

Changes in foot progression angle during gait reduce the knee adduction moment and do not increase hip moments in individuals with knee osteoarthritis

Kirsten Seagers¹, Scott D. Uhlich^{1,2,3}, Julie A. Kolesar^{2,3}, Madeleine Berkson², Janelle M. Kaneda³, Gary S. Beaupre^{1,2}, Scott L. Delp^{1,3,4}

¹Department of Mechanical Engineering, Stanford University, Stanford, California, United States

²Department of Veterans Affairs Healthcare System, Palo Alto, California, United States

³Department of Bioengineering, Stanford University, Stanford, California, United States

⁴Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Stanford University, Stanford, California, United States

Submitted to the *Journal of Biomechanics*

Abstract

People with knee osteoarthritis who adopt a modified foot progression angle (FPA) during gait often benefit from a reduction in the knee adduction moment. It is unknown, however, whether changes in the FPA increase hip moments, a surrogate measure of hip loading, which will increase the mechanical demand on the joint. This study examined how altering the FPA affects hip moments. Individuals with knee osteoarthritis walked on an instrumented treadmill with their baseline gait, 10° toe-in gait, and 10° toe-out gait. A musculoskeletal modeling package was used to compute joint moments from the experimental data. Fifty participants were selected from a larger study who reduced their peak knee adduction moment with a modified FPA. In this group, participants reduced the first peak of the knee adduction moment by 7.6% with 10° toe-in gait and reduced the second peak by 11.0% with 10° toe-out gait. Modifying the FPA reduced the early-stance hip abduction moment, at the time of peak hip contact force, by 4.3% ± 1.3% for 10° toe-in gait ($p=0.005$, $d=0.49$) and by 4.6% ± 1.1% for 10° toe-out gait ($p<0.001$, $d=0.59$) without increasing the flexion and internal rotation moments ($p>0.15$). Additionally, 74% of individuals reduced their total hip moment at time of peak hip contact force with a modified FPA. In summary, when adopting a FPA modification that reduced the knee adduction moment, participants, on average, did not increase surrogate measures of hip loading.

Keywords: gait modifications, non-surgical intervention, joint loading, musculoskeletal modeling, osteoarthritis

1 **Introduction**

2 Of the 30 million Americans who suffer from osteoarthritis (OA) (Cisternas et al., 2016),
3 an estimated 14 million have symptomatic knee OA (Deshpande et al., 2016). Mechanical
4 loading, specifically joint forces, influence OA initiation and progression (Andriacchi et al.,
5 2004; Felson, 2013). Since direct measurement of compressive joint forces in a native joint is not
6 possible, joint moments, like the knee adduction moment (KAM), are often used as surrogate
7 measures of joint loading. The KAM is correlated with knee OA presence (Baliunas et al., 2002),
8 knee pain (Robbins et al., 2011; Thorp et al., 2007), knee cartilage degradation (Chehab et al.,
9 2014), and predicts knee OA progression (Miyazaki, 2002). People can change their KAM by
10 modifying features of their gait, such as trunk sway or walking speed (Hunt et al., 2008;
11 Mündermann et al., 2004).

12 Gait modifications are an attractive intervention because they can reduce surrogate
13 measures of knee loading, such as the KAM, without requiring surgery or external devices. One
14 such gait modification is changing the foot progression angle (FPA), i.e., toeing-in or toeing-out.
15 Altering the FPA requires changes to lower-body kinematics (Shull et al., 2013) and muscle
16 coordination (Charlton et al., 2018; Rutherford et al., 2010). Toeing-in generally reduces the first
17 peak of the KAM (Shull et al., 2013), whereas toeing-out reduces the second peak of the KAM
18 (Guo et al., 2007). Although the clinical efficacy of prescribing the same FPA modification to
19 all individuals remains unclear (Hunt et al., 2018), prescribing this intervention in a personalized
20 manner can increase the achievable reductions in KAM (Uhlrich et al., 2018) and avoid cases
21 where individuals increase their KAM. Felson et al., (2019) showed a personalized approach is
22 effective for other KAM-reducing interventions. If personalized FPA retraining proves to be
23 effective clinically, it could be deployed in the clinic with advancements in mobile sensors for

24 estimating the KAM (Wang et al., 2020; Boswell et al., 2021) and providing biofeedback to
25 change it (Xia et al., 2020).

26 As research on FPA modifications for people with knee OA progresses towards a
27 deployable intervention, it is important to understand their effects more comprehensively,
28 particularly at the hip. Studies that evaluate the efficacy of KAM-targeted gait modifications
29 focus primarily on the effects at the knee, although there is a need to evaluate the effects of these
30 modifications on other joints (Mündermann et al., 2005). People with knee OA have a 25%
31 lifetime risk of developing hip OA (Murphy et al., 2010) due to shared risk factors, which place
32 multiple joints at risk for OA (Felson et al., 2004; Issa et al., 2002). Although it is unknown how
33 gait modifications will affect the hip joint, increased hip moments in all planes will increase
34 mechanical demand on the soft tissues around the hip. Increased hip moments alter the
35 compressive loading environment in the joint (Simic et al., 2011) and are associated with hip OA
36 symptoms (Hall et al., 2019), presence (Maly et al., 2013), severity (Diamond et al., 2018), and
37 progression (Tateuchi et al., 2017). The total knee joint moment, which is a summary measure of
38 knee moments in all planes, has been used to evaluate gait modifications that have a multiplanar
39 effect (Asay et al., 2018). Computing a similar measure at the hip (i.e., the total hip moment)
40 may be a valuable way to estimate the net change in soft tissue demand at the hip from a gait
41 modification for each individual. Some studies have examined the effect of FPA gait
42 modifications on hip contact forces, kinetics, and kinematics to minimize torsional loading and
43 loosening of total hip replacements (Bowsher and Vaughan, 1995) and to reduce hip contact
44 forces for patients with hip pathology (Wesseling et al., 2015). Wesseling et al., (2015) found
45 that hip kinematic perturbations that mimic clinical gait patterns, which could result in a
46 modified FPA, reduced hip moments in a simulation study, but these results have not been

