



1 Article

3

2 Validity and reliability of inertial measurement units in active range of motion assessment in the hip joint

Łukasz Stołowski^{1,2*}, Maciej Niedziela¹, Przemysław Lubiatowski^{1,3} and Tomasz Piontek ^{1,4}

4	Department of Outboundie Superior Polyconet Clinic 40 201 Degram Polyndi lukasz etalowski@rahasmart n
4 5	(Ł S): maciej niedziela@rehasport pl (M N), p lubiatowski@rehasport pl/P J) tomasz piontek@rehasport pl
6	(T.P.)
7	² Doctoral School, Poznan University of Medical Sciences, 60-812 Poznan, Poland
8	³ Orthopaedics, Traumatology and Hand Surgery Department, Poznan University of Medical Sciences, 28 Czerwca
9	1956, No. 135/147, 61-545 Poznan, Poland
10	⁴ Department of Spine Disorders and Pediatric Orthopedics, University of Medical Sciences Poznan, 61-701
11	Poznan, Poland * Correspondence: lukeer stelevichi@vebasport pl. Tel. 148602021505
12	Correspondence: lukasz.stolowski@renasport.pl; lel.: +46695031595
13	Abstract: Measuring joint range of motion has traditionally occurred with a universal goniometer,
14	inclinometer, or expensive laboratory systems. The popularity of the inertial measurement unit
15	(IMU) is growing, enabling the small even single portable device to measure the range of motion.
16	Until now, they were not used to assess hip joint range of motion. Our study aimed to check the
17	validity of IMU in assessing a hip range of motion and compare them to other measurement de-
18	vices - universal goniometer and inclinometer. Twenty participants completed three hip move-
19	ments (flexion in standing and prone internal and external rotation) on both hips. Two testers in-
20	dependently assessed each movement with a goniometer, digital inclinometer, and IMU at differ-
21	ent time points. To assess the agreement of active hip ROM between devices, Intraclass Correlation
22	Coefficient (ICC) and Bland-Altman analysis were used. Furthermore, inter-rater and intra-rater
23	reliability were also assessed by using ICC and Bland-Altman analysis. Limits of agreement (LOA)
24	were calculated using Bland-Altman plots. IMU showed good to excellent validity compared with
25	the goniometer and digital inclinometer for all tested movements with ICCs ranging from 0.87-0.99
26	and LOAs <9°. Intra-rater reliability was good-to-excellent for all tested movements for all devices,
27	with ICCs ranging from 0.87 to 0.99 and LOAs < 7°. Inter-rater reliability was lower and compara-
28	ble for all measurement methods: moderate flexion (ICC: 0.58-0.59), LOAs <22.4 and poor for both
29	rotations (ICC:-0.33-0.04), and LOAs < 7.8°). The present study shows that a single inertial meas-
30	urement unit (RSO Motion) could be successfully used to assess the active hip range of motion in
21	healthy subjects with comparable to other methods accuracy
01	nearry subjects with comparable to other methods accuracy.
32	Keywords: IMU; Hip range of motion; goniometer; inclinometer

Citation: To be added by editorial 33 staff during production.

Academic Editor: Firstname	
Lastname	
Received: date	
Revised: date	
Accepted: date	
Published: date	

Copyright: © 2023 by the authors 1 Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and 2 conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licens 4 (https://creativecommons.org/licens 4 c/bw/400

1. Introduction

34

35

36

37 38

39

40

An integral part of the clinical examination of the hip joint is the assessment of the range of motion (ROM). Determining any limitations allows for making a diagnosis, planning therapy, and objectifying the effects of treatment. In the literature, deficits of hip ROM have been reported in the case of osteoarthritis, femoroacetabular impingement syndrome, or osteitis pubis, and also as a risk factor for groin or knee injury [1,2,3,4]. The precision of the examination plays an important role, therefore it is essential to use reliable measuring tools for this purpose.

