

1 **MUSCLE COORDINATION OF SUPPORT, PROGRESSION AND BALANCE**
2 **DURING STAIR AMBULATION**

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

Yi-Chung Lin, Laurence A. Fok, Anthony G. Schache and Marcus G. Pandy
Dept of Mechanical Engineering, University of Melbourne, Parkville, Victoria,
Australia

Revision 2

13 November 2014

Word count: 3,949 (Introduction to Discussion)

Address correspondence to:
Yi-Chung Lin, Ph.D.
Department of Mechanical Engineering
University of Melbourne
Parkville, Victoria 3010, Australia
Ph. +61 3 8344 0405
Fax. +61 3 8344 4290
Email: linyc@unimelb.edu.au

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 Stair ambulation is more physically demanding than level walking because it requires
3 the lower-limb muscles to generate greater net joint moments. Although lower-limb
4 joint kinematics and kinetics during stair ambulation have been extensively studied,
5 relatively little is known about how the lower-limb muscles accelerate the whole-body
6 center of mass (COM) during stair ascent and descent. The aim of the current study
7 was to evaluate differences in muscle contributions to COM accelerations between
8 level walking and stair ambulation in 15 healthy adults. Three-dimensional
9 quantitative gait analysis and musculoskeletal modeling were used to calculate the
10 contributions of the individual lower-limb muscles to the vertical, fore-aft and
11 mediolateral accelerations of the COM (support, progression, and balance,
12 respectively) during level walking, stair ascent and stair descent. Muscles that
13 contribute most significantly to the acceleration of the COM during level walking
14 (hip, knee, and ankle extensors) also dominate during stair ambulation, but with
15 noticeable differences in coordination. In stair ascent, gluteus maximus accelerates the
16 body forward during the first half of stance and soleus accelerates the body backward
17 during the second half of stance, opposite to the functions displayed by these muscles
18 in level walking. In stair descent, vasti generates backward and medial accelerations
19 of the COM during the second half of stance, whereas it contributes minimally during
20 this period in level walking. Gluteus medius performs similarly in controlling
21 mediolateral balance during level walking and stair ambulation. Differences in lower-
22 limb muscular coordination exist between stair ambulation and level walking, and our
23 results have implications for interventions aimed at preventing stair-related falls.

24 **Keywords:** gait, falls prevention, induced accelerations, muscle function

INTRODUCTION

1
2 Stair ambulation is an activity of daily living. Although healthy adults can
3 perform this task with relative ease, ascending and descending stairs can be more
4 demanding for people with compromised motor function, such as the elderly (Reeves
5 et al., 2008) or individuals with osteoarthritis (Kaufman et al., 2001; Asay et al.,
6 2009). Compared to level walking, stair ambulation is associated with greater risk of
7 severe or fatal falls (Manning, 1983), where 75% of these falls occur during stair
8 descent (Svanström, 1974; Tinetti et al., 1988). Since muscles are responsible for
9 controlling body movement, a better understanding of how muscles accelerate the
10 whole-body center of mass (COM) (henceforth referred to as muscle function) during
11 stair ambulation could help facilitate the development of more effective fall
12 prevention strategies.

13 Lower-limb muscle function during level walking has been extensively
14 investigated using musculoskeletal modelling approaches. Each muscle contributes to
15 the vertical, fore-aft and mediolateral accelerations of the COM during stance
16 (described as support, progression, and balance, respectively) (Pandy and Andriacchi,
17 2010). Liu et al. (2006) and Pandy et al. (2010) reported that gluteus medius, gluteus
18 maximus, vasti, and soleus contribute significantly to support in the first half of
19 stance, whereas forward progression in the second half of stance is dominated by
20 soleus and gastrocnemius. Furthermore, to maintain balance in the frontal plane,
21 Pandy et al. (2010) and John et al (2012) showed that gluteus medius coordinates with
22 vasti in the first half of stance while gluteus medius coordinates with both soleus and
23 gastrocnemius in the second half of stance. By comparison, less is known about how
24 the lower-limb muscles coordinate motion of the COM during stair ambulation.

1 Inverse dynamics-based studies suggest that greater knee and ankle extension
2 moments are exerted during the first half of stance in stair ambulation than during this
3 period in level walking (Riener et al., 2002; Silverman et al., 2014). These studies
4 have also shown the peak knee extension moment during the second half of stance in
5 stair descent to be more than three-fold greater than that observed during level
6 walking. Finally, the ankle plantarflexion moment can peak as high as 75% of a
7 maximal voluntary contraction in the early stance phase of stair descent (Reeves et al.,
8 2008), whereas the ankle plantarflexion moment peaks during late stance in level
9 walking.

10 Inverse dynamics-based studies have also investigated differences in the hip joint
11 moment between level walking and stair ambulation. Compared to level walking,
12 Riener et al. (2002) and Silverman et al. (2014) found the peak hip extension moment
13 in the early stance phase of stair ascent and descent to be significantly smaller, with a
14 larger reduction evident during stair descent. A few studies have compared the peak
15 hip abduction moment between level walking and stair ambulation and have reported
16 some inconsistent results. For example, Silverman et al. (2014) found the first and
17 second peaks of the hip abduction moment during stair ascent to be significantly
18 lower than those measured for level walking, whereas Nadeau et al. (2003) found no
19 significant difference in the magnitude of the first peak.

