

1

2

3

4 **Evaluation of gait cycle time variability in patients with knee osteoarthritis**
5 **using a triaxial accelerometer**

6

7 **Short title:** Gait cycle time variability in knee osteoarthritis patients

8

9 Takeshi Akimoto^{1,2,*}, Kenji Kawamura¹, Takaaki Wada², Naomichi Ishihara², Akane
10 Yokota², Takehiko Sugino-shita², Shigeki Yokoyama³

11

12 ¹ Graduate School of Health Science, Kibi International University, Takahashi-shi, Okayama,
13 Japan

14 ² Department of Orthopedics, Medical Corporation Sugino-shita Orthopedic Clinic, Rokujizo,
15 Uji-shi, Kyoto, Japan

16 ³ Graduate School of Health Science, Kyoto Tachibana University, Yamashina-ku, Kyoto-shi,
17 Kyoto, Japan

18

19 *Corresponding author:

20 Email: suginoshita.c.akimoto@gmail.com (TA)

21

22 **Abstract**

23 Knee osteoarthritis can alter gait variability. However, few studies have compared the
24 temporal factors of the gait cycle between patients with knee osteoarthritis and healthy
25 subjects. Furthermore, no studies have investigated the relationship between gait variability
26 and potential contributing factors (knee joint functions such as muscle strength) in knee
27 osteoarthritis. The first objective of this study was to compare gait cycle variability between
28 female patients with knee osteoarthritis and healthy elderly women to determine gait
29 characteristics in patients with knee osteoarthritis. The second objective was to examine
30 whether gait cycle variability in knee osteoarthritis is associated with potential contributing
31 factors. Twenty-four female patients diagnosed with knee osteoarthritis and 12 healthy
32 elderly women participated. Gait cycle variability (coefficient of variation of gait cycle time),
33 knee extension range of motion, knee extension strength, 5-meter walk test, Timed Up & Go
34 Test, and Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Osteoarthritis Index were measured.
35 All assessment results were compared between the knee osteoarthritis and healthy groups.
36 Gait cycle variability was significantly higher in the knee osteoarthritis group ($3.2\% \pm 1.5\%$)
37 compared to the healthy group ($2.1\% \pm 0.7\%$). A significant positive correlation was found
38 between the gait cycle variability and 5-meter walk test ($r=0.46$) and Western Ontario and
39 McMaster Universities Osteoarthritis Index ($r=0.43$). The gait of patients with knee
40 osteoarthritis may be more unstable than that of healthy individuals. In addition, unstable gait
41 may be associated with gait speed and quality of life. Therefore, we believe that rehabilitation
42 to improve unstable gait can enhance the quality of life of patients with knee osteoarthritis.

43

44 **Introduction**

45 Knee osteoarthritis (OA) is a common disease that imposes an enormous personal and
46 social burden. In Japan, Yoshimura et al. [1] reported that the prevalence of radiographic
47 knee OA was 42.6% in men and 62.4% in women aged >40 years, indicating that knee OA is
48 an epidemiologically important disease. Knee OA is a common disease in elderly women [2]
49 and is a leading cause of pain and dysfunction [3]. The main symptom is decreased gait
50 ability, which can have a negative impact on activities of daily living and quality of life [4].
51 Therefore, it is important to accurately assess the gait ability of patients with knee OA and
52 improve it through rehabilitation.

53 It has been widely reported that gait function is diminished by knee OA.
54 Spatiotemporal gait parameters such as slower gait speed, shorter stride length, increased
55 stride time, increased stance phase duration, and increased double support time are worsened
56 [5–8]. In addition to these parameters, knee OA has recently been shown to alter gait
57 variability.

58 Research on gait variability in patients with knee OA is ongoing. Gait variability has
59 been compared between patients with knee OA and healthy subjects and between different
60 Kellgren–Lawrence severity levels, and outcomes have differed in each study [9–13]. In
61 particular, studies focusing on the variability of spatiotemporal parameters have investigated
62 the standard deviation and coefficient of variation (CV) of gait cycle time and stance time.