Examination of the hip joint is hampered by its multiaxiality and compensatory movements of the spine or even the knee joint [5]. In previous studies, measurements of the range of motion in the hip joint were made using a visual estimation, goniometer, digital inclinometer, photographic assessment, smartphone application, or 3D motion capture

90	ticipate in the study.
89	participants were informed about the purpose of the study and signed consent to par-
88	Poland(no.13/21) and met the criteria of the Declaration of Helsinki. Before the study, all
87	approved by the Bioethical Committee of the University of Medical Sciences in Poznań,
86	come Score (HOOS PL)(mean score ± standard deviation: 99.7±0.9) [21]. The study was
85	assessment questionnaire - Polish Version of the Hip Disability and Osteoarthritis Out-
84	tion of normal hip function, each of the participants completed the hip joint functional
83	within last 6 months, and no other diseases that may affect the test result. For confirma-
82	history of surgeries or injuries in the lower limb or spine, no pain in the hip or spine
81	body mass: 70.4 ± 13.6 kg) were recruited for the study based on inclusion criteria: no
80	Twenty healthy participants (10 female, 10 men; age: 27 ± 5 years; height: 174.4 ± 10.6 cm;
79	2.1. Participants
78	2. Materials and Methods
77	measuring the active range of motion of the hip in healthy individuals.
76	its reliability and validity against digital inclinometer and universal goniometer in
75	This study aimed to evaluate one of the IMII devices - the RSO Motion concor and check
74	their devices, making them impossible to compare [20].
73	Garimella et al. point out that manufacturers use different computational algorithms in
72	Some widely available measurement systems on the market use IMU. In a recent review,
71	like sports or work.
70	motion on his own. It also gives the opportunity to use it during more complex activities
69	In addition if the sensor is attached to the body, it allows the user to assess the range of
68	possibility of its stabilization by the examining a patient with his conditions [10]
00	possibility of its stabilization by the examiner. This is particularly important when
65	measurement, especially when working with a patient one-on-one. The use of sensors
64	The small size of the device and the ease of assembly should allow for quick and precise
63	motion in clinical settings.
62	published so far, we have vet to encounter the use of IMU in assessing a hip range of
61	ments was the analysis of the kinematics of the hip joint [17, 18]. However, in the studies
60	analysis of more complex activities such as walking or running where one of the ele-
58 59	In previous studies, IMU was validated to assess the range of motion of the shoulder joint, ankle joint or cervical spine [14, 15, 16]. Their usefulness was also confirmed in the
57	lows the calculation of precise motion measurement results [13].
56	scope, accelerometer, and magnetometer, and uses an appropriate algorithm. which al-
55	gaining popularity in the field of human motion capture. The device is made of a gyro-
54	Inertial Measurement Unit(IMU) appears as an alternative measurement solution and is
53	impractical, time-consuming, and expensive.
52	[11,12]. In daily practice, photographic evaluation or advanced 3D motion capture seems
51	shown the impact of pelvic or even knee movement on hip ROM assessment outcomes
50	a measurement simultaneously, especially if done by one tester. Previous studies have
49	goniometer, or smartphone is difficult due to the inability to stabilize the pelvis and take
48	examiner and therefore carries the risk of error[10]. Examination using an inclinometer.
47	motion but also has limitations. A major factor is always a subjective assessment of the
46	systems [67.8.9] Each method has been proven to be reliable in measuring the range of