20 While the aforementioned studies have provided important insights into the
21 differences in net joint moments between level walking and stair ambulation, the
22 corresponding changes in the functional roles of the individual lower-limb muscles
23 can only be inferred from these differences (Zajac and Gordon, 1989). The reported
24 differences in the magnitudes and/or timing of the lower-limb joint moments between
25 level walking and stair ambulation suggest that there may also be differences between

1 these two activities in the way the hip, knee, and ankle extensor muscles coordinate
2 motion of the COM.

3 In the present study, we used a three-dimensional musculoskeletal model to
4 investigate how lower-limb muscle function during stair ambulation differs from that
5 during level walking. We anticipated that any differences in muscle contributions to
6 COM motion will most likely be evident in the vertical direction because of the roles
7 of the hip, knee, and ankle extension moments in supporting the body (Kepple et al.,
8 1997) and the need to control the vertical COM displacement during stair ambulation.
9 Given that stair ambulation has been demonstrated to be associated with greater knee
10 and ankle extension moments but a reduced hip extension moment compared to level
11 walking, the vertical support provided by these three extension moments should also
12 vary accordingly. We therefore hypothesized that during stair ambulation the peak
13 contributions to the vertical acceleration of the COM would be significantly increased
14 for the knee and ankle extensors but significantly reduced for the hip extensors. The
15 results of this study will provide insight into which lower-limb muscles are most
16 relied upon for support, progression and balance during stair ambulation, and thus
17 likely play a pivotal role in preventing stair-related falls.

18

19 **METHODS**

20 Fifteen healthy adults (4 males, 11 females; age: 54 ± 8 yrs; weight: 67 ± 11 kg;
21 height: 166 ± 8 cm) underwent gait experiments in the Biomotion Laboratory at the
22 University of Melbourne. Ethical approval was obtained from the University of
23 Melbourne Human Research Ethics Committee, and each participant provided written
24 informed consent prior to the commencement of the study. Reflective markers were
25 placed at specific anatomical landmarks on the trunk, pelvis, and both arms and legs.

1 Marker trajectories were captured at 120 Hz using a nine-camera motion capture
2 system (Vicon, Oxford Metrics Ltd, Oxford, UK) during all locomotor tasks. Pairs of
3 Ag/AgCl surface electrodes (MediMax Global, Shalden, Hampshire, UK) were placed
4 on an arbitrarily chosen leg to record the electromyographic (EMG) signal from five
5 muscles: gluteus maximus, gluteus medius, vastus lateralis, gastrocnemius, and
6 soleus. Additional details regarding retro-reflective marker and EMG electrode
7 placement have been reported previously (Crossley et al., 2012). Ground reaction
8 forces (GRFs) during gait were measured using a series of three ground-embedded
9 force plates (Advanced Mechanical Technology Inc., Watertown, MA, USA),
10 whereas GRFs during stair ambulation were measured using one ground-embedded
11 force plate and two portable AccuGait force plates (Advanced Mechanical
12 Technology Inc., Watertown, MA, USA) mounted on the first and second steps of a
13 custom-built three-step staircase. GRF and EMG data were sampled at 1080 Hz.

14 All participants performed level walking (1.36 ± 0.15 m/s), stair ascent ($0.50 \pm$
15 0.11 m/s) and stair descent (0.74 ± 0.20 m/s) tasks at a self-selected speed while
16 wearing standardized footwear. Participants were asked to stand still in their neutral
17 pose before performing any task. They were then instructed to land their test leg on
18 the second ground-embedded force plate and the first step of the staircase during level
19 walking and stair ambulation, respectively. Each trial commenced from initial contact
20 with the test leg, and only data for the stance phase were analyzed. EMG data were
21 also collected whilst all participants performed isometric maximum voluntary
22 contractions of the muscles crossing the hip, knee and ankle. Marker and GRF data
23 were low-pass filtered at 4 and 60 Hz, respectively, using a fourth-order Butterworth
24 filter. EMG data were full-wave rectified and low-pass filtered at 10 Hz using a
25 second-order Butterworth filter to create linear envelopes, which were normalized by

1 the mean EMG signals recorded from each subject's maximum voluntary contraction
2 trials.

3 A generic three-dimensional musculoskeletal model was implemented in an open-
4 source software package (Delp et al., 2007) to calculate joint kinematics, joint kinetics
5 and muscle forces based on the experimental data. The skeleton was represented as a
6 12-segment, 23 degree-of-freedom linkage system. The head and trunk were modelled
7 as a single rigid body that articulated with the pelvis via a ball-and-socket joint. For
8 the lower limbs, each hip was modelled as a ball-and-socket joint, each knee as a
9 translating hinge joint, and each ankle as a universal joint comprised of two non-
10 intersecting hinge joints. The lower limbs and trunk were actuated by 92 muscle-
11 tendon units, with each unit represented as a three-element Hill-type muscle in series
12 with an elastic tendon (Zajac, 1989). For the upper limbs, each shoulder was modelled
13 as a ball-and-socket joint and each elbow was represented as a universal joint
14 comprised of two non-intersecting hinge joints. The joints of the upper limbs were
15 actuated by ten ideal torque motors (Dorn et al., 2012).

