alternative to both direct measurement and surrogates of the joint contact forces. However, a major challenge has been to account for muscle activation patterns that are known to vary between individuals [11] and control tasks [12], and are affected by joint pathology [13]. To incorporate subject- and task-specific muscle activation patterns, electromyography (EMG)-driven models [14, 15] combine an individual's experimentally measured muscle activation patterns and external joint biomechanics to estimate the tibiofemoral contact forces [16, 17].

The aims of this study were to estimate the tibiofemoral contact forces, as well as the relative muscle and external load contributions to those contact forces, in healthy individuals during walking, running and running with diagonal sidestepping (referred to as sidestepping). Furthermore, we aimed to assess whether traditional external measures would well predict the tibiofemoral contact forces during the different gait tasks. We hypothesised that 1) sidestepping would have larger maximum tibiofemoral contact forces compared to straight running, 2) the magnitude of the KAM and MTF contact force would have weak relationships during both the running and sidestepping gait tasks, and that these relationships would be gait task-specific, and 3) multiple external measures would well predict tibiofemoral contact forces for a particular gait task, but would perform poorly when applied to other gait tasks.

Methods

Sixty adults (35 male, 25 female) participated with mean±standard deviation age, height and mass of 27.3±5.4 years, 1.75±0.11 m, and 69.8±14.0 kg, respectively. Participants were free of disease and recreationally active with no history of severe lower-limb injury. Data were

equally acquired at Griffith University's Centre for Musculoskeletal Research (CMR) and University of Melbourne's Centre for Health, Exercise and Sports Medicine (CHESM). Human research ethics committees approved the study (CMR: PES/36/10/HREC, CHESM: 0932864.3) and participants provided written informed consent. Testing involved first walking at a self-selected pace, then running at 4-5 m·s⁻¹ followed by sidestepping to 45°, all performed shod (Dunlop Volleys, <http://www.volley.com.au/>) similar to our previous protocols [16-19]. A 10- (CMR) or 12- (CHESM) camera motion capture system (Vicon, Oxford Metrics, UK) (200 and 120 Hz, respectively) was used to acquire three-dimensional motion of participants wearing a full-body marker set [18]. The lower-limb portion of the marker set was modified to include 10-marker clusters on the thighs and shanks that were positioned on regions of the limbs to minimize soft tissue artefact [20]. Ground reaction forces (GRFs) were acquired using two (CMR) (Kistler Instrumente, Switzerland) or three (CHESM) (Advanced Mechanical Technology, USA) force plates (1000 and 2400 Hz, respectively). EMGs were acquired from the 8 major knee muscles from a randomized limb using Wave Wireless (CMR) (Zero Wire, Aurion, Italy) or Telemyo 900 (CHESM) (Noraxon, Arizona, USA) systems sampling (1000 and 2400 Hz, respectively). Similar to our previous studies [16, 17, 19] that used SENIAM guidelines (<http://www.seniam.org/>) [21], circular pre-formed bipolar Ag/AgCl electrodes (Duo-Trode, Myotronics, USA) were placed over the medial and lateral *gastrocnemii*, hamstrings, *vasti*, as well as the *rectus femoris* and *tensor fasciae latae*.

All data were filtered using a 2nd order Butterworth filter design that was cascaded once to the remove phase shift [22]. Markers and GRFs were low-pass filtered using 10 and 15 Hz cut-off frequencies for walking and running/sidestepping, respectively. The raw EMGs were band-pass filtered (30-500 Hz pass-band), full-wave rectified and low-pass filtered (6 Hz cut-

off) to yield linear envelopes. For each muscle, the EMG envelope amplitude was scaled to the maximum for that muscle from all acquired trials.

Gait biomechanics were determined using OpenSim v3.2 [23]. A generic anatomic model (Figure 1A), based on a previous study running of dynamics [24] was used. The model was customized by adding degrees of freedom (DOFs) and contact points to the knee. Specifically, the original 1 DOF knee [25-27], was provided 15°/5° internal/external rotation range of motion based on measurements from both *in vivo* bone pins [28] and cadavers [29]. Knee abduction/adduction rotations were locked, because these rotations cannot be accurately measured with skin-surface markers [28]. Moreover, allowing knee adduction/abduction rotations would have resulted in condylar lift-off, a feature not observed in instrumented prosthetic knee implants [2]. Overall, the customizations to the anatomic model enabled the calculation of three external knee moments, while preventing non-physiological knee rotations. To determine external moments and muscle tendon unit actuators (MTUA) moment arms about the medial and lateral tibiofemoral compartments, contact points were fixed to the tibia plateau (Figure 1B). Their positions were determined using a regression method based on the width of the femoral condyles [17] (Supplementary material).

For each participant, the customized generic anatomic model was scaled, registered and optimized to the participant's anthropometry and experimental marker configuration. Linear scaling does not necessarily preserve normal muscle and tendon operating ranges, therefore, we optimized the tendon slack and optimal fiber lengths of each MTUA to preserve the dimensionless operating ranges [30]. The final anatomic model was then used to calculate joint angles, moments and MTUA kinematics (lengths and moment arms) for walking, running and sidestepping trials using OpenSim inverse kinematics, inverse dynamics (ID) and muscle analysis tools, respectively.