91	
92	2.2. Instrumentation
93	Hip joint range of motion was measured using three devices:
94	1. Universal plastic goniometer with a length of 20.32 cm and allow to obtain a meas-
95	urement every 1° on a 360° scale.
96 97	2. Baseline digital inclinometer (Fabrication Enterprises, White Plains, NY, USA). The manufacturer ensure a measurement accuracy of 0.5° .
98	3. IMU by RSQ Motion (RSQ Technologies, Poznan, Poland). The RSQ Motion system is a
99	nologies brand intended for the analysis of body movement RSO Motion Sensor per-
101	forms measurements using MEMS sensors: accelerometer, gyroscope, and magnetome-
102	ter This data is sent as a digital electrical signal to a microcontroller, which processes it
102	filters it and calculates the orientation of the Motion Sensor and presents it in the form of
104	quaternions. The module with the microcontroller has a built-in Bluetooth LowEnergy
105	antenna and communicates with the RSO Motion Hub or an application using this pro-
106	tocol. The accuracy of the sensors was tested in laboratory conditions by comparing it to
107	the Kuka robot (0.15°) The results showed excellent accuracy and repeatability, which
108	allows us to believe that the device used will not affect the final results [22].
109	2.3. Study protocol
110	The study was conducted by two independent testers, both experienced physiotherapists
111	working clinically with orthopedic patients and skilled in assessing range of motion
112	Before the current study, a pilot trial was conducted on a group of 5 subjects to establish a
113	uniform measurement protocol.
114	Every study participant was evaluated on two independent days, in the same place and
115	at a similar time of day. The subjects were wearing sports clothes and were without
116	shoes. During the first day, two investigators performed an assessment (3 measurements
117	for every direction of movement) with an hour interval to assess inter-rater reliability.
118	After three days, another test was performed by one researcher to demonstrate intra-rater
119	reliability.
120	Before the measurement to familiarize themselves with the measurements, all partici-
121	pants were asked to perform 2 test repetitions before each tested direction. The order of
122	the tested movements was established according to the protocol: active flexion in the
123	standing position, active external rotation, and internal rotation in the prone position.
124	2.3.1. Active hip flexion in standing position (Figure 1):
125	The participant stands against the wall with his feet in a relaxed position and supports
126	himself with the opposite hand to the tested leg to maintain balance. During the exami-
127	nation, the patient is asked to lift the thigh with a flexed and relaxed knee as high as
128	possible and maintain this position for about 1 second. The limb is held in the obtained
129	position by the assistant for measurement with the goniometer and inclinometer. The
130	examiner visually controls the occurrence of possible compensation - flexion of the other
131	knee or lateral flexion of the trunk and corrects it if necessary. The measurement is made
132	3 times for both limbs using three devices:

133 134 135 136	1. IMU: The device is calibrated according to the protocol and zeroed at fixed vertical reference. The sensor is attached with a sticker 5 cm above the patella of the examined limb. When the maximum range of motion is reached, the recording is made by clicking the button on the so-called "clicker" and saved in a connected application.
137 138 139	2. Inclinometer: The device is zeroed at a fixed vertical surface. The measurement is made by placing the inclinometer on the distal part of the thigh. The recording is made at the same time as IMU.
140 141 142	3. Goniometer: The axis is placed at the height of the greater trochanter, one arm is di- rected along the femur, and the other vertically, parallel to the wall. The measurement is made right after the inclinometer and IMU.
143	
144 145	
146	
147	
148	
149	
150	
152	
153	
154	<i>Figure 1.</i> Active flexion range of motion assessment withgoniometer.
155	
156	2.3.2. Active external and internal rotation in the prone position (Figures 2&3).
157 158 159 160 161	Participant lying prone on the couch. To maintain the position of the limbs, a foam roller with a diameter of 13 cm was placed between the knees to avoid adduction/abduction movement of the hip. The knee of the test leg is bent to 90°. The assistant stabilizes the pelvis manually while the participant performs an active external rotation movement as far as possible. The obtained position is maintained by the assistant to take measure-
162 163	ments. The same test is performed for internal rotation. The measurement is made 3 times for both limbs using three devices:
164 165 166 167	1. IMU: The device is calibrated according to the protocol and zeroed at a fixed vertical surface. The sensor is attached with a sticker 5 cm proximal to the ankle joint of the examined limb. When the maximum range of motion is reached, the recording is made by clicking the button on the so-called "clicker" and saved in a connected application.

168 169 170	2. Inclinometer: The device is zeroed by placing the inclinometer along the made at the same time as IMU.	at a fixed vertical surface. The measurement is made e tibia underneath the IMU sensor. The recording is	ļ
171 172	3. Goniometer: Axis of rotation set at the tibia, stationary arm set perpendi	the tibial tuberosity. Movable arm along the edge of icular to the couch.	E
173			
174			
175			
176			
177			
1/8			
179			
180			
181	(a)	(b)	
183	internal rotation range of motion assessn	Figure 2. Active <i>ment with IMU and inclinometer(a) and goniometer(b).</i>	
184			
185			
186			
187			
188			
189			
190			
191			
192	(a)	(b)	
193	(4)	(~)	
194	<i>Figure 3. Active external rotation range</i>	of motion assessment with IMU and inclinometer(a) and	!
195	gon10meter(b).		
196			