16 Scaled-generic models were developed by scaling the segmental inertial properties
17 and muscle-tendon attachment sites assumed in the generic musculoskeletal model to
18 each participant's body dimensions. Joint angles were computed over an entire gait
19 cycle using an inverse kinematics analysis that minimized the sum of the squared
20 differences between the positions of virtual markers identified on the model and
21 reflective markers placed on the subject (Lu and O'Connor, 1999). Internal joint
22 moments were calculated using a standard inverse dynamics approach.

23 Joint moments were decomposed into individual muscle forces using a static
24 optimization algorithm, which minimized the sum of all muscle activations squared
25 subject to each muscle's force-length-velocity properties (Anderson and Pandy,

1 2001). A pseudo-inverse force decomposition method (Lin et al., 2011) was then used
2 to compute the contributions of all lower-limb muscle forces to the vertical, fore-aft,
3 and mediolateral accelerations of the COM (support, progression, and balance,
4 respectively). Individual muscle forces, as well as their contributions to the COM
5 accelerations, were combined into functional muscle groups (see Figure 2 caption).
6 All results were time-normalized to the stance phase and then averaged separately
7 across all participants. Muscle forces and joint moments were normalized to each
8 participant's body weight and to body weight and height, respectively.

9 One-way repeated-measures ANOVA tests were used to determine whether
10 locomotor task (i.e., level walking, stair ascent, and stair descent) significantly
11 influenced the peak muscle forces and peak muscle contributions to the COM
12 accelerations. If a significant main effect was obtained, post hoc paired *t*-tests were
13 used to determine if significant differences existed between each of the locomotor
14 tasks. A significance level of $p < 0.017$ was set for all tests after applying a
15 Bonferroni correction to the significance level of 0.05 (i.e., three pairwise
16 comparisons were performed per dependent variable). Note that only the pairwise
17 comparisons of stair ambulation versus level walking were of interest; the pairwise
18 comparison of stair ascent versus descent was beyond the scope of the present study.

19

20

RESULTS

21 In the sagittal plane, stair ascent and descent both required greater peak moments
22 at the knee and ankle joints in the first half of the stance phase, but a smaller peak
23 moment at the ankle joint in the second half of stance when compared to level
24 walking (Fig. 1). During stair ascent a hip extension moment was present throughout
25 the stance phase. The peak hip extension and flexion moments were reduced during

1 the first and second half of stance, respectively, in stair descent relative to level
2 walking. In the frontal plane, a double-bump hip abduction moment was observed
3 across all three functional tasks, but the magnitude of this moment was reduced
4 during stair ascent.

5 The time histories of the predicted muscle forces were in general agreement with
6 the recorded EMG linear envelopes for level walking and stair ambulation, except for
7 SOL during stair descent and GMED during stair ascent (Fig. 2). Locomotor task had
8 a significant effect on peak muscle forces (Table 1). Post hoc tests revealed that
9 differences in peak muscle forces were evident during both stair ascent and stair
10 descent compared to level walking (Fig. 3). During stair ascent, the peak forces
11 generated by VAS and SOL in the first half of stance were significantly higher than
12 during level walking ($p < 0.001$), whereas the peak forces generated by SOL, GMED,
13 and GAS in the second half of stance were significantly lower than during level
14 walking (SOL: $p = 0.003$; GMED and GAS: $p < 0.001$). Over the entire stance phase
15 for stair descent, the force generated by SOL was higher than that generated during
16 level walking, with the magnitude of the peak force being significantly different ($p =$
17 0.003). The peak force generated by VAS in the second half of the stance phase for
18 stair descent was significantly higher ($p < 0.001$) than that generated during level
19 walking, whereas the peak force generated by GAS was significantly lower ($p <$
20 0.001).

21 Locomotor task had a significant effect on muscle function during the first half of
22 stance for the hip, knee, and ankle extensors and the hip abductors; the fore-aft
23 contributions of VAS and SOL, however, were not significantly different (Table 1).
24 Post hoc tests revealed that during stair descent GMAX and GMED generated
25 significantly less vertical support compared to level walking (GMAX: $p < 0.001$;

1 GMED: $p < 0.001$), whereas SOL generated significantly greater vertical support ($p <$
2 0.001) and lateral acceleration ($p < 0.001$) (Fig. 5). The contributions of GMAX and
3 GMED to the fore-aft acceleration of the COM were also significantly different
4 between level walking and stair ambulation (GMAX: $p < 0.001$; GMED: $p < 0.015$).
5 Both hip muscles accelerated the body forward during the first half of stance in stair
6 ambulation, whereas the same muscles decelerated the body during level walking
7 (Figs. 4 and 5). GMED also provided significantly higher medial acceleration during
8 stair descent ($p < 0.001$).

9 Locomotor task also had a significant effect on muscle function during the second
10 half of stance for the hip, knee, and ankle extensors (Table 1). Post hoc tests revealed
11 that VAS generated significantly greater vertical support ($p < 0.002$) and fore-aft
12 deceleration ($p < 0.003$) during stair ambulation, whereas this muscle contributed
13 virtually nothing during level walking (Figs. 4 and 6). Compared to level walking,
14 VAS also generated significantly greater medial acceleration during stair descent ($p <$
15 0.001). Contributions from SOL to accelerate the COM forward were not significantly
16 different between level walking and stair descent; in contrast, SOL applied a
17 backward acceleration during stair ascent.