47 verified experimentally. Toe-out gait, which increased the KAM in asymptomatic individuals,
48 increased hip sagittal and frontal plane moments (Legrand et al., 2021); however, it is unclear
49 whether these effects will be the same in individuals with knee OA who reduce their KAM with
50 a modified FPA. Therefore, an important next step is to understand how interventions that target
51 knee loading affect hip kinetics, kinematics, and spatiotemporal parameters of gait in an
52 osteoarthritic population.

53 This study analyzes the biomechanical effects of a FPA modification on the hip in
54 individuals with medial compartment knee OA who reduce their KAM with the modification.
55 We hypothesize that changing the FPA will not increase hip moments or the total hip moment at
56 time of peak hip contact force compared to baseline gait. Additionally, we performed an
57 exploratory analysis to evaluate the effect of FPA on kinematics and spatiotemporal parameters.
58 Our results provide insight into whether gait modifications for knee osteoarthritis increase
59 mechanical demand at the hip.

60

61 **Methods**

62 *Data Collection*

63 Participant data were analyzed from a clinical study (clinicaltrials.gov NCT02767570)
64 that trained people with medial compartment knee OA to walk with a modified FPA to reduce
65 their peak KAM. One hundred seven people provided informed consent in agreement with a
66 Stanford University Institutional Review Board protocol. Inclusion criteria included medial
67 compartment knee OA grade between one and three on the Kellgren-Lawrence scale from
68 anterior-posterior weightbearing radiographs; medial knee pain of three or greater on an 11-point
69 numeric rating scale; the ability to walk safely on a treadmill without assistance for 25 minutes;

70 and BMI less than 35. Participants were excluded if they had symptomatic arthritis in lower limb
71 joints other than the knee that was more severe than their arthritic knee. The limb examined for
72 each participant was chosen based on the presence of radiographic and symptomatic medial knee
73 OA. If medial knee OA was present in both knees, the more symptomatic side was analyzed.

74 Experimental gait data were collected during a visit where different FPA modifications
75 were evaluated for their effect on KAM peaks. Nineteen reflective markers were placed
76 bilaterally on the 2nd and 5th metatarsal heads, calcanei and medial and lateral malleoli, medial
77 and lateral femoral epicondyles, anterior and posterior superior iliac spines, and the C7 vertebrae,
78 with eighteen additional markers for limb tracking. First, a standing calibration trial was
79 performed, followed by a functional hip joint center calibration trial during which participants
80 were asked to circumduct their hips (Piazza et al., 2004). Participants then walked naturally for
81 two minutes (i.e., baseline trial) at a self-selected speed on an instrumented split belt treadmill
82 (Bertec Corporation, Columbus, OH, USA) while ground reaction force data and optical marker
83 positions were recorded (Motion Analysis Corporation, Santa Rosa, CA, USA). Then, two-
84 minute FPA modification trials were performed where vibrotactile biofeedback (Engineering
85 Acoustics, Casselberry, FL, USA) was given to participants to toe-in and toe-out by 10° relative
86 to their natural FPA. The absolute FPA was calculated as the angle between the line connecting
87 the calcaneus and second metatarsal head marker positions and the forward direction of the
88 treadmill during 15-40% of stance (Rutherford et al., 2008).

89 Of the one hundred seven participants who completed this task in the clinical study, fifty
90 were included in this analysis (Table 1). Selection for this analysis required participants to
91 reduce the first or second peak KAM by at least 5%, a magnitude of KAM reduction that would
92 likely elicit an improvement in knee pain (Erhart-Hledick et al., 2012), with either a 10° toe-in or

93 a 10° toe-out gait modification as compared to baseline. Participants who did not reduce their
94 peak KAM would not be prescribed a FPA modification and were therefore excluded from this
95 analysis. The first and second peaks of the KAM during the baseline walking trial were defined
96 as the maximum values during 0-50% and 51-100% of the stance phase, respectively. The FPA
97 modification KAM peaks were identified within $\pm 10\%$ of the timing of the participant's baseline
98 peaks. Participants were excluded from this analysis if they used the treadmill handrails during
99 walking trials or had greater than an estimated 1 cm of soft tissue between the anterior superior
100 iliac spine marker and the anatomical bony landmark to ensure the fidelity of hip joint marker
101 data (Hicks et al., 2015; Leardini et al., 2005).

102 ***Musculoskeletal Modeling***

103 We used a constrained musculoskeletal model (Rajagopal et al., 2016) with 25 degrees of
104 freedom for kinematic and kinetic analysis. This model includes a three degree of freedom hip
105 joint with Euler flexion, abduction, and rotation angles. We adapted the model published by
106 Rajagopal and colleagues, by locking the metatarsophalangeal joints, removing the arms, and
107 including a two degree of freedom knee joint (Lerner et al., 2015).