198

2.4. Statistical analysis

INCL vs GON INCL vs GON Abbreviations: IM ICC- Intra Class Co 3.1.2. In Inter - r niomete was bele iter reliability indicators in Tester 1	0.94 U - Inertial prrelation Co ater - rater p rater reliab er - below f ow 1° and f n hip flexior Test	-6.8 ± 4.1 Measurement To pefficient; 95% C reliability ility was mode 11.8° and 12.8° MDC95 was be n for all of the me er 2	-14.8; 1.3 Unit; INCL- digit I-95% confidence rate for all teste and 22.4° for ir dow 2.8° for all t easuring devices; 1 ICC	0.93 al inclinon interval; L d instrum nclinomete rested inst Fester 1 vs SEM M	-5.1 ± 3.6 neter; GON - un OA- Limits of Ag nents. LOA was er and IMU res ruments (Table Tester 2. IDC95 Bias(-12.22; 2.0 niversal goniometer greement. s lowest for go- spectively. SEM e 2.).
INCL vs GON INCL vs GON Abbreviations: IM ICC- Intra Class Co 3.1.2. In Inter - r niomete was belen	0.94 U - Inertial orrelation Co ater - rater r cater reliab er - below f ow 1° and f n hip flexior	-6.8 ± 4.1 Measurement 1 pefficient; 95% C reliability ility was mode 11.8° and 12.8° MDC95 was be	-14.8; 1.3 Unit; INCL- digit I-95% confidence rate for all teste and 22.4° for ir low 2.8° for all t easuring devices; 7	0.93 al inclinon interval; L d instrum aclinomete ested inst Fester 1 vs	-5.1 ± 3.6 neter; GON - un OA- Limits of Ag nents. LOA was er and IMU res ruments (Table Tester 2.	-12.22; 2.0 niversal goniometer greement. s lowest for go- spectively. SEM e 2.).
INC VS GON INCL vs GON Abbreviations: IM ICC- Intra Class Co 3.1.2. In Inter - r niomete was bel	0.94 U - Inertial prrelation Co ater - rater p rater reliab er - below 1 ow 1° and 1	-6.8 \pm 4.1 Measurement 1 pefficient; 95% C: reliability ility was mode 11.8° and 12.8° MDC95 was be	-14.8; 1.3 Unit; INCL- digit I-95% confidence rate for all teste and 22.4° for ir low 2.8° for all t	0.93 al inclinon interval; L d instrum aclinomete ested inst	-5.1 ± 3.6 neter; GON - un OA- Limits of Ag nents. LOA was er and IMU res ruments (Table	-12.22; 2.0 niversal goniometer greement. s lowest for go- spectively. SEM e 2.).
INCL vs GON Abbreviations: IM ICC- Intra Class Co 3.1.2. In Inter - r niomete was bel	0.94 U - Inertial orrelation Co a ter - rater rater reliab er - below 1 ow 1° and 1	-6.8 \pm 4.1 Measurement 1 befficient; 95% C reliability ility was mode 11.8° and 12.8° MDC95 was be	-14.8; 1.3 Unit; INCL- digit I-95% confidence rate for all teste and 22.4° for ir low 2.8° for all t	0.93 al inclinon interval; L d instrum aclinomete ested inst	-5.1 ± 3.6 neter; GON - un OA- Limits of Ag eents. LOA was er and IMU res ruments (Table	-12.22; 2.0 niversal goniometer greement. s lowest for go- spectively. SEM e 2.).
INCL vs GON INCL vs GON Abbreviations: IM ICC- Intra Class Co 3.1.2. In Inter - r niomete	0.94 U - Inertial orrelation Co ater - rater p rater reliab er - below	-6.8 \pm 4.1 Measurement 1 pefficient; 95% C: reliability ility was mode 11.8° and 12.8°	-14.8; 1.3 Jnit; INCL- digit I-95% confidence rate for all teste and 22.4° for ir	0.93 al inclinon interval; L d instrum aclinomete	-5.1 ± 3.6 neter; GON - un OA- Limits of Ag nents. LOA was er and IMU res	-12.22; 2.0 niversal goniometer greement. s lowest for go- spectively. SEM