Gait biomechanics and processed EMGs were then used to calibrate and execute an EMG-driven model [14, 15] that estimated muscle and tibiofemoral contact forces [16, 17]. For each participant, a walking, running, and sidestepping trial was used to calibrate the EMG-driven model by optimizing muscle activation dynamics and MTUAs parameters to best match the experimental knee flexion/extension moment from ID [15] and minimize the tibiofemoral contact forces [16].

For each participant, an average of three repeats of each gait task were used to create mean curves for all measurements. The traditional biomechanical measurements included gait spatiotemporal parameters (*i.e.* gait speed, stride length/time/cadence, *etc.*), GRFs, knee kinematics and moments, and muscle activation patterns. The EMG-driven model outputs were the total (TTF), medial (MTF) and lateral (LTF) tibiofemoral contact forces, as well as relative contributions of muscle and external loads. To calculate the relative contributions of muscle and external loads, we summed all loads that had a component in the frontal plane (*i.e.* external, muscle and contact moments) about both the MTF and LTF contact points. We then expressed the mechanical action of these muscle and external moments as a percentage of the total contact loading experienced by the relevant compartment. All variables were time-normalized to 100% of gait cycle and stance phase for walking and running/sidestepping, respectively. To address the first aim of the study, the maximum tibiofemoral contact forces were calculated for each participant during each of the gait modes, and a repeated measures ANOVA was used to test the main effect of gait task on the contact forces. If significant main effects were found, *post-hoc* paired t-tests with Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons were used to test specific paired differences. Bonferroni corrections resulted in a significance level of 0.017.

To address the second aim of this study, three types of general linear models (GLMs) were used to explore the relationships between external measures and tibiofemoral contact forces. We first identified the timing of each participant's maximum tibiofemoral contact forces during stance, and then parameterized the external measures at that same time point. This ensured temporal alignment between predictor and response variables in the GLMs, and overall dynamic consistency in our analysis. For the first GLM, GLMSimple, we regressed the maximum tibiofemoral contact forces (scaled to bodyweight (BW)) onto the corresponding KAM ($\text{N}\cdot\text{m}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}$) for each gait task. As gait task may influence these relationships, we added a categorical variable to the simple regression (GLMCat) that, when specified for each gait task (one or zero), adjusted for different intercepts. We selected six external measures that have previously been shown to correlate with the tibiofemoral contact forces: KAM [4, 5, 7], external knee flexion moment (KFM) [8, 9], vertical ground reaction force (VGRF) [31], body mass (MASS) [1], gait velocity (VEL) [1] and *gastrocnemii* activation (GAST) [32]. As described above, the time varying external measures (KAM, KFM, VGRF and VEL) were evaluated at the same time as the maximum tibiofemoral contact forces. These six variables were then used in step-wise regression (GLMStep) with the maximum tibiofemoral contact forces. Finally, the GLMStep equations from a particular gait task (*e.g.* walking) were applied to the other two gait tasks (*e.g.* running and sidestepping) and assessed by R^2 and normalized root mean squared error (NRMSE).

Results

Participants walked with velocity $1.44\pm 0.22 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$, stride length $1.51\pm 0.12 \text{ m}$ and cadence $55.7\pm 4.45 \text{ strides}\cdot\text{min}^{-1}$, ran at $4.38\pm 0.42 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$, and sidestepped at $3.58\pm 0.50 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$. The gait velocities were all significantly different from each other ($p<0.001$).

Maximum tibiofemoral contact forces differed significantly across gait tasks (all $p<0.0001$). Maximum walking tibiofemoral contact forces (TTF 2.83 ± 0.64 BW, MTF 1.82 ± 0.47 BW and LTF 1.15 ± 0.35 BW) were significantly lower than running (TTF 7.83 ± 1.48 BW, MTF 5.10 ± 0.95 BW and LTF 2.97 ± 0.7 BW) ($p<0.0001$) and sidestepping (TTF 8.47 ± 1.57 BW, MTF 4.62 ± 0.83 BW and LTF 4.30 ± 1.05 BW) ($p<0.0001$) (Figure 2). Running had significantly larger maximum MTF contact forces than walking and sidestepping ($p<0.0001$), while maximum TTF and LTF contact forces were significantly larger in sidestepping than walking and running ($p<0.0001$). During walking and running the MTF compartment bore the majority of the contact force, while during sidestepping maximum MTF and LTF contact forces were similar.

The mean relative contributions of muscle to MTF and LTF (Figure 3) contact forces differed significantly across gait tasks (all $p<0.0001$). Mean muscle contributions to MTF contact force increased significantly from walking ($48\pm10\%$) to running ($83\pm20\%$) ($p<0.0001$) and to sidestepping ($91\pm12\%$) ($p<0.0001$), while mean muscle contributions to LTF contact increased from walking ($63\pm19\%$) to running ($88\pm11\%$) ($p<0.0001$) and then decreased during sidestepping ($79\pm12\%$) ($p<0.0001$).