63 Clermont and Tanimoto et al. [9, 10] reported that there was no significant difference
64 in the gait cycle time standard deviation or CV between the knee OA and healthy groups.
65 However, Kiss et al. [11] reported that the knee OA group had a significantly higher CV of
66 stance time. Oka et al. [12] reported that there was a significant difference in the gait cycle
67 time CV between knee OA patients with a fear of falling and those without a fear of falling.

68 Thus, studies focusing on the gait variability of spatiotemporal parameters in knee OA have
69 not yielded a consistent view.

70 On the other hand, many researchers have investigated gait variability in healthy
71 elderly people. Hausdorff and Balasubramanian et al. [14, 15] reported that gait variability is
72 related to gait speed in community-dwelling older adults. In addition, Bogen et al. [16]
73 reported that gait variability tended to be related to muscle strength measured two years
74 earlier. Matsuda et al. [17] suggested that muscle strength must be improved to reduce gait
75 variability. Thus, studies have investigated the relationship between gait variability and
76 potential contributing factors in elderly people in the community. However, to the best of our
77 knowledge, no study has investigated the relationship between gait variability and potential
78 contributing factors (knee joint functions such as muscle strength, range of motion, and
79 physical functions such as gait speed) in knee OA.

80 The first objective of this study was to compare gait cycle variability between female
81 patients with knee OA and healthy elderly women to determine gait characteristics in patients
82 with knee OA. The second objective was to examine whether gait cycle variability in knee
83 OA is associated with potential contributing factors. We hypothesized that 1) gait cycle
84 variability would be different in knee OA and healthy participants and 2) potential
85 contributing factors such as muscle strength would be associated with gait cycle variability.

86

87 **Materials and Methods**

88

89 **Participants**

90 This study recruited participants in two groups: patients with knee OA and healthy
91 elderly women. Twenty-four female patients diagnosed with knee OA by radiography were

92 included in the knee OA group [age: 70.8 ± 5.7 years, height: 1.56 ± 0.05 m, weight: 56.6 ± 6.4
93 kg, body mass index (BMI): 23.3 ± 2.4 kg/m²], and 12 healthy elderly women living in the
94 community were included in the healthy group (age: 69.8 ± 8.1 years, height: 1.53 ± 0.06 m,
95 weight: 53.5 ± 6.1 kg, BMI: 22.9 ± 2.9 kg/m²). The Kibi International University Ethics
96 Committee approved all measures of this study (approval number: 19-14). All participants
97 provided written informed consent before participating in the study.

98 The criteria for inclusion in the knee OA group were (1) women and (2) patients who
99 were able to participate in rehabilitation at least once a week. The exclusion criteria were (1)
100 severe pain other than knee pain, (2) history of lower extremity trauma or surgery, (3) history
101 of serious cardiac or pulmonary disease, and (4) history of rheumatoid arthritis. The inclusion
102 criteria for the healthy group were as follows: (1) women. The exclusion criteria were (1)
103 pain in the lower limbs, (2) a history of lower extremity trauma or surgery, (3) a history of
104 serious cardiac or pulmonary disease, and (4) a history of rheumatoid arthritis.

105 The Kellgren–Lawrence classification of the knee OA group was grade I (No
106 patient), grade II (15 patients), grade III (8 patients), and grade IV (1 patient).

107

108 **Measurement Method**

109 Prior to the trial task, participants were given practice time to become accustomed to
110 gait on the treadmill. The comfortable gait speed for each participant was determined during
111 the practice period. This comfortable gait speed was used for data collection in this study.
112 After an adequate rest period, the participants walked on the treadmill for 1 minute at a
113 comfortable gait speed (comfortable speed was 2.3 ± 0.8 km/h for the knee OA group and
114 2.5 ± 0.8 km/h for the healthy group). During the task, the rating of the perceived exertion
115 scale (Borg's 6–20 scale) was assessed to investigate exercise intensity [18].

116 A triaxial accelerometer (TSND121, ATR-Promotions Co., Kyoto, Japan) was used to
117 collect data during the trial. The size of the sensor was 37 mm×46 mm×12 mm and weighed
118 22 g. A triaxial accelerometer was attached to the third lumbar vertebra of each participant.
119 The acceleration waveform data during gait were transmitted to the computer via Bluetooth.
120 The raw sensor data were sampled at a frequency of 100 Hz. The heel ground contact of the
121 gait was analyzed using acceleration waveform information. The duration of one gait cycle
122 was defined as the time between heel ground contact and the next heel ground contact on the
123 same side. The CV, which is the ratio of the standard deviation to the mean, was calculated
124 from the obtained gait cycle time. This CV was defined as the gait cycle variability and was
125 used in the results.