INCL vs GON INCL vs GON Abbreviations: IM ICC- Intra Class Co 3.1.2. In Inter - r	0.94 U - Inertial orrelation Co t ter - rater r cater reliab	-6.8 ± 4.1 Measurement 1 oefficient; 95% C reliability ility was mode	-14.8; 1.3 Jnit; INCL- digit I-95% confidence rate for all teste	0.93 al inclinon interval; L d instrum	-5.1 ± 3.6 neter; GON - un OA- Limits of Ag nents. LOA was	-12.22; 2.0 niversal goniometer greement. s lowest for go-
INCL vs GON Abbreviations: IM ICC- Intra Class Co 3.1.2. In	0.94 U - Inertial prrelation Co t ter - rater p	-6.8 ± 4.1 Measurement 1 pefficient; 95% C reliability	-14.8; 1.3 Unit; INCL- digit I-95% confidence	0.93 al inclinon interval; L d instruce	-5.1 ± 3.6 neter; GON - un OA- Limits of Ag	-12.22; 2.0 niversal goniometer greement.
INCL vs GON INCL vs GON Abbreviations: IM ICC- Intra Class Co 312 In	0.94 U - Inertial orrelation Co	-6.8 ± 4.1 Measurement 1 oefficient; 95% C reliability	-14.8; 1.3 Jnit; INCL- digit I-95% confidence	0.93 al inclinon interval; L	-5.1 ± 3.6 neter; GON - u OA- Limits of A§	-12.22; 2.0 niversal goniometer greement.
INCL vs GON Abbreviations: IM ICC- Intra Class Co	0.94 U - Inertial orrelation Co	-6.8 ± 4.1 Measurement 1 pefficient; 95% C	-14.8; 1.3 Unit; INCL- digit I-95% confidence	0.93 al inclinon interval; L	-5.1 ± 3.6 neter; GON - un OA- Limits of Ag	-12.22; 2.0 niversal goniometer greement.
INCL vs GON Abbreviations: IM ICC- Intra Class Co	0.94 U - Inertial orrelation Co	-6.8 ± 4.1 Measurement U pefficient; 95% C	-14.8; 1.3 Unit; INCL- digit I- 95% confidence	0.93 al inclinon interval; L [,]	-5.1 ± 3.6 neter; GON - u OA- Limits of Aş	-12.22; 2.0 niversal goniometer greement.
INCL vs GON Abbreviations: IM	0.94 U - Inertial	-6.8 ± 4.1 Measurement V	-14.8; 1.3 Unit; INCL- digit	0.93 al inclinon	-5.1 ± 3.6 neter; GON - ut	-12.22; 2.0 niversal goniometer
INCL vs GON	0.94	-6.8 ± 4.1	-14.8; 1.3	0.93	-5.1 ± 3.6	-12.22; 2.0
THE APPOINT		60.11	140 1 0			
IMU vs CON	0.90	-3.5 ± 3.2	-9.8; 2.8	0.91	-3.8 ± 3.7	-11.1; 3.4
IMU vs INCL	0.88	3.3 ± 2.9	-2.4; 9.0	0.90	1.3 ± 3.2	-5.0; 7.6
	ICC	Bias (°)	LOA (°)	ICC	Bias (°)	LOA (°)
	le	ester I			I este	er z
						2
gathered	l by differen	t instruments by	Tester 1 and 2 for	flexion as	sessment.	the data
Table 1	Intra Class (Coefficient with	95% confidence in	terval bias	and I O A betwe	en the data
clinome	eter was exe	cellent with LO	A below 2°(Tab	rrelation t le 1.)	between gomor	neter and m-
The ICC	C analysis s	showed good $compare (I \cap A)$ w	orrelation betwe	en IMU a	nd inclinomete	r and goniom-
3.1.1. Co	oncurrent	validity		.		
3.1. Hip	Flexion in	standing posit	ion:			
3. Resu	lts					
(MDC9	5) [24].					
ment er	rror) was c	alculated as $\widetilde{\mathrm{M}}$	inimal Detectab	le Change	(MDC) with 9	95% confidence
measur	ement mus	st show to be g	reater than the	within-su	bject variability	y and measure-
Measur	ement (SEI	M). The sensiti	vity to change (the minin	hal amount of a	a change that a
	l moneuror	n 0.90 as indica	itive of excellent	t reliabilit	y [23]. The pred	cision of the in-
values { dividua	greater that	ty, values betw	een 0.75 and 0.9	90 as indi	cative of good	reliability, and
modera values g dividua	ite reliabilit greater tha		eliability, values	between	0.50 and 0.75	as indicative of
than 0.5 modera values g dividua	50 as indica ite reliabilit greater tha	ative of poor re			pious, we defin	ned ICCs of less