Overall, the GLMs revealed significant weak-to-moderate relationships between external measures and tibiofemoral contact forces (Table 1). Weak correlations existed between KAM and contact forces (GLMSimple) (all $R^2<0.36$) and varied depending on both the gait task and tibiofemoral compartment (TTF, MTF and LTF). GLMSimple showed incrementally larger y-intercepts from walking, to running, to sidestepping (Figure 4), with the categorical gait task variable (GLMCat) improving the strength of the relationships compared to GLMSimple. GLMStep revealed the most important external measures: VGRF (first predictor in 5 of 9 equations and present in 8 of 9 equations), KAM (first predictor in 4 of 9

equations), MASS (present in 6 of 9 equations) and KFM (present in 3 of 9 equations) (Table 1). GLMStep yielded stronger relationships ($0.20 < R_{adj}^2 < 0.78$) compared to GLMSimple, however, the strength of the relationships varied substantially depending on both the gait task and tibiofemoral compartment. Furthermore, the specific external measures retained by the step-wise process were different depending on the gait task and tibiofemoral compartment. Consequently, when a GLMStep equation from a particular gait task (*e.g.* walking) was used to estimate contact forces for a different gait task (*e.g.* running or sidestepping) the NRMSE significantly increased (from 0.76 ± 0.11 to 4.76 ± 2.7 , $p < 0.0001$).

Discussion

We used an EMG-driven model to estimate the tibiofemoral contact forces in young healthy adults during walking, running and sidestepping. We found that the magnitude of the tibiofemoral contact forces increased from walking to the more vigorous gait tasks, with sidestepping having the largest tibiofemoral contact loading. Second, the relative contributions made by muscle to the tibiofemoral contact forces were larger than the contributions of the external loads and peaked during sidestepping. Third, the tested external measures were poor-to-moderate correlates of the tibiofemoral contact forces, gait task-specific, and not generalizable. To our knowledge, this study was the first to explore the tibiofemoral contact forces during these gait tasks in a young healthy population.

Consistent with our first hypothesis and instrumented prosthetic knee implant data [1], the magnitude of the tibiofemoral contact forces increased from walking to the more vigorous gait tasks of running and sidestepping where they were substantial (7.5-8.5BW). In previous studies, subject-specific measures of muscle activation patterns [33] and muscle strengths [34] were explicitly incorporated into the computational models, and the estimates of running [33] and sidestepping [34] tibiofemoral contact forces were similar to our results. In contrast,

1 traditional static optimization models [35] that did not incorporate these subject-specific
2 measures, have estimated knee contact forces during running >12 BW. However, it has been
3
4 acknowledged [35] that these traditional static optimization methods likely overestimated the
5
6 lower-limb joint contact forces during vigorous gait tasks. Importantly, the inclusion of
7
8 subject-specific measures into computational models in our study, and others [33, 34], has
9
10 yielded more reasonable estimates of the tibiofemoral contact forces during running and
11
12
13
14 sidestepping.
15