18

19

DISCUSSION

20 The current study quantified the contributions of the individual lower-limb
21 muscles to the generation of vertical support, the modulation of forward progression,
22 and the control of mediolateral balance during stair ambulation in healthy adults.
23 Consistent with our hypothesis, vertical support generated by the knee and ankle
24 extensors was significantly greater during stair ascent and descent, respectively, than
25 during level walking. Vertical support generated by the hip extensors was

1 significantly less during stair descent, which also concurs with our hypothesis.
2 Interestingly, the contributions of the hip extensors to the fore-aft acceleration of the
3 COM differed in direction between level walking and stair ambulation.

4 Muscles that contribute most significantly to the acceleration of the COM during
5 level walking (i.e., the hip, knee, and ankle extensors) also dominate the acceleration
6 of the COM during stair ambulation, but with noticeable differences in coordination.
7 For example, SOL generated the greatest forward acceleration during the second half
8 of stance in level walking, while it generated the greatest backward acceleration
9 during the same period of stair ascent. These differences can be attributed to the
10 configuration of the skeletal system by calculating a given muscle's potential
11 contribution to the acceleration of the COM on a unit-force basis. Such a calculation
12 describes the net effect of body posture, and hence musculoskeletal geometry (i.e.,
13 moment arm) on the functional capacity of the muscle during a prescribed task
14 (Correa and Pandy, 2013) (see Supplementary Material).

15 In agreement with Riener et al. (2002) and Silverman et al. (2014), we found that
16 stair ascent and descent required greater knee and ankle extension moments during the
17 first half of stance compared to level walking (Fig. 1). These increases in the
18 extension moments were reflected in the greater forces generated by VAS and SOL
19 during stair ambulation (Figs. 2 and 3), which is consistent with findings reported by
20 Ghafari et al. (2009). The observed increase in the vertical support generated by these
21 two extensors during stair ambulation supports our hypothesis.

22 Stair ascent is a more challenging functional task than level walking as the lower-
23 limb muscles must raise the COM against gravity in order to progress to the next step.
24 Consistent with McFadyen and Winter (1988), we found that the knee extensors,
25 VAS, played a primary role in supporting the body during the first half of stance (Fig.

1 4). The hip and ankle extensors, GMAX and SOL, were the other two important
2 muscles that contributed to the elevation of the COM during the same period of stair
3 ascent.

4 The function of the largest muscle in the human body, GMAX, is likely to be of
5 clinical relevance in terms of preventing backward falls during stair ascent. GMAX
6 supported the body during both level walking and stair ascent. It also contributed
7 greatly to the forward acceleration of the COM during stair ascent and the backward
8 acceleration of the COM during level walking. This contribution to the body's
9 forward movement during stair ascent may be the main mechanism that moves the
10 COM closer to the center of pressure (which was described by McFadyen and Winter
11 (1988) as an optimal position) during the first double support period in stair ascent.
12 People with GMAX weakness may therefore experience difficulty in initiating stair
13 ascent due to an inability to move the body's COM forward to this optimal position.
14 Moreover, Zachazewski et al. (1993) has shown that the COM is anterior to the center
15 of pressure for most of the single-leg support period during stair ascent. This relative
16 anterior position of the COM probably helps to reduce the likelihood of a backward
17 fall during stair ascent and it may be partially attributable to trunk flexion (Krebs et
18 al., 1992), which likely requires optimal hip extensor function. Weak hip extensors
19 are known to cause backward trunk lean during level walking (Perry, 1992); therefore,
20 people with GMAX dysfunction will likely experience difficulty in controlling
21 locomotor stability during stair ascent.

22 Consistent with the findings of McFadyen and Winter (1988), the ankle extensors,
23 SOL and GAS, dominated vertical support during the second half of stance in stair
24 ascent (Fig. 4). McFadyen and Winter (1988) also reported that the ankle extensors
25 were involved in the forward movement of the body during the same period of stair

1 ascent. We found that whilst SOL and GAS both contributed substantially to vertical
2 support, GAS accelerated the COM forward whereas SOL produced a backward
3 acceleration (Fig. 4). The action of GAS as a knee flexor may explain its contribution
4 to forward acceleration during stair ascent, because its action as an ankle extensor
5 would presumably decelerate the body as suggested by the contribution of SOL to
6 backward acceleration.

7 During stair descent, humans are required to control the rate of lowering of the
8 COM while progressing to the next step. Our results showed that VAS and SOL were
9 the two major extensors to prevent the body from collapsing under the force of gravity
10 and to control its speed during stair descent (Fig. 4), which is in agreement with the
11 findings of McFadyen and Winter (1988).

12 The present study highlighted two interesting features of muscle coordination
13 related to the knee extensors and hip abductors during stair descent. First, the
14 contributions of VAS and GMED to the fore-aft acceleration of the COM during
15 stance were similar in magnitude but opposite in direction; VAS and GMED
16 decelerated and accelerated the body, respectively (Fig. 4). GMED is known for its
17 role in providing frontal-plane stability during level walking (Winter 1995; Pandy et
18 al., 2010; John et al., 2012), but our results showed that GMED also has a major role
19 in propelling the body forward during stair descent. This functional role of GMED is
20 especially important during the first half of stance as most of the forward acceleration
21 of the COM is generated by GMED. For the same reason, the decelerating ability of
22 VAS is especially critical during the midstance phase of stair descent. Therefore, the
23 body may experience excessive forward momentum if VAS fails to provide the
24 necessary fore-aft deceleration during stair descent, which would threaten locomotor
25 stability and may induce a fall.