of agree than 0.5 modera values g dividua	ement (LOA 50 as indica ite reliabilit greater tha	A) were calcula ative of poor re	ited using Bland	l-Altman	nlote We defin	
intra-ra of agree than 0.5 modera values g dividua	ter reliabili ement (LO 50 as indica ite reliabilit greater tha	ity were also as A) were calcula ative of poor re	sessed by using ited using Bland	ICC and I I-Altman	Bland-Altman a	analysis. Limits
Coeffici intra-ra of agree than 0.5 modera values g dividua	, a goniom ent (ICC) ter reliabili ement (LO2 50 as indica ite reliabilit greater tha	and Bland-Alt and Bland-Alt ity were also as A) were calcula ative of poor re	man analysis w sessed by using sted using Bland	each mov ere used. ICC and I I-Altman	Furthermore, Bland-Altman	inter-rater and analysis. Limits
maxima sensors Coeffici intra-ra of agree than 0.5 modera values g dividua	al value). T , a goniom tert (ICC) ter reliabili ement (LO2 50 as indica te reliabilit greater tha	o assess the agneter, and an in and Bland-Alt ity were also as A) were calcula ative of poor re	reement of activ nclinometer for man analysis w sessed by using ited using Bland	e hip RON each mov ere used. ICC and I-Altman	VI between IMU vement, Intracl Furthermore, Bland-Altman plots, We defin	J - RSQ Motion ass Correlation inter-rater and analysis. Limits
the two maxima sensors, Coeffici intra-ra of agree than 0.5 modera values g dividua	groups. The al value). The al value). The cent (ICC) ter reliabilite ment (LO2 50 as indicate te reliabilite greater tha	he values were o assess the ag neter, and an in and Bland-Alt ity were also as A) were calcula ative of poor re	presented as the reement of activ nclinometer for man analysis w sessed by using tted using Blanc	e mean ± : e hip ROM each mov ere used. ICC and I-Altman	standard devia M between IMU vement, Intracl Furthermore, Bland-Altman plats, We defin	tion (minimal – J - RSQ Motion ass Correlation inter-rater and analysis. Limits
bution. the two maxima sensors, Coeffici intra-ra of agree than 0.5 modera values g dividua	Wilcoxon's groups. Th al value). T , a goniom tent (ICC) ter reliabili ement (LO2 50 as indica te reliabilit greater tha	s signed-rank t he values were o assess the ag neter, and an in and Bland-Alt ity were also as A) were calcula ative of poor re	est was used to presented as the reement of activ nclinometer for man analysis w sessed by using ated using Bland	compare e mean ± s e hip ROM each mov ere used. ICC and I I-Altman	continuous vai standard devia M between IMU ement, Intracl Furthermore, Bland-Altman a plats. We defin	riables between tion (minimal – J - RSQ Motion ass Correlation inter-rater and analysis. Limits
	values	moderate reliabili	than 0.50 as indicative of poor re moderate reliability, values betw	than 0.50 as indicative of poor reliability, values moderate reliability, values between 0.75 and 0.9	than 0.50 as indicative of poor reliability, values between moderate reliability, values between 0.75 and 0.90 as indi	of agreement (LOA) were calculated using Bland-Altman plots. We defir than 0.50 as indicative of poor reliability, values between 0.50 and 0.75 moderate reliability, values between 0.75 and 0.90 as indicative of good