108 Scaling the generic musculoskeletal model to match the dimensions of each subject was a
109 two-step process. First, long-leg radiograph measurements were used to adjust frontal plane
110 lower limb alignment and pelvic width. The frontal plane lower limb alignment was found by
111 measuring the angle (ImageJ, National Institute of Mental Health, Bethesda, Maryland, USA)
112 between a line connecting the hip and knee joint centers and a line connecting the knee and ankle
113 joint centers (Lerner et al., 2015). The pelvic width was defined as the distance between the hip
114 joint centers identified on the radiograph. Second, the remainder of the model bodies were scaled
115 using locations of joint centers and anatomical markers in OpenSim 4.0 (Seth et al., 2018).

116 Inverse kinematics was performed to compute hip adduction, flexion, and internal
117 rotation angles. Results were filtered with a 4th order Butterworth filter and cutoff frequency of
118 15 Hz. These kinematics and ground reaction forces, also filtered at 15 Hz, were used in inverse
119 dynamics to calculate external hip abduction, extension, and internal rotation moments as well as
120 the KAM. Moments were reported in the joint coordinate reference frame.

121 *Data and Statistical Analysis*

122 For each gait trial (baseline, 10° toe-in, and 10° toe-out), the last 20 steps that achieved
123 the target FPA, within 2.5°, were analyzed. Each biomechanical metric of interest was calculated
124 for every step and averaged over each walking condition.

125 Hip moments were normalized by participant mass (Wesseling et al., 2015) and
126 compared between walking conditions for the primary kinetic metrics: the early-stance hip
127 moment, total hip moment, and angular impulse. To estimate the hip moment at the time of
128 greatest hip loading, the early-stance hip moment was computed as the average moment during
129 15-20% of stance phase, the time of first peak hip contact force (Bergmann et al., 2001;
130 Wesseling et al., 2015). To estimate the net effect of moment changes in all planes, the total hip
131 moment at time of peak hip contact force was calculated. This metric was defined as the square
132 root of the sum of squares of the early stance hip abduction, flexion, and internal rotation
133 moments (Asay et al., 2018). For analysis during the entire stance phase, the angular impulse
134 value was computed as the area under the absolute value of the hip moment curve during stance
135 phase. For kinematic analysis, joint angles were averaged during stance and compared between
136 walking conditions to capture global changes. Peak angles were also compared between
137 conditions. Spatiotemporal parameters were also determined for comparison, including FPA,
138 stride length, and step width. Stride length was defined as the difference in right and left foot

139 calcaneus marker positions at time of heel strike. Step width was defined as the distance between
140 the right and left foot center of pressure at 50% of stance (Donelan et al., 2001).

141 Statistical evaluations of 10° toe-in and 10° toe-out gait metrics compared to baseline
142 were performed in MATLAB R2020a (MathWorks Corporation, Natick, MA USA) using a
143 Wilcoxon signed-rank test ($\alpha = 0.05$), since a Kolmogorov-Smirnov test indicated the data were
144 not normally distributed. Bonferroni corrected p-values for multiple comparisons across FPA
145 conditions were reported to mitigate type I error. Additionally, the Cohen's d effect size was
146 calculated for further comparison of the hip moments between gait patterns, where $d < 0.20$ is a
147 small effect and $d > 0.80$ is a large effect.

148

149 **Results**

150 Participants adopted a FPA modification that reduced the peak KAM and did not increase
151 surrogate measures of hip loading. On average, 10° toe-in modifications reduced the first peak of
152 the KAM by 7.6% compared to baseline, and 10° toe-out reduced the second peak by 11.0%. The
153 early-stance hip abduction moment was significantly lower during 10° toe-in gait ($-4.3\% \pm 1.3\%$,
154 [range: -31.7% , 11.0%], $p=0.005$, $d=0.49$) and during 10° toe-out gait ($-4.6\% \pm 1.1\%$, [range: -
155 21.9% , 9.4%], $p < 0.001$, $d=0.59$) compared to baseline. There were no significant differences
156 ($p > 0.05$, $d < 0.25$) in the early-stance hip extension moment or early-stance internal rotation
157 moment for 10° toe-in or toe-out conditions compared to baseline (Figure 1). The baseline
158 internal rotation moment and changes with FPA modifications were small in magnitude (Figure
159 2, Table 2), yet this results in large percent changes from baseline (Figure 1).

160 On average, there were no significant increases in the total hip moment at time of peak
161 hip contact force; however, on an individual basis when walking with a modified FPA that

162 maximally reduced their KAM, 37 individuals (74% of participants) reduced their total hip
163 moment, while 13 individuals (26% of participants) increased their total hip moment. When
164 walking with a toe-out gait, 46% of individuals increased this metric, and 40% increased it with
165 toe-in gait. The largest observed total hip moment increase from baseline was 9.2% and 12.4%
166 for 10° toe-in and 10° toe-out gait, respectively. There was no difference in the change in total
167 hip moment from baseline for 10° toe-in gait ($-1.9\% \pm 0.8\%$, [range: -17.3%, 9.2%], $p>0.05$,
168 $d=0.30$) or 10° toe-out gait ($-1.4\% \pm 0.8\%$, [range: -16.5%, 12.4%], $p>0.05$, $d=0.22$) compared to
169 baseline.