16
17 The large and continuous MTF and LTF contact forces across the different gait tasks
18
19 demonstrated the knee was well stabilized. During sidestepping, Besier and colleagues [36]
20
21 identified specific muscle activation patterns they suggested stabilized the knee against the
22
23 large and complex external loads. However, their measures of stabilization were derived
24
25 directly from surface EMG [36], and were thus indirect measures of muscle action that may
26
27 not have reflected the actual mechanical stabilization of the knee. Our results indicated that
28
29 muscle was the primary contributor to the tibiofemoral contact forces during running and
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
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1320
1321
1322
1323
1324
1325
1326
1327
1328
1329
1330
1331
1332
1333
1334
1335
1336
1337
1338
1339
1340
1341
1342
1343
1344
1345
1346
1347
1348
1349
1350
1351
1352
1353
1354
1355
1356
1357
1358
1359
1360
1361
1362
1363
1364
1365
1366
1367
1368
1369
1370
1371
1372
1373
1374
1375
1376
1377
1378
1379
1380
1381
1382
1383
1384
1385
1386
1387
1388
1389
1390
1391
1392
1393
1394
1395
1396
1397
1398
1399
1400
1401
1402
1403
1404
1405
1406
1407
1408
1409
1410
1411
1412
1413
1414
1415
1416
1417
1418
1419
1420
1421
1422
1423
1424
1425
1426
1427
1428
1429
1430
1431
1432
1433
1434
1435
1436
1437
1438
1439
1440
1441
1442
1443
1444
1445
1446
1447
1448
1449
1450
1451
1452
1453
1454
1455
1456
1457
1458
1459
1460
1461
1462
1463
1464
1465
1466
1467
1468
1469
1470
1471
1472
1473
1474
1475
1476
1477
1478
1479
1480
1481
1482
1483
1484
1485
1486
1487
1488
1489
1490
1491
1492
1493
1494
1495
1496
1497
1498
1499
1500
1501
1502
1503
1504
1505
1506
1507
1508
1509
1510
1511
1512
1513
1514
1515
1516
1517
1518
1519
1520
1521
1522
1523
1524
1525
1526
1527
1528
1529
1530
1531
1532
1533
1534
1535
1536
1537
1538
1539
1540
1541
1542
1543
1544
1545
1546
1547
1548
1549
1550
1551
1552
1553
1554
1555
1556
1557
1558
1559
1560
1561
1562
1563
1564
1565
1566
1567
1568
1569
1570
1571
1572
1573
1574
1575
1576
1577
1578
1579
1580
1581
1582
1583
1584
1585
1586
1587
1588
1589
1590
1591
1592
1593
1594
1595
1596
1597
1598
1599
1600
1601
1602
1603
1604
1605
1606
1607
1608
1609
1610
1611
1612
1613
1614
1615
1616
1617
1618
1619
1620
1621
1622
1623
1624
1625
1626
1627
1628
1629
1630
1631
1632
1633
1634
1635
1636
1637
1638
1639
1640
1641
1642
1643
1644
1645
1646
1647
1648
1649
1650
1651
1652
1653
1654
1655
1656
1657
1658
1659
1660
1661
1662
1663
1664
1665
1666
1667
1668
1669
1670
1671
1672
1673
1674
1675
1676
1677
1678
1679
1680
1681
1682
1683
1684
1685
1686
1687
1688
1689
1690
1691
1692
1693
1694
1695
1696
1697
1698
1699
1700
1701
1702
1703
1704
1705
1706
1707
1708
1709
1710
1711
1712
1713
1714
1715
1716
1717
1718
1719
1720
1721
1722
1723
1724
1725
1726
1727
1728
1729
1730
1731
1732
1733
1734
1735
1736
1737
1738
1739
1740
1741
1742
1743
1744
1745
1746
1747
1748
1749
1750
1751
1752
1753
1754
1755
1756
1757
1758
1759
1760
1761
1762
1763
1764
1765
1766
1767
1768
1769
1770
1771
1772
1773
1774
1775
1776
1777
1778
1779
1780
1781
1782
1783
1784
1785
1786
1787
1788
1789
1790
1791
1792
1793
1794
1795
1796
1797
1798
1799
1800
1801
1802
1803
1804
1805
1806
1807
1808
1809
1810
1811
1812
1813
1814
1815
1816
1817
1818
1819
1820
1821
1822
1823
1824
1825
1826
1827
1828
1829
1830
1831
1832
1833
1834
1835
1836
1837
1838
1839
1840
1841
1842
1843
1844
1845
1846
1847
1848
1849
1850
1851
1852
1853
1854
1855
1856
1857
1858
1859
1860
1861
1862
1863
1864
1865
1866
1867
1868
1869
1870
1871
1872
1873
1874
1875
1876
1877
1878
1879
1880
1881
1882
1883
1884
1885
1886
1887
1888
1889
1890
1891
1892
1893
1894
1895
1896
1897
1898
1899
1900
1901
1902
1903
1904
1905
1906
1907
1908
1909
1910
1911
1912
1913
1914
1915
1916
1917
1918
1919
1920
1921
1922
1923
1924
1925
1926
1927
1928
1929
1930
1931
1932
1933
1934
1935
1936
1937
1938
1939
1940
1941
1942
1943
1944
1945
1946
1947
1948
1949
1950
1951
1952
1953
1954
1955
1956
1957
1958
1959
1960
1961
1962
1963
1964
1965
1966
1967
1968
1969
1970
1971
1972
1973
1974
1975
1976
1977
1978
1979
1980
1981
1982
1983
1984
1985
1986
1987
1988
1989
1990
1991
1992
1993
1994
1995
1996
1997
1998
1999
2000
2001
2002
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016
2017
2018
2019
2020
2021
2022
2023
2024
2025
2026
2027
2028
2029
2030
2031
2032
2033
2034
2035
2036
2037
2038
2039
2040
2041
2042
2043
2044
2045
2046
2047
2048
2049
2050
2051
2052
2053
2054
2055
2056
2057
2058
2059
2060
2061
2062
2063
2064
2065
2066
2067
2068
2069
2070
2071
2072
2073
2074
2075
2076
2077
2078
2079
2080
2081
2082
2083
2084
2085
2086
2087
2088
2089
2090
2091
2092
2093
2094
2095
2096
2097
2098
2099
2100
2101
2102
2103
2104
2105
2106
2107
2108
2109
2110
2111
2112
2113
2114
2115
2116
2117
2118
2119
2120
2121
2122
2123
2124
2125
2126
2127
2128
2129
2130
2131
2132
2133
2134
2135
2136
2137
2138
2139
2140
2141
2142
2143
2144
2145
2146
2147
2148
2149
2150
2151
2152
2153
2154
2155
2156
2157
2158
2159
2160
2161
2162
2163
2164
2165
2166
2167
2168
2169
2170
2171
2172
2173
2174
2175
2176
2177
2178
2179
2180
2181
2182
2183
2184
2185
2186
2187
2188
2189
2190
2191
2192
2193
2194
2195
2196
2197
2198
2199
2200
2201
220

MTF contact force during walking [4, 5]. However, when the KAM was altered by gait retraining or walking poles, changes to the KAM were not necessarily conferred to the MTF contact force [6]. Decoupling of the KAM and the MTF contact forces occurs because the KAM is just one of six generalized external knee loads and does not directly determine the load sharing amongst the many knee structures (*i.e.* articular surfaces, muscles, passive soft tissues). Understandably, the KAM was a worse predictor of maximum MTF contact forces during running and sidestepping compared to walking due to both the increased relative contributions of muscle, and decreased relative contributions of external loads to the tibiofemoral contact forces during the more vigorous gait tasks.