126 To evaluate knee joint function, knee extension range of motion (ROM) and knee
127 extension strength were measured. Knee extension ROM was measured in the supine position
128 using a goniometer. Knee extension strength was measured as the isometric strength at 90° of
129 knee flexion. A hand-held dynamometer (μ Tas F-1, Anima Co., Tokyo, Japan) was used to
130 measure muscle strength.

131 The 5-m walk test (5MWT) [19] and the Timed Up & Go Test (TUG) [20] were used
132 to assess gait ability. The 5MWT measured the gait speed over a distance of 5 meters. An 11-
133 meter gait path was used, with 3 meters at each end prepared for acceleration and
134 deceleration and the central 5 meters used for measurement. The participants were instructed
135 to walk as quickly as possible. TUG measured the time it took for a participant to get up from
136 a chair, walk 3 meters, turn around, walk back to the chair, and sit down.

137 The Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Osteoarthritis Index (WOMAC) [21]
138 was used to assess pain, stiffness, and function. The WOMAC was used as a specific quality
139 of life measure for knee OA. Higher WOMAC scores indicate more severe functional
140 limitations.

141

142 **Statistical Analysis**

143 The statistical software IBM SPSS for Windows version 26 was used for the
144 statistical analysis. Physical characteristics, gait cycle variability, gait speed on the treadmill,
145 Borg's 6–20 scale, knee extension strength, knee extension ROM, 5MWT, TUG, and
146 WOMAC were compared between the knee OA and healthy groups. Normality was checked
147 using the Shapiro-Wilk test, and either the t-test or Mann-Whitney U test was performed. The
148 effect size r was calculated from the T-value (for t-test) and Z-value (for Mann-Whitney U
149 test) using Microsoft Excel.

150 In addition, the relationships between gait cycle variability and knee extension
151 strength, knee extension ROM, 5MWT, TUG, and WOMAC in the knee OA group were
152 examined. Normality was checked using the Shapiro-Wilk test, and Spearman's rank
153 correlation coefficient was used. Correlation results were interpreted as negligible ($p < 0.30$),
154 weak ($p = 0.30–0.50$), moderate ($p = 0.50–0.70$), high ($p = 0.70–0.90$), or very high ($p > 0.90$).

155 The sample size was determined after conducting a pilot study with 12 participants (6
156 in the OA group and 6 in the healthy group). The allocation ratio was 2:1 for the knee OA
157 and healthy groups, and the significance (α) and power were set at 0.05 and 0.8, respectively.
158 The calculated sample size was 20 for the OA group and 10 for the healthy group, and we
159 were able to recruit a sufficient number of participants.

160

161 **Results**

162 The participants' characteristics for the knee OA and healthy groups are shown in
163 Table 1. There were no significant differences in age, height, weight, or BMI between the
164 knee OA and healthy groups.

165 **Table 1. Participant characteristics**

| | Knee OA group (n=24) | Healthy group (n=12) | p- value | Effect size r |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------|
| Age (years) | 70.8 (5.7) | 69.8 (8.1) | p=0.80 | 0.05 |
| Height (m) | 1.56 (0.05) | 1.53 (0.06) | p=0.14 | 0.25 |
| Body mass (kg) | 56.6 (6.4) | 53.5 (6.1) | p=0.38 | 0.15 |
| BMI (kg/m ²) | 23.3 (2.4) | 22.9 (2.9) | p=0.68 | 0.07 |
| KL Score (n) | | | | |
| | Grade □ 0 | | | |
| | Grade □ 15 | | | |
| | Grade □ 8 | | | |
| | Grade □ 1 | | | |

166 Data are presented as mean (\pm SD). OA: osteoarthritis; BMI: body mass index; KL:

167 Kellgren–Lawrence

168

169 Gait cycle variability was $3.2\pm 1.5\%$ in the knee OA group and $2.1\pm 0.7\%$ in the
 170 healthy group, which was significantly higher in the knee OA group (medium effect size,
 171 0.44). The comfortable gait speed on the treadmill was 2.3 ± 0.8 km/h in the knee OA group
 172 and 2.5 ± 0.8 km/h in the healthy group, which was not significantly different. The Borg's 6–
 173 20 scale during the gait task was 11.0 ± 2.3 in the knee OA group and 11.1 ± 1.3 in the healthy
 174 group and both groups fell into the “fairly light” category, with no significant difference
 175 (Table 2).