170 The frontal plane angular impulse was significantly reduced compared to baseline for 10°
171 toe-in gait ($-2.3\% \pm 0.7\%$, [range: -11.7%, 7.4%], $p<0.01$, $d=0.45$) and for 10° toe-out gait ($-$
172 $6.9\% \pm 0.8\%$, [range: -23.1%, 4.5%], $p<0.001$, $d=1.23$), but no significant differences ($p>0.05$,
173 $d<0.18$) were observed in the sagittal or transverse plane (Figure 3).

174 Changes in hip kinematics were minimal. Participants walked with a decreased *average* hip
175 adduction angle for 10° toe-in gait ($-0.4^\circ \pm 1.1^\circ$, $p=0.045$) and 10° toe-out gait ($-1.6^\circ \pm 1.2^\circ$,
176 $p<0.001$) compared to baseline (Figure 4). *Peak* hip adduction angles also decreased for both toe-
177 in ($-0.7^\circ \pm 1.5^\circ$, $p=0.009$) and toe-out ($-1.8^\circ \pm 1.5^\circ$, $p=0.005$) gait compared to baseline.

178 Participants walked with increased *average* hip flexion when toeing-in ($2.7^\circ \pm 2.2^\circ$, $p<0.001$)
179 and toeing-out ($1.7^\circ \pm 2.1^\circ$, $p<0.001$). Both modifications had a lower *peak* extension angle
180 compared to baseline (toe-in: $-3.2^\circ \pm 2.7^\circ$, $p<0.001$; toe-out: $-2.5^\circ \pm 2.7^\circ$, $p<0.001$). The *average*
181 hip internal rotation angle increased by an average of $4.4^\circ \pm 2.6^\circ$ ($p<0.001$) when walking with a
182 10° toe-in gait and decreased by $5.7^\circ \pm 1.3^\circ$ ($p<0.001$) with a 10° toe-out gait. Similar directional
183 changes were seen in the *peak* hip internal rotation angle compared to baseline (toe-in: $4.6^\circ \pm$
184 2.7° , $p<0.001$; toe-out: $-5.8^\circ \pm 1.6^\circ$, $p<0.001$). Changes in spatiotemporal parameters were also

185 observed. Stride length decreased with both FPA modifications ($p < 0.001$), while step width
186 increased only for 10° toe-out gait ($p < 0.001$) (Table 2).

187

188 **Discussion**

189 We analyzed how changing the FPA during walking affects hip moments in fifty
190 individuals with medial knee OA who successfully reduce their KAM with the modification.
191 Our hypothesis was confirmed, as hip moments did not increase, on average, when a modified
192 FPA was adopted. Both 10° toe-in and 10° toe-out modifications decreased the early-stance hip
193 abduction moment and angular impulse. On average, adopting a FPA modification that reduced
194 the KAM did not significantly increase hip moments at time of peak hip contact force, the total
195 hip moment at time of peak hip contact force, or the angular impulse. However, some
196 participants did increase their total hip moment at time of peak hip contact force with the FPA
197 modification. This suggests that for individuals with hip joint pathology or at risk of developing
198 hip OA, the effect of a FPA gait modification at the hip should be evaluated individually to
199 ensure that adopting a modification that improves knee loading does not cause a potentially
200 harmful increase in hip loading.

201 Our observed decrease in the hip abduction moment is consistent with other studies. The
202 4% decrease in the early-stance hip abduction moment when toeing-in and toeing-out was
203 smaller than the 16% decrease in hip abduction observed at the time of peak KAM in a healthy
204 population (Kettley et al., 2018). This could be due to the varying participant population and
205 differences in gait cycle timing when the hip moments were analyzed (i.e., at peak hip contact
206 force versus peak KAM). Similarly, the reductions in early-stance hip abduction moment (10°
207 toe-in: 0.03 Nm/kg; 10° toe-out: 0.04 Nm/kg) agreed directionally with the 0.1 Nm/kg decrease

208 Wesseling et al., (2015) reported from simulated perturbations of frontal plane hip kinematics.
209 The magnitude differences are unsurprising when comparing simulation predictions to
210 experimental results, since participants may adopt other compensatory strategies to modify their
211 FPA that were not captured in these simulations. Additionally, our observed hip rotation moment
212 changes were small in magnitude, compared to the abduction and extension moments, resulting
213 in large percent changes.

214 Kinematic and spatiotemporal changes were also observed when participants modified
215 their FPA. Changes in the hip rotation angle were less than the change in FPA, which aligns with
216 results from Cibulka et al., (2016), who found that FPA modifications elicit changes at multiple
217 lower-extremity joints. In addition to the rotational kinematics changes, the average hip
218 adduction angle decrease relates to the increase in step width for toe-out gait. Other studies
219 (Kettlety et al., 2020; Uhlich et al., 2018) have also observed that step width increases with a
220 modified FPA resulting from less hip adduction. While the decrease in hip adduction angle and
221 increase in step width are small, these changes increase medio-lateral stability (Meyer et al.,
222 2018). Additionally, participants decreased stride length, which can increase double-limb support
223 time, resulting in a more stable gait (Shkuratova et al., 2004). The changes to kinematics and
224 spatiotemporal parameters may attenuate over time as an individual becomes more comfortable
225 with the gait modification.