The gait task significantly affected the relationships between the KAM and maximum tibiofemoral contact forces, fully confirming our second hypothesis. In Figure 5, data were clustered along the x-axes due to different KAM values in each gait task, and the regression lines had significantly different y-intercepts due to different maximum tibiofemoral contact forces. If the relationships between the KAM and tibiofemoral contact forces were generalizable to different gait tasks, clustering along the x-axis would still occur reflecting the task-specific KAM, but the tibiofemoral contact forces would be on the same regression line with a common intercept. However, this was not the case, rather, the categorical variable for the gait task was significant for all tibiofemoral compartments, which indicated that the GLMSimple relationships were specific to the gait task. Therefore, other biomechanical and neuromuscular measures, rather than KAM alone, must have substantially influenced the tibiofemoral contact forces.

The strongest predictors of the maximum tibiofemoral contact forces were the VGRF, KAM, MASS and KFM. During gait, the VGRF has been shown to strongly influence the tibiofemoral contact forces [31], and Meyer et al [9] reported significant correlations between the vertical shank resultant force (a VGRF proxy) and the tibiofemoral contact forces at

discrete points throughout the gait cycle. As the GRFs during gait are generated by the combination of body, inertial and muscle loads, it is understandable their importance in determining the contact loading at the knee. Likewise, the heavier the individual the larger the body forces throughout the musculoskeletal system. As well, the KFM has been identified as an important contributor to walking tibiofemoral loading [8, 9]. The KFM during gait is generated primarily by knee flexion and extension muscles, and these muscles have substantial adduction or abduction moment arms [37] in addition to flexion and extension moment arms. Therefore, their activation loads both the MTF and LTF compartments [11, 17]. While GLMStep produced significant relationships to the tibiofemoral contact forces for specific gait tasks, it was unclear whether these relationships were generalizable to different gait tasks.

When the GLMStep equations were applied to a different gait task (*e.g.* a walking equation used to predict running contact forces) they produced larger prediction errors for all of the tibiofemoral contact forces ($1.04 < \text{NRMSE} < 10.3$). This indicated that the GLMStep models were specific to the gait task, and should not be generalized to different gait tasks or external loading conditions, thus confirming our third hypothesis. To determine the tibiofemoral contact forces for different gait tasks or populations some form of neuromusculoskeletal modelling may be necessary. This is because muscle activation patterns have been shown to be dependent on the control task [12], and to vary with both joint health [13] and training [38]. Thus, it seems unlikely that external measures, when used in statistical models that are inherently linear and non-dynamic, can predict joint contact forces during dynamic locomotor tasks.

There were several limitations to this study. First, the estimation of the tibiofemoral contact forces was sensitive to the musculoskeletal [16] and knee contact geometries [39]. We linearly scaled a generic anatomic model to match each participant's dimensions, but linear

scaling is a crude method to personalize musculoskeletal anatomy. Moreover, the tibiofemoral contact points were estimated from a regression equation. Thus, our anatomic models, while personalized, were not fully subject-specific and this could have influenced the relationships we found between the external measures and the tibiofemoral contact forces. Second, we locked the knee adduction/abduction rotations in our anatomic model, enforcing neutral frontal plane alignment of the lower-limbs for all participants. The tibiofemoral contact forces are sensitive to the alignment of the lower-limb [39], thus, locking the knee adduction/abduction rotations for those participants with non-neutral alignment would result in inaccurate model predictions of knee contact forces. However, we did not have standing lower-limb radiographs, therefore, we cannot comment on the lower-limb alignment of the participants, but note that it is a limitation of this study. Third, we did not perform an exhaustive exploration of the possible external measures and their correlation with the tibiofemoral contact forces. Rather, we selected six external measures (KAM, KFM, VGRF, MASS, VEL, GAST) that had a potential biomechanical role in loading the tibiofemoral compartments and had been shown to correlate with the aspects of the tibiofemoral contact forces. However, the studies that reported these correlations were limited to walking gait and selected activities of daily living. Thus, it was possible that during more vigorous gait tasks of running and sidestepping other external measures (not included in our analyses) may have yielded stronger relationships. Finally, we used an EMG-driven neuromusculoskeletal model to solve the muscle redundancy problem required to determine the tibiofemoral contact forces. As such, our study presented the same limitations as other musculoskeletal modelling studies of human motion: a lack of direct validation of the model estimates of muscle force that are subsequently used to determine the tibiofemoral contact forces. The EMG-driven modelling methods have been verified against instrumented knee implants [16], but as vigorous gait tasks are not recommended to knee arthroplasty patients no implant-measure