1 Second, VAS and GMED acted in unison to accelerate the body medially
2 during the second half of the stance phase in stair descent (Fig. 4). VAS has been
3 reported to accelerate the body laterally during early stance in level walking (Pandy et
4 al., 2010; John et al., 2012). In the current study, VAS also accelerated the body
5 laterally during early stance in both level walking and stair ascent; however, it
6 accelerated the body medially during the transition from single-leg support to double-
7 leg support in stair descent (Fig. 4). Therefore, VAS and GMED acted in unison to
8 control frontal-plane balance by maintaining the projection of the COM medial to the
9 base of support during this transition period. The quadriceps muscles play an
10 important role in stair descent, and quadriceps strength is known to decrease
11 significantly with increasing age (Hurley et al., 1988). It is possible that this reduction
12 in quadriceps strength impedes the ability of the quadriceps to maintain frontal-plane
13 balance and may explain why older adults fall more frequently during stair descent
14 than ascent (Svanström, 1974; Tinetti et al., 1988).

15 Three limitations should be considered when interpreting the results of this
16 study. First, muscle forces were calculated by solving a static optimization problem
17 that minimized the sum of the muscle activations squared. Although this performance
18 criterion has been widely used to predict muscle forces during level walking (Glitsch
19 and Baumann, 1997; Pandy and Andriacchi, 2010; Lin et al., 2012), it is unclear
20 whether the same criterion is also applicable to stair ambulation. Nevertheless, the
21 temporal agreement between our muscle force predictions and the measured EMG
22 linear envelopes was generally good for level walking and stair ambulation (Fig. 2).
23 We note, however, that the calculated SOL force during stair descent is greater than
24 may be expected based on the recorded EMG activity, whereas the calculated GMED
25 force during stair ascent is smaller than expected. We examined the potential causes

1 of these two discrepancies and concluded that they are unlikely to significantly affect
2 our interpretations of SOL and GMED function (see Supplementary Material).

3 Second, no published results are available for comparison with our results of
4 lower-limb muscle function during stair ambulation. However, our muscle function
5 results for level walking are consistent with those published previously (Neptune et
6 al., 2004; Liu et al., 2006; Pandy et al., 2010; John et al., 2012). Since the same
7 musculoskeletal model and methods were used to calculate muscle function during
8 level walking and stair ambulation for each subject, we have confidence in the
9 conclusions derived for stair ambulation. In addition, our GRF measurements (Fig.
10 S2, Supplementary Material) and calculated joint kinematics (Figs. S3 and S4,
11 Supplementary Material) during stair ambulation are consistent with results reported
12 previously by others (Nadeau et al., 2003; Protopapadaki et al., 2007; Reeves et al.,
13 2008; Bovi et al., 2011).

14 Third, a three-step staircase was used in the present study, which limits the
15 ability to analyze steady-state stair ambulation. While knee kinematics has been found
16 to remain consistent across gait cycles during stair ambulation on a four-step staircase
17 (Whatling and Holt, 2010), Cluff and Robertson (2011) demonstrated that a single
18 gait cycle may not be sufficient to achieve steady-state stair descent. Further work is
19 required to understand the extent to which the number of stair steps affects muscle
20 function during stair ambulation.

21 To summarize, we observed several distinct differences in the coordination of
22 the major lower-limb muscles between level walking and stair ambulation. In stair
23 ascent, GMAX accelerates the body forward and SOL accelerates the body backward
24 during the first and second half of stance, respectively, opposite to the functions
25 displayed by these muscles in level walking. In stair descent, VAS generates

1 backward and medial accelerations of the COM during the second half of stance,
2 whereas it contributes minimally during this period in level walking. Previous studies
3 have shown that muscle strength training can reduce the risk of falling (Horlings et
4 al., 2008; Seguin and Nelson, 2003). Our findings related to the functional roles of
5 hip, knee, and ankle extensors during stair ambulation further suggest that optimizing
6 the performance of these muscles should be prioritized in programs aimed at
7 preventing stair-related falls.

8

9

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

10 This work was supported by an Australian Research Council Grant (DP0878705), a
11 National Health and Medical Research Council of Australia Project Grant (508966),
12 and a VESKI Innovation Fellowship awarded to MGP. We thank Jonathan Lentzos
13 and Hannah Ozturk for their assistance with the collection of gait data.