226 It is important to identify the limitations of our study. We estimated the effect of FPA
227 modifications on surrogate measures of hip loading. Electromyography was not used in this
228 study, but, in the future, validated electromyography-informed simulations could estimate
229 changes in muscle and hip contact forces. The surrogate measure of hip loading that we used,
230 joint moments, is related to muscle and joint contact forces, which provides an estimate of the

231 directional change in hip contact force. Meyer et al. (2018) reported that a decrease in the hip
232 abduction moment and hip adduction angle reduced the work generated by the hip abductor
233 muscles and decreased hip loading in people with hip OA. The relationship between the total hip
234 moment and hip OA pathogenesis has not been studied, but the total knee joint moment and the
235 change in relative contribution of its components (knee adduction, flexion, and rotation
236 moments) reflect gait changes associated with progressing knee OA and pain (Asay et al., 2018).
237 Similarly, the total hip moment is likely an effective summary metric of changes in muscular
238 demand in all planes at the hip and future work should investigate how it relates to hip OA
239 initiation and progression. Generally, little is known about the role of hip joint loading on the
240 initiation of hip OA; elucidating these relationships should be the topic of future work.

241 Several studies have shown that FPA modifications can provide meaningful reductions in
242 the KAM. Our results add to this growing body of evidence and show that, on average, FPA
243 modifications reduce frontal plane hip moments without increasing the moments in other planes.
244 However, some individuals did increase their total hip moment at time of peak hip contact force.
245 If an individual is at risk for hip OA, then hip moments will be an important biomechanical
246 parameter to monitor when prescribing gait modifications. Yet, 74% of people, who could
247 meaningfully reduce their KAM, reduced their total hip moment at time of peak hip contact force
248 with a modified FPA. In summary, on average and for most individuals, a FPA modification that
249 reduces knee loading does not increase surrogate measures of hip loading.

250

251 **Acknowledgements**

252 We would like to thank the participants involved in the study. This work was supported by the
253 Sang Samuel Wang Stanford Graduate Fellowship, NSF Graduate Research Fellowships (DGE-

254 1147470 and DGE-1656518), NIH grant P41EB027060, and by Merit Review Award I01
255 RX001811 from the United States Department of Veterans Affairs Rehabilitation Research and
256 Development Service.

257 **References**

- 258
- 259 Andriacchi, T.P., Mündermann, A., Smith, R.L., Alexander, E.J., Dyrby, C.O., Koo, S., 2004. A
260 Framework for the in Vivo Pathomechanics of Osteoarthritis at the Knee. *Annals of*
261 *Biomedical Engineering* 32, 447–457.
- 262 Asay, J.L., Erhart-Hledik, J.C., Andriacchi, T.P., 2018. Changes in the Total Knee Joint Moment
263 in Patients with Medial Compartment Knee Osteoarthritis Over 5 years. *Journal of*
264 *Orthopaedic Research* 36, 2373-2379.
- 265 Baliunas, A.J., Hurwitz, D.E., Ryals, A.B., Karrar, A., Case, J.P., Block, J.A., Andriacchi, T.P.,
266 2002. Increased knee joint loads during walking are present in subjects with knee
267 osteoarthritis. *Osteoarthritis and Cartilage* 10, 573–579.
- 268 Bergmann, G., Deuretzbacher, G., Heller, M., Graichen, F., Rohlmann, A., Strauss, J., Duda,
269 G.N., 2001. Hip contact forces and gait patterns from routine activities. *Journal of*
270 *Biomechanics* 34, 859–871.
- 271 Bowsher, K.A., Vaughan, C.L., 1995. Effect of foot-progression angle on hip joint moments
272 during gait. *Journal of Biomechanics* 28, 759–762.
- 273 Charlton, J.M., Hatfield, G.L., Guenette, J.A., Hunt, M.A., 2018 Toe-in and toe-out walking
274 require different lower limb neuromuscular patterns in people with knee osteoarthritis.
275 *Journal of Biomechanics* 76, 112–118.
- 276 Chehab, E.F., Favre, J., Erhart-Hledik, J.C., Andriacchi, T.P., 2014. Baseline knee adduction and
277 flexion moments during walking are both associated with 5-year cartilage changes in
278 patients with medial knee osteoarthritis. *Osteoarthritis and Cartilage* 22, 1833–1839.
- 279 Cibulka, M.T., Winters, K., Kampwerth, T., McAfee, B., Payne, L., Roegenhaus, T., Ross,
280 S.A., 2016. Predicting Foot Progression Angle during Gait using Two Clinical Measures in
281 Healthy Adults, a Preliminary Study. *International Journal of Sports Physical Therapy* 11,
282 400-408.
- 283 Cisternas, M.G., Murphy, L., Sacks, J.J., Solomon, D.H., Pasta, D.J., Helmick, C.G., 2016.
284 Alternative Methods for Defining Osteoarthritis and the Impact on Estimating Prevalence in
285 a US Population-Based Survey: OA Prevalence in a Population-Based Survey. *Arthritis*
286 *Care & Research* 68, 574–580.
- 287 Deshpande, B.R., Katz, J.N., Solomon, D.H., Yelin, E.H., Hunter, D.J., Messier, S.P., Suter,
288 L.G., Losina, E., 2016. Number of Persons With Symptomatic Knee Osteoarthritis in the
289 US: Impact of Race and Ethnicity, Age, Sex, and Obesity: Symptomatic Knee OA in the
290 US. *Arthritis Care & Research* 68, 1743–1750.
- 291 Diamond, L.E., Allison, K., Dobson, F., Hall, M., 2018. Hip joint loading during walking in
292 people with hip osteoarthritis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Osteoarthritis and*
293 *Cartilage*, Abstracts from the 2018 OARSI World Congress on Osteoarthritis 26, S370.
- 294 Donelan, J.M., Kram, R., Kuo, A.D., 2001. Mechanical and metabolic determinants of the
295 preferred step width in human walking. *Proceedings of the Royal Society: Biological*
296 *Sciences* 268, 1985-1992.
- 297 Erhart-Hledik, J.C., Elspas, B., Giori, N.J., Andriacchi, T.P., 2012. Effect of variable-stiffness
298 walking shoes on knee adduction moment, pain, and function in subjects with medial
299 compartment knee osteoarthritis after 1 year. *Journal of Orthopedic Research* 30, 514-21.
- 300 Felson, D.T., Parkes, M., Carter, S., Liu, A., Callaghan, M.J., Hodgson, R., Bowes, M., Jones,
301 R.K., 2019. The Efficacy of a Lateral Wedge Insole for Painful Medical Knee Osteoarthritis
302 After Prescreening: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *Arthritis & Rheumatology* 71, 908-915.