176 The results of the other measurements are presented in Table 2.

177

178 **Table 2. Comparison of gait on the treadmill, knee function, gait ability, and WOMAC**
 179 **between the knee OA group and healthy group**

| | Knee OA group (n=24) | Healthy group (n=12) | p-value | Effect size r |
|---|----------------------------|-------------------------|-------------|------------------|
| Gait on the treadmill | | | | |
| Gait cycle variability (%) | 3.2 (1.5) | 2.1 (0.7) | p<0.01 | 0.44 |
| Gait speed on the treadmill (km/h) | 2.3 (0.8) | 2.5 (0.8) | p=0.56 | 0.10 |
| Borg's 6-20 scale | 11.0 (2.3) | 11.1 (1.3) | p=0.96 | 0.01 |
| Knee function | | | | |
| Knee extension ROM (°) | -4.2 (4.3) | -0.8 (1.9) | p<0.05 | 0.41 |
| Knee extension strength (kgf/kg) | 0.38 (0.09) | 0.51 (0.12) | p<0.00 1 | 0.52 |
| Gait ability | | | | |
| 5MWT (s) | 3.8 (0.9) | 2.9 (0.3) | p<0.00 1 | 0.55 |
| TUG (s) | 6.8 (1.0) | 5.9 (0.4) | p<0.01 | 0.43 |
| Assessments of pain, stiffness, and function | | | | |
| WOMAC | 20.5 (9.0) | 4.3 (7.4) | p<0.00 1 | 0.69 |

180 Data are presented as mean (\pm SD). WOMAC: Western Ontario and McMaster Universities

181 Osteoarthritis Index; OA: osteoarthritis; ROM: range of motion; 5MWT: 5-meter walk test;

182 TUG: Timed Up & Go test;

183

184 Knee function was significantly lower in the knee OA group in terms of both extensor
185 muscle strength and extension ROM (medium to large effect size, 0.41–0.52). The 5MWT
186 and TUG test results were significantly slower in the knee OA group (medium to large effect
187 size, 0.43–0.55). WOMAC scores were significantly higher in the knee OA group (large
188 effect size, 0.69).

189 Furthermore, Table 3 shows the results of the correlations between gait cycle
190 variability and knee extension strength, knee extension ROM, 5MWT, TUG, and WOMAC
191 in the knee OA group. A significant weak positive correlation was found between gait cycle
192 variability and 5MWT ($r=0.46$). In addition, there was a significant weak positive correlation
193 between gait cycle variability and WOMAC scores ($r=0.43$). There was no significant
194 association between gait cycle variability and other factors (Table S1).

195

196 **Table 3. Potential contributing factors associated with gait cycle variability in the knee**
197 **OA group**

| | Knee OA group (n=24) | |
|-------------------------|--|---------|
| | Spearman's rank correlation coefficient (ρ) | p-value |
| Knee extension ROM | -0.25 | p=0.23 |
| Knee extension strength | -0.24 | p=0.25 |
| 5MWT | 0.46 | p<0.05 |
| TUG | 0.33 | p=0.11 |
| WOMAC | 0.43 | p<0.05 |

198 OA: osteoarthritis; ROM: range of motion; 5MWT: 5-meter walk test; TUG: Timed Up & Go
199 test; WOMAC: Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Osteoarthritis Index

200

201 Discussion

202 The first objective of this study was to investigate whether gait cycle variability
203 differed between the knee OA and healthy groups. The results showed that the gait cycle
204 variability of the knee OA group was significantly larger than that of the healthy group. This
205 study showed that gait cycle variability may play an important role in the rehabilitation of
206 patients with knee OA.