IMU	107.4 ± 8.2 (91.1 – 130.1) 107.1 ± 7.8 (89)	9.3 - 129.6)	0.58	1.0	2.8	1.0 ± 10.9	-20.4; 22
Inclinometer	104.0 ± 8.8 (90.4 - 128.9)	105.8 ± 7.9 (93.0	0 - 127.8)	0.59	0.7	1.9	-1.8 ± 7.4	-16.4; 12
Goniometer	110.9 ± 6.7 (101.0 - 134.0)	111.0 ± 6.2 (100).0 - 128.0)	0.58	0.6	1.6	-0.2 ± 6.1	-12.7; 1
Abbreviations:	SD- Standard Deviation; IC	C- Intra Class Corre	lation coeffic	cient; 9	5% CI- 95	5% confidence	e interval; SE	M - Stand
Error of Measur	cement; MDC- Minimal dete	table Change with 9	5% confiden	ce; SE-S	Standard	Error; LOA- I	Limits of Agre	ement.
	3.1.3. Intra	a - rater reliability						
	Intra - rate	er reliability for flex	xion was ex	cellen	t for IM	J and gonio	meter and g	ood for ii
	clinometer	with LOA below	6.7°. SEM v	vas bel	low 0.4°	and MDC95	was below	1.1° for a
	tested inst	ruments (Table 3.)						
Table 3. Intra - :	rater reliability indicators in	hip flexion for all of	measuring d	evices.				
Flexion	Test	Retest		ICC	SEM	MDC95	Bias (°)	LOA (°
	Mean ± SD	Mean ± SD			(°)	(%)(°)	± SE	
	(min – max)	(min – max)						
IMU	106.0 ± 7.2 (89.3 - 129.6)	106.8 ± 7.7	(89.2 –	0.94	0.4	1.1	-1.4 ± 4.1	-9.6; 6.7
		133.8)						
Inclinometer	$1012 \pm 60(020, 1278)$	105.8 ± 7.5	(93.0 –	0.87	0.4	1.1	-2.0 ± 4.3	-10.5; 6
	1141 - 7 + 69(9 - 11 - 177 - 6)							
	104.0 ± 0.7 (75.0 - 127.0)	138.0)						
Goniometer Abbreviations: Error of Measur	109.8 ± 5.6 (100.0 - 128.0) SD- Standard Deviation; ICC rement; MDC- Minimal detect	138.0) 110.1 ± 6.0 131.0) C- Intra Class Correl stable Change; SE-Sta	(100.0 - lation coeffic andard Error	0.91 cient; 95 ; LOA-	0.3 5% CI- 95 Limits o	0.9 % confidence Agreement.	-0.9 ± 3.5 e interval; SE	-7.7; 5.9 M - Stand
Goniometer Abbreviations: Error of Measur	109.8 ± 5.6 (100.0 - 128.0) SD- Standard Deviation; ICC ement; MDC- Minimal detec	138.0) 110.1 ± 6.0 131.0) C- Intra Class Correl ctable Change; SE-Sta	(100.0 - lation coeffic andard Error	0.91 cient; 95 ; LOA-	0.3 5% CI- 95 Limits of	0.9 % confidence Agreement.	-0.9 ± 3.5 e interval; SE	-7.7; 5.9 M - Stand
Goniometer Abbreviations: Error of Measur	109.8 ± 5.6 (100.0 - 128.0) SD- Standard Deviation; ICC ement; MDC- Minimal detect 3.2. Hip pt	138.0) 110.1 ± 6.0 131.0) C- Intra Class Correl Stable Change; SE-Sta Fone internal rotat	(100.0 - lation coeffic andard Error ion	0.91 cient; 95 ; LOA-	0.3 5% CI- 95 Limits of	0.9 % confidence Agreement.	-0.9 ± 3.5 e interval; SE	-7.7; 5.9 M - Stand
Goniometer Abbreviations: Error of Measur	109.8 ± 5.6 (100.0 - 128.0) SD- Standard Deviation; ICC rement; MDC- Minimal detect 3.2. Hip pt 3.2.1. Cont	138.0) 110.1 ± 6.0 131.0) C- Intra Class Correl Stable Change; SE-Sta Fone internal rotation	(100.0 - lation coeffic andard Error ion	0.91 cient; 95 ; LOA-	0.3 5% CI- 95 Limits of	0.9 % confidence Agreement.	-0.9 ± 3.5 e interval; SE	-7.7; 5.9 M - Stand