14

15

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

16 None of the authors have a conflict of interest in relation to the work reported here.

17

REFERENCES

- 1
- 2 Anderson, F.C., Pandy, M.G., 2001. Static and dynamic optimization solutions for
3 gait are practically equivalent. *Journal of Biomechanics* 34, 153-161.
- 4 Asay, J.L., Mündermann, A., Andriacchi, T.P., 2009. Adaptive patterns of movement
5 during stair climbing in patients with knee osteoarthritis. *Journal of*
6 *Orthopaedic Research* 27, 325-329.
- 7 Bovi, G., Rabuffetti, M., Mazzoleni, P., & Ferrarin, M., 2011. A multiple-task gait
8 analysis approach: kinematic, kinetic and EMG reference data for healthy
9 young and adult subjects. *Gait Posture*, 33, 6-13.
- 10 Cluff, T., Robertson, D. G., 2011. Kinetic analysis of stair descent: Part 1. Forwards
11 step-over-step descent. *Gait Posture*, 33, 423-428.
- 12 Crossley, K.M., Dorn, T.W., Ozturk, H., Van den Noort, J., Schache, A.G., Pandy,
13 M.G., 2012. Altered hip muscle forces during gait in people with
14 patellofemoral osteoarthritis. *Osteoarthritis and Cartilage* 20, 1243-1249.
- 15 Delp, S.L., Anderson, F.C., Arnold, A.S., Loan, P., Habib, A., John, C.T.,
16 Guendelman, E., Thelen, D.G., 2007. OpenSim: Open-source software to
17 create and analyze dynamic simulations of movement. *IEEE Transactions on*
18 *Biomedical Engineering* 54, 1940-1950.
- 19 Dorn, T.W., Schache, A.G., Pandy, M.G., 2012. Muscular strategy shift in human
20 running: dependence of running speed on hip and ankle muscle performance. *J*
21 *Exp Biol*, 215, 1944-1956.
- 22 Dwyer, M. K., Stafford, K., Mattacola, C. G., Uhl, T. L., Giordani, M., 2013.
23 Comparison of gluteus medius muscle activity during functional tasks in
24 individuals with and without osteoarthritis of the hip joint. *Clinical*
25 *Biomechanics*, 28, 757-761.
- 26 Fok, L.A., Schache, A.G., Crossley, K.M., Lin, Y.-C., Pandy, M.G., 2013.
27 Patellofemoral joint loading during stair ambulation in people with
28 patellofemoral osteoarthritis. *Arthritis and Rheumatism* 65, 2059-2069.
- 29 Foucher, K. C., Hurwitz, D. E., & Wimmer, M. A., 2007. Preoperative gait
30 adaptations persist one year after surgery in clinically well-functioning total
31 hip replacement patients. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 40, 3432-3437.
- 32 Ghafari, A.S., Meghdari, A., Vossoughi, G.R., 2009. Muscle-driven forward
33 dynamics simulation for the study of differences in muscle function during
34 stair ascent and descent. *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical*
35 *Engineers, Part H: Journal of Engineering in Medicine* 223, 863-874.
- 36 Glitsch, U., Baumann, W., 1997. The three-dimensional determination of internal
37 loads in the lower extremity. *Journal of Biomechanics* 30, 1123-1131.
- 38 Hicks-Little, C.A., Peindl, R.D., Fehring, T.K., Odum, S.M., Hubbard, T.J., Cordova,
39 M.L., 2012. Temporal-spatial gait adaptations during stair ascent and descent
40 in patients with knee osteoarthritis. *Journal of Arthroplasty* 27, 1183-1189.
- 41 Horlings, C.G.C., van Engelen, B.G.M., Allum, J.H.J., Bloem, B.R., 2008. A weak
42 balance: the contribution of muscle weakness to postural instability and falls.
43 *Nat Clin Pract Neuro* 4, 504-515.
- 44 Hurley, M.V., Rees, J., Newham, D.J., 1998. Quadriceps function, proprioceptive
45 acuity and functional performance in healthy young, middle-aged and elderly
46 subjects. *Age Ageing*, 27, 55-62.