- 303 Felson, D.T., 2013. Osteoarthritis as a disease of mechanics. *Osteoarthritis and Cartilage* 21, 10–
304 15.
- 305 Felson, D.T., 2004. Risk factors for osteoarthritis: understanding joint vulnerability. *Clinical*
306 *Orthopaedics and Related Research* 427, S16-21.
- 307 Guo, M., Axe, M.J., Manal, K., 2007. The influence of foot progression angle on the knee
308 adduction moment during walking and stair climbing in pain free individuals with knee
309 osteoarthritis. *Gait & Posture* 26, 436–441.
- 310 Hall, M., Chabra, S., Shakoor, N., Leurgans, S.E., Demirtas, H., Foucher, K.C., 2019. Hip joint
311 moments in symptomatic vs. asymptomatic people with mild radiographic hip osteoarthritis.
312 *Journal of Biomechanics* 96, 109347.
- 313 Hicks, J.L., Uchida, T.K., Seth, A., Rajagopal, A., Delp, S.L., 2015. Is my model good enough?
314 Best practices for verification and validation of musculoskeletal models and simulations of
315 movement. *Journal of Biomechanical Engineering* 137, 0209051-02090524.
- 316 Hunt, M.A., Birmingham, T.B., Jenkyn, T.R., Giffin, J.R., Jones, I.C., 2008. Measures of frontal
317 plane lower limb alignment obtained from static radiographs and dynamic gait analysis.
318 *Gait & Posture* 27, 635–640.
- 319 Hunt, M.A., Charlton, J.M., Krowchuk, N.M., Tse, C.T.F., Hatfield, G.L., 2018. Clinical and
320 biomechanical changes following a 4-month toe-out gait modification program for people
321 with medial knee osteoarthritis: a randomized controlled trial. *Osteoarthritis and Cartilage*
322 26, 903-911.
- 323 Issa, R., Griffin, T., 2012. Pathobiology of obesity and osteoarthritis: integrating biomechanics
324 and inflammation. *Pathobiology of Aging & Age-related Diseases* 2, 17470.
- 325 Kettley, S., Lindsey, B., Eddo, O., Prebble, M., Caswell, S., Cortes, N., 2020. Changes in hip
326 mechanics during gait modification to reduce knee adduction moment. *Journal of*
327 *Biomechanics* 99, 1-7.
- 328 Leardini, A., Chiari L., Croce, U.D., Cappozzo, A., 2005. Human movement analysis using
329 stereophotogrammetry. Part 3. Soft tissue artifact assessment and compensation. *Gait &*
330 *Posture* 21, 212-225.
- 331 Legrand, T., Younesian, H., Equey, N., Campeau-Lecours, A., Turcot, K., 2021. Trunk lean and
332 toe out gait strategies impact on lower limb joints. *Journal of Biomechanics* 129, 110740.
- 333 Lerner, Z.F., DeMers, M.S., Delp, S.L., Browning, R.C., 2015. How tibiofemoral alignment and
334 contact locations affect predictions of medial and lateral tibiofemoral contact forces. *Journal*
335 *of Biomechanics* 48, 644–650.
- 336 Maly, M.R., Robbins, S.M., Stratford, P.W., Birmingham, T.B., Callaghan, J.P., 2013.
337 Cumulative knee adductor load distinguishes between healthy and osteoarthritic knees—A
338 proof of principle study. *Gait & Posture* 37, 397–401.
- 339 Manal, K., Gardinier, E., Buchanan, T.S., Snyder-Mackler, L., 2015. A More Informed
340 Evaluation of Medial Compartment Loading: the Combined Use of the Knee Adduction and
341 Flexor Moments. *Osteoarthritis and Cartilage* 23(7), 1107-1111.
- 342 Meyer, C., Wesseling, M., Corten, K., Nieuwenhuys, A., Monari, D., Simon, J., Jonkers, I.,
343 Desloovere, K., 2018. Hip movement pathomechanics of patients with hip osteoarthritis aim
344 at reducing hip joint loading on the osteoarthritic side. *Gait & Posture*, 59, 11-17.
- 345 Miyazaki, T., 2002. Dynamic load at baseline can predict radiographic disease progression in
346 medial compartment knee osteoarthritis. *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases* 61, 617–622.
- 347 Mündermann, A., Dyrby, C.O., Hurwitz, D.E., Sharma, L., Andriacchi, T.P., 2004. Potential
348 strategies to reduce medial compartment loading in patients with knee osteoarthritis of