207 There were no significant differences in age, height, weight, or BMI between the knee
208 OA and healthy groups (Table 1). In other words, there was no difference in the physical
209 characteristics between the two groups, and only the knee OA group had OA symptoms such
210 as knee pain. Therefore, the participants in this study were suited to the purpose of the study,
211 which was to compare patients with knee OA to healthy individuals.

212 Gait cycle variability was significantly greater in the knee OA group than in the
213 healthy group. Kiss et al. [11] reported a significantly greater stance time CV in the knee OA
214 group than in the healthy group. Therefore, among the studies comparing the CV of
215 spatiotemporal gait parameters, the present study supports the work of Kiss et al. [11]. Kiss et
216 al. [11] used the same gait speed for all participants when collecting data on treadmill gait.
217 On the other hand, the present study collected data at a comfortable gait speed for each
218 participant. A new finding was that the gait variability of spatiotemporal parameters in the
219 knee OA group was greater than that in the healthy group, even at the participants' daily gait
220 speed. Furthermore, previous studies have reported that increased gait variability is
221 associated with an increased risk of falls [14, 22, 23]. Although the present study did not
222 investigate falls, the gait of patients with knee OA may be less stable than that of healthy
223 individuals.

224 Borg's 6–20 scale for treadmill gait showed no significant difference between the two
225 groups (Table 2). Therefore, in terms of exercise intensity, the gait task speed was

226 appropriate because participants in both groups fell into the “fairly light” category and
227 performed the task at the same intensity.

228 Knee joint function, gait speed, and WOMAC scores were lower in the knee OA
229 group than in the healthy group (Table 2). Previous studies have also reported reduced knee
230 extensor strength and gait speed in patients with knee OA compared to those in healthy
231 subjects [6–8, 24, 25], which means that the results of the present study support those of
232 previous studies. Furthermore, there were significant weak positive correlations between gait
233 cycle variability and 5MWT ($r=0.46$) and between gait cycle variability and WOMAC
234 ($r=0.43$). Gait cycle variability has been reported to correlate with gait speed in healthy
235 participants [14, 15]. The present study showed that gait cycle variability was associated with
236 gait speed, even in patients with knee OA. The correlation of gait cycle variability with
237 WOMAC indicates that gait variability reflects the quality of life and physical function of
238 patients with knee OA. Kalsi-Ryan et al. [26] reported a correlation between Japan Orthopedic
239 Association score and gait CV in patients with spondylolisthesis osteoarthritis. Correlation
240 with such disease-specific assessments of physical functioning, even in patients with knee
241 OA, indicates that gait variability is associated with quality of life. Therefore, reducing gait
242 CV may lead to improved quality of life.

243 On the other hand, no relationship was found between knee function and gait cycle
244 variability. This result differs from our hypothesis. It has been reported that there is an
245 association between gait cycle variability and knee extension strength in healthy elderly
246 people [14, 16, 17]. There was a difference in the results for knee OA. To the best of our
247 knowledge, no previous study has examined the relationship between gait cycle variability
248 and extensor muscle strength in knee OA. Therefore, different factors may be associated with
249 gait cycle variability in patients with knee OA than in healthy older adults. In a previous
250 study of local elderly people, a correlation between hip abduction strength and gait cycle

251 variability was reported [27]. In this study, only knee extension strength was evaluated;
252 therefore, it is necessary to evaluate knee flexion strength and hip joint strength in the future.

253

254 **Research limitations**

255 This study has some limitations. First, the study included 24 participants in the knee
256 OA group and 12 in the healthy group, which is a small sample size. The sample size may
257 have affected the results. Second, the trial task was gait on a treadmill. Although the
258 participants were given time to practice, it is possible that their experience with the treadmill
259 may have influenced the results. One of the reasons for adopting the treadmill gait was to
260 increase the number of steps. Lord et al. [28] reported that it is possible to measure gait cycle
261 variability even at 10 m walking, but in many cases, a certain number of steps is ensured,
262 such as measuring 100 gait cycles or 6–10 minutes of walking [29, 30]. Therefore, we
263 adopted the treadmill gait to increase the number of steps. However, treadmill gait has a
264 disadvantage in that it is different from a normal gait. In the future, it will be necessary to
265 consider the design of the study to increase the number of steps with a continuous gait in a
266 large space.