1 contact forces are available to analyse the contact loading demanding gait tasks. Therefore, it
2 should be noted that while our modelled tibiofemoral contact forces were similar to implant-
3 measurements from walking, and consistent with other subject-specific models for running
4 and sidestepping, they were estimates.
5
6
7
8
9

10 In conclusion, the tibiofemoral contact forces increased from walking to the more vigorous
11 gait tasks. Sidestepping was unique among the gait tasks, having similar peak MTF and LTF
12 contact forces. In our young population, walking and running contact forces were
13 considerably larger than those reported in elderly people with instrumented prostheses,
14 indicating a need for implant design to be adapted for younger patients. During all the gait
15 tasks, the tibiofemoral joint was well stabilized by muscles in the frontal plane. Both
16 compartments experienced continuous contact forces, even in the presence of substantial
17 external knee adduction and abduction moments. Overall, the KAM was a poor predictor of
18 the maximum tibiofemoral contact forces during all the gait tasks, particularly during running
19 and sidestepping as the relative contributions of muscle to contact loading increased. Multiple
20 external measures yielded stronger relationships to the maximum tibiofemoral contact forces
21 compared to KAM alone, with maximum VGRF, KAM, MASS and KFM as the strongest
22 predictors. The relationships between multiple external measures and the maximum
23 tibiofemoral contact forces were specific to the gait task and performed poorly when
24 generalized. Therefore, neuromusculoskeletal modelling may be required to estimate
25 tibiofemoral contact forces during different locomotion tasks and populations.
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] Bergmann G, Bender A, Graichen F, Dymke J, Rohlmann A, Trepczynski A, et al. Standardized loads acting in knee implants. PLoS One. 2014;9:e86035.
- [2] Fregly BJ, Besier TF, Lloyd DG, Delp SL, Banks SA, Pandy MG, et al. Grand challenge competition to predict in vivo knee loads. Journal of Orthopaedic Research. 2012;30:503-13.
- [3] Schipplein OD, Andriacchi TP. Interaction between active and passive knee stabilizers during level walking. Journal of Orthopaedic Research. 1991;9:113-9.
- [4] Trepczynski A, Kutzner I, Bergmann G, Taylor WR, Heller MO. Modulation of the relationship between external knee adduction moments and medial joint contact forces across subjects and activities. Arthritis & Rheumatology. 2014;66:1218-27.
- [5] Zhao D, Banks SA, Mitchell KH, D'Lima DD, Colwell CW, Jr., Fregly BJ. Correlation between the knee adduction torque and medial contact force for a variety of gait patterns. Journal of Orthopaedic Research. 2007;25:789-97.
- [6] Walter JP, D'Lima DD, Colwell CW, Jr., Fregly BJ. Decreased knee adduction moment does not guarantee decreased medial contact force during gait. Journal of Orthopaedic Research. 2010;28:1348-54.
- [7] Erhart JC, Dyrby CO, D'Lima DD, Colwell CW, Andriacchi TP. Changes in in vivo knee loading with a variable-stiffness intervention shoe correlate with changes in the knee adduction moment. Journal of Orthopaedic Science. 2010;28:1548-53.
- [8] Manal K, Gardinier E, Buchanan TS, Snyder-Mackler L. A more informed evaluation of medial compartment loading: the combined use of the knee adduction and flexor moments. Osteoarthritis and Cartilage. 2015;23:1107-11.
- [9] Meyer AJ, D'Lima DD, Besier TF, Lloyd DG, Colwell CW, Jr., Fregly BJ. Are external knee load and EMG measures accurate indicators of internal knee contact forces during gait? Journal of Orthopaedic Research. 2013;31:921-9.

- [10] Kurtz S, Mowat F, Ong K, Chan N, Lau E, Halpern M. Prevalence of primary and revision total hip and knee arthroplasty in the United States from 1990 through 2002. *Journal of Bone & Joint Surgery - American Volume*. 2005;87:1487-97.
- [11] Lloyd DG, Buchanan TS. Strategies of muscular support of varus and valgus isometric loads at the human knee. *Journal of Biomechanics*. 2001;34:1257-67.
- [12] Buchanan TS, Lloyd DG. Muscle activity is different for humans performing static tasks which require force control and position control. *Neuroscience Letters*. 1995;194:61-4.
- [13] Hopkins JT, Ingersoll CD, Edwards JE, Cordova ML. Changes in soleus motoneuron pool excitability after artificial knee joint effusion. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*. 2000;81:1199-203.
- [14] Buchanan TS, Lloyd DG, Manal K, Besier TF. Neuromusculoskeletal modeling: estimation of muscle forces and joint moments and movements from measurements of neural command. *Journal of Applied Biomechanics*. 2004;20:367-95.
- [15] Lloyd DG, Besier TF. An EMG-driven musculoskeletal model to estimate muscle forces and knee joint moments in vivo. *Journal of Biomechanics*. 2003;36:765-76.
- [16] Gerus P, Sartori M, Besier TF, Fregly BJ, Delp SL, Banks SA, et al. Subject-specific knee joint geometry improves predictions of medial tibiofemoral contact forces. *Journal of Biomechanics*. 2013;46:2778-86.
- [17] Winby CR, Lloyd DG, Besier TF, Kirk TB. Muscle and external load contribution to knee joint contact loads during normal gait. *Journal of Biomechanics*. 2009;42:2294-300.
- [18] Dempsey AR, Lloyd DG, Elliott BC, Steele JR, Munro BJ, Russo KA. The effect of technique change on knee loads during sidestep cutting. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*. 2007;39:1765-73.