- 1 John, C.T., Seth, A., Schwartz, M.H., Delp, S.L., 2012. Contributions of muscles to
2 mediolateral ground reaction force over a range of walking speeds. *Journal of*
3 *Biomechanics*, 45, 2438-2443.
- 4 Kaufman, K.R., Hughes, C., Morrey, B.F., Morrey, M., An, K.-N., 2001. Gait
5 characteristics of patients with knee osteoarthritis. *Journal of Biomechanics*
6 34, 907-915.
- 7 Kepple, T. M., Siegel, K. L., & Stanhope, S. J., 1997. Relative contributions of the
8 lower extremity joint moments to forward progression and support during
9 gait. *Gait & Posture*, 6, 1-8.
- 10 Krebs, D.E., Wong, D., Jevsevar, D., Riley, P.O., Hodge, W.A., 1992. Trunk
11 kinematics during locomotor activities. *Phys Ther*, 72, 505-514.
- 12 Lin, Y.-C., Kim, H.J., Pandy, M.G., 2011. A computationally-efficient method for
13 assessing muscle function during human locomotion. *International Journal*
14 *for Numerical Methods in Biomedical Engineering* 27, 436-449.
- 15 Lin, Y.-C., Dorn, T.W., Schache, A.G., Pandy, M.G., 2012. Comparison of different
16 methods for estimating muscle forces in human movement. *Proceedings of the*
17 *Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part H: Journal of Engineering in*
18 *Medicine*, 226, 103-112.
- 19 Liu, M.Q., Anderson, F.C., Pandy, M.G., Delp, S.L., 2006. Muscles that support the
20 body also modulate forward progression during walking. *Journal of*
21 *Biomechanics* 39, 2623-2630.
- 22 Lu, T.W., O'Connor, J.J., 1999. Bone position estimation from skin marker co-
23 ordinates using global optimisation with joint constraints. *Journal of*
24 *Biomechanics* 32, 129-134.
- 25 Lyons, K., Perry, J., Gronley, J. K., Barnes, L., & Antonelli, D., 1983. Timing and
26 relative intensity of hip extensor and abductor muscle action during level and
27 stair ambulation. An EMG study. *Phys Ther* 63, 1597-1605.
- 28 Manning, D.P., 1983. Deaths and injuries caused by slipping, tripping and falling.
29 *Ergonomics* 26, 3-9.
- 30 McFadyen, B.J., Winter, D.A., 1988. An integrated biomechanical analysis of normal
31 stair ascent and descent. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 21, 733-744.
- 32 Nadeau, S., McFadyen, B.J., Malouin, F., 2003. Frontal and sagittal plane analyses of
33 the stair climbing task in healthy adults aged over 40 years: what are the
34 challenges compared to level walking? *Clinical Biomechanics* 18, 950-959.
- 35 Neptune, R.R., Zajac, F.E., Kautz, S.A., 2004. Muscle force redistributes segmental
36 power for body progression during walking. *Gait and Posture* 19, 194-205.
- 37 Perry, J., 1992. *Gait analysis : normal and pathological function*. Thorofare, N.J.:
38 SLACK Incorporated.
- 39 Pandy, M. G., 2001. Computer modeling and simulation of human movement. *Annu*
40 *Rev Biomed Eng* 3: 245-273.
- 41 Pandy, M.G., Andriacchi, T.P., 2010. Muscle and joint function in human locomotion.
42 *Annual Review of Biomedical Engineering* 12, 401-433.
- 43 Pandy, M.G., Lin, Y.-C., Kim, H.J., 2010. Muscle coordination of mediolateral
44 balance in normal walking. *Journal of Biomechanics* 43, 2055-2064.
- 45 Protopapadaki, A., Drechsler, W.I., Cramp, M.C., Coutts, F.J., Scott, O.M., 2007.
46 Hip, knee, ankle kinematics and kinetics during stair ascent and descent in
47 healthy young individuals. *Clinical Biomechanics* 22, 203-210.
- 48 Reeves, N.D., Spanjaard, M., Mohagheghi, A.A., Baltzopoulos, V., Maganaris, C.N.,
49 2008. The demands of stair descent relative to maximum capacities in elderly

1 and young adults. *Journal of Electromyography and Kinesiology* 18, 218-
2 227.

3 Riener, R., Rabuffetti, M., Frigo, C., 2002. Stair ascent and descent at different
4 inclinations. *Gait & Posture* 15, 32-44.

5 Seguin, R., Nelson, M.E., 2003. The benefits of strength training for older adults.
6 *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 25, 141-149.

7 Silverman, A. K., Neptune, R. R., Sinitski, E. H., & Wilken, J. M., 2014. Whole-body
8 angular momentum during stair ascent and descent. *Gait Posture*, 39, 1109-
9 1114.

10 Svanström, L., 1974. Falls on stairs: an epidemiological accident study. *Scandinavian*
11 *Journal of Public Health* 2, 113-120.

12 Tinetti, M.E., Speechley, M., Ginter, S.F., 1988. Risk-Factors for Falls among Elderly
13 Persons Living in the Community. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 319,
14 1701-1707.

15 Winter, D.A., 1995. Human balance and posture control during standing and walking.
16 *Gait & Posture* 3, 193-214.

17 Whatling, G. M., & Holt, C. A., 2010. Does the choice of stair gait cycle affect
18 resulting knee joint kinematics and moments? *Proceedings of the Institution*
19 *of Mechanical Engineers Part H-Journal of Engineering in Medicine*,
20 224(H9), 1085-1093.

21 Zachazewski, J. E., Riley, P. O., & Krebs, D. E. (1993). Biomechanical analysis of
22 body mass transfer during stair ascent and descent of healthy subjects. *J*
23 *Rehabil Res Dev*, 30(4), 412-422.

24 Zajac, F.E., 1989. Muscle and tendon: properties, models, scaling, and application to
25 biomechanics and motor control. *Critical reviews in biomedical engineering*
26 17, 359-411.

27 Zajac, F.E., Gordon, M.E., 1989. Determining muscle's force and action in multi-
28 articular movement. *Exercise and Sport Sciences Reviews*, 17, 187-230.

29

FIGURE CAPTIONS

1

2 **Fig. 1.** Mean joint moments during level walking (black solid line), stair ascent (black
3 dashed line) and stair descent (black dotted line). Positive moments represent knee
4 extension, hip flexion, hip abduction, hip internal rotation, ankle plantarflexion, and
5 subtalar inversion.

6 **Fig. 2.** Comparison of experimental EMG and model-predicted muscle forces for
7 level walking, stair ascent, and stair descent. The shaded areas represent the mean
8 normalized EMG linear envelopes recorded for all participants, whereas the solid
9 lines represent the mean muscle forces (dashed lines represent \pm one standard
10 deviation from the mean) predicted for all participants. Symbols defining the major
11 gait events are as follows: IHS, ipsilateral heel-strike; CTO, contralateral toe-off;
12 CHS, contralateral heel-strike; and ITO, ipsilateral toe-off. Muscle symbols appearing
13 in the graphs are: GMAX (superior, middle and inferior gluteus maximus), GMED
14 (anterior, middle and posterior compartments of gluteus medius/minimus), VAS
15 (vastus medialis, vastus intermedius and vastus lateralis), GAS (medial and lateral
16 compartments of gastrocnemius), and SOL (soleus). For each muscle, the EMG linear
17 envelopes are dimensionless and have been scaled using the same scaling factor for
18 all three functional tasks to enhance clarity. The scaling factor for each muscle was
19 determined by calculating the ratio between the peak muscle force and the peak
20 normalized EMG activity across three functional tasks.