267

268 **Conclusion**

269 In our study, we compared differences in gait variability between female patients with
270 knee OA and healthy elderly women. The gait of patients with knee OA may be more
271 unstable than that of healthy individuals. In addition, unstable gait may be associated with
272 gait speed and quality of life. Therefore, we believe that rehabilitation to improve unstable
273 gait can enhance the quality of life of patients with knee OA.

274

275

276 **Acknowledgments**

277 We would like to thank Editage (www.editage.com) for English language editing.

278

279 **References**

- 280 [1] Yoshimura N, Muraki S, Oka H, Mabuchi A, En-Yo Y, Yoshida M, et al. Prevalence
281 of knee osteoarthritis, lumbar spondylosis, and osteoporosis in Japanese men and
282 women: the research on osteoarthritis/osteoporosis against disability study. *J Bone
283 Miner Metab.* 2009;27:620-628.
- 284 [2] Garriga C, Sánchez-Santos MT, Judge A, Hart D, Spector T, Cooper C, et al.
285 Predicting incident radiographic knee osteoarthritis in middle-aged women within
286 four years: the importance of knee-level prognostic factors. *Arthritis Care Res
287 (Hoboken).* 2020;72:88-97.
- 288 [3] Murphy SL, Schepens Niemiec S, Lyden AK, Kratz AL. Pain, Fatigue, and Physical
289 Activity in Osteoarthritis: The Moderating Effects of Pain- and Fatigue-Related
290 Activity Interference. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2016;97:S201-9.
- 291 [4] Choojaturu S, Sindhu S, Utriyaprasit K, Viwatwongkasem C. Factors associated with
292 access to health services and quality of life in knee osteoarthritis patients: a multilevel
293 cross-sectional study. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2019;19:688.
- 294 [5] Mills K, Hunt MA, Ferber R. Biomechanical deviations during level walking
295 associated with knee osteoarthritis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Arthritis
296 Care Res (Hoboken).* 2013;65:1643-1665.
- 297 [6] Sparkes V, Whatling GM, Biggs P, Khatib N, Al-Amri M, Williams D, et al.
298 Comparison of gait, functional activities, and patient-reported outcome measures in

- 299 patients with knee osteoarthritis and healthy adults using 3D motion analysis and
300 activity monitoring: an exploratory case-control analysis. *Orthop Res Rev.*
301 2019;11:129-140.
- 302 [7] Ismailidis P, Hegglin L, Egloff C, Pagenstert G, Kernen R, Eckardt A, et al. Side to
303 side kinematic gait differences within patients and spatiotemporal and kinematic gait
304 differences between patients with severe knee osteoarthritis and controls measured
305 with inertial sensors. *Gait Posture.* 2021;84:24-30
- 306 [8] Peixoto JG, de Souza Moreira B, Diz JBM, Timoteo EF, Kirkwood RN, Teixeira-
307 Salmela LF. Analysis of symmetry between lower limbs during gait of older women
308 with bilateral knee osteoarthritis. *Aging Clin Exp Res.* 2019;31:67-73.
- 309 [9] Clermont CA, Barden JM. Accelerometer-based determination of gait variability in
310 older adults with knee osteoarthritis. *Gait Posture.* 2016;50:126-130.
- 311 [10] Tanimoto K, Takahashi M, Tokuda K, Sawada T, Anan M, Shinkoda K.
312 Lower limb kinematics during the swing phase in patients with knee osteoarthritis
313 measured using an inertial sensor. *Gait Posture.* 2017;57:236-240.
- 314 [11] Kiss RM. Effect of severity of knee osteoarthritis on the variability of gait
315 parameters. *J Electromyogr Kinesiol.* 2011;21:695-703.
- 316 [12] Oka T, Asai T, Kubo H, Fukumoto Y. Association of fear of falling with
317 acceleration-derived gait indices in older adults with knee osteoarthritis. *Aging Clin*
318 *Exp Res.* 2019;31:645-651.
- 319 [13] Yakhdani HR, Bafghi HA, Meijer OG, Bruijn SM, van den Dikkenberg N,
320 Stibbe AB, et al. Stability and variability of knee kinematics during gait in knee
321 osteoarthritis before and after replacement surgery. *Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon).*
322 2010;25:230-236.