- [19] Winby CR, Gerus P, Kirk TB, Lloyd DG. Correlation between EMG-based co-activation measures and medial and lateral compartment loads of the knee during gait. *Clinical Biomechanics*. 2013;28:1014-9.
- [20] Stagni R, Fantozzi S, Cappello A, Leardini A. Quantification of soft tissue artefact in motion analysis by combining 3D fluoroscopy and stereophotogrammetry: a study on two subjects. *Clinical Biomechanics*. 2005;20:320-9.
- [21] Hermens HJ, Freriks B, Disselhorst-Klug C, Rau G. Development of recommendations for SEMG sensors and sensor placement procedures. *Journal of Electromyography and Kinesiology*. 2000;10:361-74.
- [22] Robertson DG, Dowling JJ. Design and responses of Butterworth and critically damped digital filters. *Journal of Electromyography and Kinesiology*. 2003;13:569-73.
- [23] Delp SL, Anderson FC, Arnold AS, Loan P, Habib A, John CT, et al. OpenSim: open-source software to create and analyze dynamic simulations of movement. *IEEE Transactions on Bio-medical Engineering*. 2007;54:1940-50.
- [24] Hamner SR, Seth A, Delp SL. Muscle contributions to propulsion and support during running. *Journal of Biomechanics*. 2010;43:2709-16.
- [25] Yamaguchi GT, Zajac FE. A planar model of the knee joint to characterize the knee extensor mechanism. *Journal of Biomechanics*. 1989;22:1-10.
- [26] Delp SL, Loan JP, Hoy MG, Zajac FE, Topp EL, Rosen JM. An interactive graphics-based model of the lower extremity to study orthopaedic surgical procedures. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*. 1990;37:757-67.
- [27] Seth A, Sherman M, Eastman P, Delp S. Minimal formulation of joint motion for biomechanisms. *Nonlinear Dynamics*. 2010;62:291-303.

- [28] Benoit DL, Ramsey DK, Lamontagne M, Xu L, Wretenberg P, Renstrom P. Effect of skin movement artifact on knee kinematics during gait and cutting motions measured in vivo. *Gait & Posture*. 2006;24:152-64.
- [29] Kanamori A, et al. The effect of axial tibial torque on the function of the anterior cruciate ligament: A biomechanical study of a simulated pivot shift test. *Arthroscopy: The Journal of Arthroscopic & Related Surgery*. 2002;18:394-8.
- [30] Modenese L, Ceseracciu E, Reggiani M, Lloyd DG. Estimation of musculotendon parameters for scaled and subject specific musculoskeletal models using an optimization technique. *Journal of Biomechanics*. 2016;49:141-8.
- [31] Shelburne KB, Torry MR, Pandy MG. Contributions of muscles, ligaments, and the ground-reaction force to tibiofemoral joint loading during normal gait. *Journal of Orthopaedic Research* 2006;24:1983-90.
- [32] Demers MS, Pal S, Delp SL. Changes in tibiofemoral forces due to variations in muscle activity during walking. *Journal of Orthopaedic Science* 2014;32:769-76.
- [33] Sasaki K. Muscle contributions to the tibiofemoral joint contact force during running - biomed 2010. *Biomedical Sciences Instrumentation*. 2010;46:305-10.
- [34] Weinhandl JT, Earl-Boehm JE, Ebersole KT, Huddleston WE, Armstrong BS, O'Connor KM. Reduced hamstring strength increases anterior cruciate ligament loading during anticipated sidestep cutting. *Clinical Biomechanics*. 2014;29:752-9.
- [35] Rooney BD, Derrick TR. Joint contact loading in forefoot and rearfoot strike patterns during running. *Journal of Biomechanics*. 2013;46:2201-6.
- [36] Besier TF, Lloyd DG, Ackland TR. Muscle activation strategies at the knee during running and cutting maneuvers. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*. 2003;35:119-27.

- [37] Buchanan TS, Kim AW, Lloyd DG. Selective muscle activation following rapid varus/valgus perturbations at the knee. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*. 1996;28:870-6.
- [38] Hakkinen K, Komi PV. Changes in neuromuscular performance in voluntary and reflex contraction during strength training in man. *International Journal of Sports Medicine*. 1983;4:282-8.
- [39] Lerner ZF, DeMers MS, Delp SL, Browning RC. How tibiofemoral alignment and contact locations affect predictions of medial and lateral tibiofemoral contact forces. *Journal of Biomechanics*. 2015;48:644-50.