21 **Fig. 3.** Mean peak forces calculated for GMAX, VAS, SOL, GMED, and GAS during
22 the first-half (top panel) and second-half (bottom panel) of stance in level walking and
23 stair ambulation. The thin vertical line at the top of each histogram represents \pm 1
24 standard deviation from the mean. Asterisks and double asterisks indicate $p < 0.017$
25 and $p < 0.001$, respectively, for post hoc tests.

1 **Fig. 4.** Comparison of contributions of major muscle groups to the vertical, fore-aft
2 and mediolateral components of the center-of-mass acceleration for stair ambulation
3 and level walking. The solid line (walking), dashed line (stair ascent) and dotted line
4 (stair descent) represent the mean contributions of individual muscles to the center of
5 mass acceleration in the vertical (top row), fore-aft (middle row) and mediolateral
6 (bottom row) directions. Upward, forward and lateral accelerations are positive;
7 downward, backward and medial accelerations are negative. OTHER represents the
8 sum of the contributions from all lower-limb muscles included in the model other than
9 GMAX, VAS, SOL, GMED, and GAS.

10 **Fig. 5.** Mean peak contributions of GMAX, VAS, SOL, GMED, and GAS to the
11 vertical, fore-aft, and mediolateral accelerations of the COM during the first-half of
12 stance in level walking and stair ambulation. Upward, forward and lateral
13 accelerations are positive; downward, backward and medial accelerations are
14 negative. The thin vertical line at the top of each histogram represents ± 1 standard
15 deviation from the mean. Asterisks and double asterisks indicate $p < 0.017$ and $p <$
16 0.001 , respectively, for post hoc tests.

17 **Fig. 6.** Mean peak contributions of GMAX, VAS, SOL, GMED, and GAS to the
18 vertical, fore-aft, and mediolateral accelerations of the COM during the second-half of
19 stance in level walking and stair ambulation. Upward, forward and lateral
20 accelerations are positive; downward, backward and medial accelerations are
21 negative. The thin vertical line at the top of each histogram represents ± 1 standard
22 deviation from the mean. Asterisks and double asterisks indicate $p < 0.017$ and $p <$
23 0.001 , respectively, for post hoc tests.

24 **Supplementary Fig. S1.** Potential contributions of GMAX and SOL to the fore-aft
25 COM acceleration for level walking, stair ascent, and stair descent. Forward and

1 backward accelerations are positive and negative, respectively. The solid (walking),
2 dashed (stair ascent) and dotted (stair descent) lines represent the means calculated for
3 all subjects.

4 **Supplementary Fig. S2.** Mean ground reaction forces measured for level walking,
5 stair ascent, and stair descent. The solid lines are the means calculated for all subjects,
6 while the shaded regions represent ± 1 standard deviation from the mean.

7 **Supplementary Fig. S3.** Mean sagittal-plane joint kinematics measured for level
8 walking, stair ascent, and stair descent. Positive values represent hip flexion, knee
9 flexion, and ankle dorsiflexion. The solid lines are the means calculated for all
10 subjects, while the shaded regions represent ± 1 standard deviation from the mean.

11 **Supplementary Fig. S4.** Mean frontal- and transverse-plane joint kinematics
12 measured for level walking, stair ascent, and stair descent. Positive values represent
13 hip adduction, hip internal rotation, and subtalar eversion. The solid lines are the
14 means calculated for all subjects, while the shaded regions represent ± 1 standard
15 deviation from the mean.

16 **Supplementary Fig. S5.** Mean COM accelerations calculated for level walking, stair
17 ascent, and stair descent. The solid lines are the means calculated for all subjects,
18 while the shaded regions represent ± 1 standard deviation from the mean.

19
20
21
22

Figure 1

[Click here to download Figure: Linetal_30April2014_Fig1.eps](#)




Figure 2
[Click here to download Figure: Linetal_30April2014_Fig2.eps](#)




Figure 5

[Click here to download Figure: Linetal_30April2014_Fig5.eps](#)




Figure 6

[Click here to download Figure: Linetal_30April2014_Fig6.eps](#)




Figure 3

[Click here to download Figure: Linetal_30April2014_Fig3.eps](#)





Figure 4
[Click here to download Figure: Fig4_Rev1_15Aug2014.eps](#)





Minerva Access is the Institutional Repository of The University of Melbourne

Author/s:

Lin, Y-C;Fok, LA;Schache, AG;Pandy, MG

Title:

Muscle coordination of support, progression and balance during stair ambulation

Date:

2015-01-21

Citation:

Lin, Y. -C., Fok, L. A., Schache, A. G. & Pandy, M. G. (2015). Muscle coordination of support, progression and balance during stair ambulation. JOURNAL OF BIOMECHANICS, 48 (2), pp.340-347. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2014.11.019>.

Persistent Link:

<http://hdl.handle.net/11343/55023>