- 323 [14] Hausdorff JM, Rios DA, Edelberg HK. Gait variability and fall risk in
324 community-living older adults: a 1-year prospective study. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.*
325 2001;82:1050-1056.
- 326 [15] Balasubramanian CK, Clark DJ, Gouelle A. Validity of the gait variability
327 index in older adults: effect of aging and mobility impairments. *Gait Posture.*
328 2015;41:941-946.
- 329 [16] Bogen B, Moe-Nilssen R, Aaslund MK, Ranhoff AH. Muscle Strength as a
330 Predictor of Gait Variability after Two Years in Community-Living Older Adults. *J*
331 *Frailty Aging.* 2020;9:23-29.
- 332 [17] Matsuda K, Ikeda S, Nakahara M, Ikeda T, Okamoto R, Kurosawa K, et al.
333 Factors affecting the coefficient of variation of stride time of the elderly without
334 falling history: a prospective study. *J Phys Ther Sci.* 2015;27:1087-1090.
- 335 [18] Borg G. Perceived exertion as an indicator of somatic stress. *Scand J Rehabil*
336 *Med.* 1970;2:92-98
- 337 [19] Amano T, Suzuki N. Minimal Detectable Change for Motor Function Tests in
338 Patients with Knee Osteoarthritis. *Prog Rehabil Med.* 2018;3:20180022.
- 339 [20] Podsiadlo D, Richardson S. The timed "Up & Go": a test of basic functional
340 mobility for frail elderly persons. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 1991;39:142-148.
- 341 [21] Bellamy N, Buchanan WW, Goldsmith CH, Campbell J, Stitt LW. Validation
342 study of WOMAC: a health status instrument for measuring clinically important
343 patient relevant outcomes to antirheumatic drug therapy in patients with osteoarthritis
344 of the hip or knee. *J Rheumatol.* 1988;15:1833-1840.
- 345 [22] Asai T, Misu S, Sawa R, Doi T, Yamada M. The association between fear of
346 falling and smoothness of lower trunk oscillation in gait varies according to gait speed
347 in community-dwelling older adults. *J Neuroeng Rehabil.* 2017;14:5.

- 348 [23] Ayoubi F, Launay CP, Kabeshova A, Fantino B, Annweiler C, Beauchet O.
349 The influence of fear of falling on gait variability: results from a large elderly
350 population-based cross-sectional study. *J Neuroeng Rehabil.* 2014;11:128.
- 351 [24] Espinosa SE, Costello KE, Souza RB, Kumar D. Lower knee extensor and
352 flexor strength is associated with varus thrust in people with knee osteoarthritis. *J*
353 *Biomech.* 2020;107:109865.
- 354 [25] Uritani D, Fukumoto T, Myodo T, Fujikawa K, Usui M, Tatara D. The
355 association between toe grip strength and osteoarthritis of the knee in Japanese
356 women: A multicenter cross-sectional study. *PLoS One.* 2017;12:e0186454.
- 357 [26] Kalsi-Ryan S, Rienmueller AC, Riehm L, Chan C, Jin D, Martin AR, et al.
358 Quantitative assessment of gait characteristics in degenerative cervical myelopathy: a
359 prospective clinical study. *J Clin Med.* 2020;9:E752.
- 360 [27] Inoue W, Ikezoe T, Tsuboyama T, Sato I, Malinowska KB, Kawaguchi T, et
361 al. Are there different factors affecting walking speed and gait cycle variability
362 between men and women in community-dwelling older adults. *Aging Clin Exp Res.*
363 2017;29:215-221.
- 364 [28] Lord S, Howe T, Greenland J, Simpson L, Rochester L. Gait variability in
365 older adults: a structured review of testing protocol and clinimetric properties. *Gait*
366 *Posture.* 2011;34:443-450.
- 367 [29] Owings TM, Grabiner MD. Measuring step kinematic variability on an
368 instrumented treadmill: how many steps are enough. *J Biomech.* 2003;36:1215-1218.
- 369 [30] Barden JM, Clermont CA, Kobsar D, Beauchet O. Accelerometer-based step
370 regularity is lower in older adults with bilateral knee osteoarthritis. *Front Hum*
371 *Neurosci.* 2016;10:625.
- 372

373 **Supporting information**

374 **S1 Table. Research Data**