- 349 varying severity: Reduced walking speed: Relationship of Walking Speed to Maximum
350 Knee Adduction Moment. *Arthritis & Rheumatism* 50, 1172–1178.
- 351 Mündermann, A., Dyrby, C.O., Andriacchi, T.P., 2005. Secondary gait changes in patients with
352 medial compartment knee osteoarthritis: Increased load at the ankle, knee, and hip during
353 walking. *Arthritis & Rheumatism* 52, 2835–2844.
- 354 Murphy, L.B., Helmick, C.G., Schwartz, T.A., Renner, J.B., Tudor, G., Koch, G.G., Dragomir,
355 A.D., Kalsbeek, W.D., Luta, G., Jordan, J.M., 2010. One in four people may develop
356 symptomatic hip osteoarthritis in his or her lifetime. *Osteoarthritis and Cartilage* 18, 1372–
357 1379.
- 358 Piazza, S.J., Erdemir, A, Okita, N, Cavanagh, P.R., 2004. Assessment of the functional method
359 of hip joint center location subject to reduced range of hip motion. *Journal of Biomechanics*
360 37, 349-356
- 361 Rajagopal, A., Dembia, C.L., DeMers, M.S., Delp, D.D., Hicks, J.L., Delp, S.L., 2016. Full-
362 Body Musculoskeletal Model for Muscle-Driven Simulation of Human Gait. *IEEE*
363 *Transactions on Biomedical Engineering* 63, 2068–2079.
- 364 Robbins, S.M., Birmingham, T.B., Callaghan, J.P., Jones, G.R., Chesworth, B.M., Maly, M.R.,
365 2011. Association of pain with frequency and magnitude of knee loading in knee
366 osteoarthritis. *Arthritis Care & Research* 63, 991–997.
- 367 Rutherford, D.J., Hubble-Kozey, C.L., Deluzio, K.J., Stanish, W.D., Dunbar, M., 2008. Foot
368 progression angle and the knee adduction moment: a cross-sectional investigation in knee
369 osteoarthritis. *Osteoarthritis and Cartilage* 16, 883-889.
- 370 Rutherford, D.J., Hubble-Kozey, C.L., Stanish, W.D., 2010. The neuromuscular demands of
371 altering foot progression angle during gait in asymptomatic individuals and those with knee
372 osteoarthritis. *Osteoarthritis and Cartilage* 18, 654–661.
- 373 Seth, A., Hicks, J.L, Uchida, T.K., Habib, A., Dembia, C.L., Dunne, J.J., Ong, C.F., DeMers,
374 M.S., Rajagopal, A., Millard, M., Hamner, S.R., Arnold, E.M., Yong, J.R., Lakshimikanth,
375 S.K., Sherman, M.A, Ku, J.P., Delp, S.L., 2018. OpenSim: Simulating musculoskeletal
376 dynamics and neuromuscular control to study human and animal movement. *PLoS*
377 *Computational Biology* 14, e1006223.
- 378 Shkuratova, N., Morris, M.E., Huxham, F., 2004. Effects of age on balance control during
379 walking. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation* 85(4), 582-588.
- 380 Shull, P.B., Shultz, R., Silder, A., Drago, J.L., Besier, T.F., Cutkosky, M.R., Delp, S.L., 2013.
381 Toe-in gait reduces the first peak knee adduction moment in patients with medial
382 compartment knee osteoarthritis. *Journal of Biomechanics* 46, 122–128.
- 383 Simic, M., Hinman, R., Wrigley, T., Bennell, K., Hunt, M., 2011. Gait modification strategies for
384 altering medial knee joint load: a systematic review. *Arthritis Care & Research* 63, 405–
385 426.
- 386 Tateuchi, H., Koyama, Y., Akiyama, H., Goto, K., So, K., Kuroda, Y., Ichihashi, N., 2017. Daily
387 cumulative hip moment is associated with radiographic progression of secondary hip
388 osteoarthritis. *Osteoarthritis and Cartilage* 25, 1291–1298.
- 389 Thorp, L.E., Sumner, D.R., Wimmer, M.A., Block, J.A., 2007. Relationship between pain and
390 medial knee joint loading in mild radiographic knee osteoarthritis. *Arthritis Care &*
391 *Research* 57, 1254–1260.
- 392 Uhlrich, S.D., Silder, A., Beaupre, G.A., Shull, P.B., Delp, S.L., 2018. Subject-specific toe-in or
393 toe-out gait modifications reduce the larger knee adduction moment peak more than a non-
394 personalized approach. *Journal of Biomechanics* 66, 103–110.