Figure 1. (A) The OpenSim [23] generic anatomic model used as a template for each participant. The model was subsequently scaled, registered and optimized to each participant's anthropometry and experimental marker configuration. (B) The tibiofemoral mechanism [25-27] was customized to permit 15°/5° internal/external rotations, while locking adduction/abduction rotations. Two contact points were added to enable the determination of net moments and muscle tendon unit actuator moment arms about the medial and lateral tibial compartments. These contact points were modeled as hinges (with axes perpendicular to the shank's frontal plane) that linked bodies with negligible mass/inertial properties, separated by distance d based on femur condylar width (Supplementary material).

Figure 2. The mean $\pm$ 95% confidence interval of the EMG-driven (solid line) medial (A, B, C), lateral (D, E, F) and total (G, H, I) tibiofemoral contact forces during walking ($\sim 1.44 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$) (left column), running ($\sim 4.4 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$) (middle column) and running with diagonal sidestepping ($\sim 3.5 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$) (right column). All tibiofemoral contact forces were scaled to bodyweight (BW) and time was normalized to 100% of gait cycle for walking or stance for running/sidestepping.

Figure 3. The mean muscle (hollow dot (o)) and external load (horizontal line (-)) relative contributions (%) to the medial (A) and lateral (B) tibiofemoral compartment contact forces during walking, running and sidestepping. The boxes represent the 25-75 quartiles range, median value is marked by the notch and the whiskers approximate ± 2.7 standard deviations ($\sim 99\%$ of the data).

Figure 4. The maximum medial (A), lateral (B) and total (C) tibiofemoral contact forces (BW) regressed against the external knee adduction moment ($\text{N}\cdot\text{m}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}$) for walking (cross-hairs), running (squares) and sidestepping (diamonds). GLMSimple equations in Table 1 correspond to each gait task and tibiofemoral compartment in this figure.

6. Table. Summary of general linear models.

Table 1. The general linear models used to predict the maximum tibiofemoral contact forces.

Tibiofemoral Contact Force	Gait Task	General Linear Model Equations					Prediction Errors using GLMStep Equations		
		GLMSimple & GLMCat	R^2	NRMSE	GLMStep	R^2_{adj}	NRMSE		
							Walk	Run	Sidestep
Medial	Walk		0.36*	0.79	$c_1KAM + c_2VEL + c_3MASS + c_4GAST + c_5$	0.78*	0.43	5.44	3.88
	Run	$c_1KAM + c_2$	0.13*	0.92	$c_1VGRF + c_2KFM + c_3$	0.45*	6.11	0.72	4.79
	Sidestep		0.03	0.98	$c_1VGRF + c_2$	0.34*	5.05	7.61	0.80
	All Tasks	$\sum_{i=1}^3 c_1KAM + c_{2_i}c_{CAT_i} + c_3$	0.35*	0.80	NA				
Lateral	Walk		0.01	0.99	$c_1VGRF + c_2$	0.35*	0.76	6.16	10.3
	Run		0.02	0.98	$c_1KAM + c_2VGRF + c_3MASS + c_4$	0.20*	2.54	0.86	9.61
	Sidestep	$c_1KAM + c_2$	0.29*	0.83	$c_1KAM + c_2VGRF + c_3VEL + c_4MASS + c_5GAST + c_6$	0.59*	1.95	4.75	0.57
	All Tasks	$\sum_{i=1}^3 c_1KAM + c_{2_i}c_{CAT_i} + c_3$	0.58*	0.64	NA				

Total	Walk	$c_1KAM + c_2$	0.15*	0.91	$c_1KAM + c_2VGRF + c_3KFM + c_4MASS + c_5GAST + c_6$	0.63*	0.56	2.62	1.33
	Run	$c_1KAM + c_2$	0.05	0.99	$c_1VGRF + c_2MASS + c_3$	0.23*	2.31	0.85	9.09
	Sidestep		0.01	0.99	$c_1VGRF + c_2KFM + c_3MASS + c_4$	0.36*	1.05	1.04	0.74
	All Tasks	$\sum_{i=1}^3 c_1KAM + c_{2i}c_{CAT_i} + c_3$	0.43*	0.76	NA				

*Significance $p < 0.05$.

The external measures were the external knee adduction moment (KAM), external knee flexion/extension moment (KFM), vertical ground reaction force (VGRF), participant body mass (MASS), gait velocity (VEL), net *gastrocnemii* activation (GAST) evaluated at the time point of the maximum tibiofemoral contact forces.

GLMSimple was a simple regression of maximum tibiofemoral contact forces onto the corresponding KAM.

GLMCat added a categorical variable for the gait task to GLMSimple. c_{CAT_i} was the categorical variable for the i^{th} gait task in GLMCat, and was specified as 1 for the particular gait task and zero for the other gait tasks.

GLMStep was a step-wise regression of the maximum tibiofemoral contact forces onto the corresponding external measures.

Figure 1. The generic anatomic model.
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

Figure 2. Tibiofemoral contact forces during gait tasks.
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

Figure 3. Muscle and external loads contributions.
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

Figure 4. Tibiofemoral contact forces and the KAM

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)