- 395 Wang, C., Chan, P.P.K, Lam, B.M.F, Wang, S., Zhang, J.H., Chan, Z.Y.S., Chan, R.H.M, *Senior*
396 *Member, IEEE*, Ho, K.K.W., Cheung, R.T.H., 2020. Real-Time Estimation of Knee
397 Adduction Moment for Gait Retraining in Patients with Knee Osteoarthritis. *IEEE*
398 *Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering* 28, 888-894.
- 399 Wesseling, M., Groote, F. de, Meyer, C., Corten, K., Simon, J.P., Desloovere, K., Jonkers, I.,
400 2015. Gait alterations to effectively reduce hip contact forces. *Journal of Orthopaedic*
401 *Research* 33, 1094–1102.
- 402 Xia, H., Charlton, J.M., Shull, P.B., Hunt, M.A., 2020. Portable, automated foot progression
403 angle gait modification via a proof-of-concept haptic feedback-sensorized shoe. *Journal of*
404 *Biomechanics* 107, 109789

405 **TABLES & FIGURES**

Characteristic (N = 50)	Mean (SD)
Age (yr)	61 (7)
Height (m)	1.7 (0.1)
Mass (kg)	76.2 (15.4)
BMI (kg/m ²)	25.8 (3.8)
Gender	M: 31 F: 19
Static Knee Angle (°): Varus (-) Valgus (+)	Ipsilateral: -2.4 (3.6) Contralateral: -1.0 (3.6)
Participants who reduced peak KAM with a modified FPA	Peak 1 only: n =11 Peak 2 only: n =14 Peak 1 & Peak 2: n =25
Gait Speed (m/s)	1.2 (0.1)
Kellgren and Lawrence Grade	□: 12, □: 27, □: 11
Medial Knee Pain: 0 (no pain) - 10 (worst pain)	4 (2)

406


407 **Table 1:** Demographics of the fifty participants with symptomatic medial knee osteoarthritis

408 included in the analysis. Standard deviation (SD) is reported in parentheses.

Parameter	Baseline		10° Toe-in			10° Toe-out		
	mean	SD	mean	SD	p-value	mean	SD	p-value
FPA (°)	6.9	3.4	- 2.8	3.5	< 0.001	16.5	3.4	< 0.001
Stride Length (m)	1.33	0.14	1.29	0.13	< 0.001	1.29	0.13	< 0.001
Step Width (m)	0.18	0.04	0.19	0.04	0.863	0.22	0.05	< 0.001
Peak Hip Abduction Moment (Nm/kg)	0.97	0.12	0.93	0.13	< 0.001	0.91	0.14	< 0.001
Peak Hip Extension Moment (Nm/kg)	0.72	0.18	0.75	0.18	0.003	0.73	0.19	0.227
Peak Hip Flexion Moment (Nm/kg)	-0.64	0.17	-0.60	0.16	< 0.001	-0.60	0.15	< 0.001
Peak Hip Internal Rotation Moment (Nm/kg)	0.20	0.06	0.21	0.08	0.37	0.22	0.08	0.025
Peak Hip External Rotation Moment (Nm/kg)	-0.11	0.03	-0.09	0.04	< 0.001	-0.08	0.04	< 0.001
1st Peak KAM: (%BW*H)	3.69	1.17	3.41	1.11		3.80	1.23	
(Nm/kg)	0.62	0.20	0.57	0.19		0.64	0.21	
2nd Peak KAM: (%BW*H)	2.72	0.98	2.72	1.01		2.42	1.06	
(Nm/kg)	0.46	0.17	0.46	0.17		0.41	0.18	

409


410 **Table 2:** Spatiotemporal parameters, peak hip moments, and KAM for participants during
411 baseline gait, 10° toe-in and 10° toe-out. Note, p-values are not reported for the peak KAM
412 values since participants were selected based on their ability to reduce their peak KAM.



413

414

415 **Figure 1:** Participants reduced their early-stance hip abduction moment for 10° toe-in (blue) and
416 10° toe-out (red) gait as compared to baseline. No significant differences were observed
417 between baseline gait and toe-in or toe-out gait for the early-stance hip extension and internal
418 rotation moment. (*p<0.005)



419


420

421 **Figure 2:** Ensemble-averaged hip moment curves, normalized by bodyweight, for all participants

422 (n = 50) during stance phase. Baseline gait (black, dashed) hip moments are compared to 10°

423 toe-in gait (blue, solid) in the first row and 10° toe-out gait (red, solid) in the second row. The

424 shaded region indicates one standard deviation from the average moment.



425


426

427 **Figure 3:** Participants reduced their frontal plane angular impulse during 10° toe-in (blue) and

428 10° toe-out (red) gait compared to baseline. No significant differences were observed between

429 baseline and toe-in or toe-out gait for the angular impulse in the sagittal and transverse plane.

430 (*p<0.01)



431

432

433 **Figure 4:** Ensemble-averaged hip kinematics for all participants ($n = 50$) during stance phase.

434 Baseline gait (black, dashed) hip angles are compared to 10° toe-in gait (blue, solid) in the first

435 row and 10° toe-out gait (red, solid) in the second row. The shaded region indicates one standard

436 deviation from the average hip angle. The peak hip adduction angle and the peak hip extension

437 angle are significantly reduced with 10° toe-in gait and 10° toe-out gait compared to baseline

438 ($p < 0.01$). The peak hip internal rotation angle is significantly increased for 10° toe-in gait and

439 reduced for 10° toe-out gait compared to baseline ($p < 0.001$).