Goniometer Abbreviations: Error of Measur	109.8 ± 5.6 (100.0 - 128.0) SD- Standard Deviation; ICC rement; MDC- Minimal deter 3.2. Hip pr 3.2.1. Con The ICC a	138.0) 110.1 ± 6.0 131.0) C- Intra Class Correl ctable Change; SE-Sta cone internal rotata current validity unalysis showed an	(100.0 - lation coeffic andard Error <i>ion</i> n excellent	0.91 Sient; 95 ; LOA-	0.3 5% CI- 95 Limits of	0.9 % confidence Agreement.	-0.9 ± 3.5 e interval; SE	-7.7; 5.9 M - Stand meter an
Goniometer Abbreviations: Error of Measur	109.8 ± 5.6 (100.0 - 128.0) SD- Standard Deviation; ICC rement; MDC- Minimal detec 3.2. Hip pr 3.2.1. Con The ICC a goniomete	138.0) 110.1 ± 6.0 131.0) C- Intra Class Correle table Change; SE-Stand cone internal rotation current validity unalysis showed and pr. LOA was below	(100.0 - lation coeffic andard Error <i>ion</i> n excellent v 19.5° for '	0.91 tient; 99 ; LOA- correl Tester	0.3 5% CI- 95 Limits of ation be 2 and b	0.9 % confidence Agreement. tween IMU elow 3.7° fo	-0.9 ± 3.5 e interval; SE and inclino r Tester 1. C	-7.7; 5.9 M - Stand meter an Correlatic
Goniometer Abbreviations: Error of Measur	109.8 ± 5.6 (100.0 - 128.0) SD- Standard Deviation; ICC rement; MDC- Minimal deter 3.2. Hip pr 3.2.1. Con The ICC a goniometer between g	138.0) 110.1 ± 6.0 131.0) C- Intra Class Correl ctable Change; SE-Sta cone internal rotata current validity analysis showed an er. LOA was below oniometer and inc	(100.0 - lation coeffic andard Error <i>ion</i> n excellent v 19.5° for ' linometer v	0.91 cient; 95 ; LOA- correl Tester vas als	0.3 5% CI- 95 Limits of ation be 2 and b o excelle	0.9 % confidence Agreement. tween IMU elow 3.7° fo nt with LOA	-0.9 ± 3.5 e interval; SE and inclino r Tester 1. C A below 3.6°	-7.7; 5.9 M - Stand meter an Correlatic (Table 4.)
Goniometer Abbreviations: Error of Measur	109.8 ± 5.6 (100.0 - 128.0) SD- Standard Deviation; ICC rement; MDC- Minimal detec 3.2. Hip pr 3.2.1. Con The ICC a goniometec between g	138.0) 110.1 ± 6.0 131.0) C- Intra Class Correlectable Change; SE-State cone internal rotations current validity unalysis showed and er. LOA was below oniometer and incomposite contact of the control of the	(100.0 - lation coeffic andard Error <i>ion</i> n excellent v 19.5° for ' linometer v	0.91 cient; 99 ; LOA- correl Tester vas als	0.3 5% CI- 95 Limits of ation be 2 and b o excelle	0.9 % confidence Agreement. tween IMU elow 3.7° fo nt with LOA	-0.9 ± 3.5 e interval; SE and inclino r Tester 1. C A below 3.6°	-7.7; 5.9 M - Stand meter an Correlatic (Table 4.)
Goniometer Abbreviations: Error of Measur	109.8 ± 5.6 (100.0 - 128.0) SD- Standard Deviation; ICC rement; MDC- Minimal deter 3.2. Hip pr 3.2.1. Con The ICC a goniometer between g Table 4. In	138.0) 110.1 ± 6.0 131.0) C- Intra Class Correl table Change; SE-Sta cone internal rotatic current validity analysis showed and er. LOA was below oniometer and incomposition tra Class Coefficient	(100.0 - lation coeffic andard Error <i>ion</i> n excellent v 19.5° for ' linometer v 95% CI- 95%	0.91 cient; 95 ; LOA- correl Tester vas als 6 confid	0.3 5% CI- 95 Limits of ation be 2 and b o excelle dence inte	0.9 % confidence Agreement. tween IMU elow 3.7° fo nt with LOA erval, bias and	-0.9 ± 3.5 e interval; SE and inclino r Tester 1. C A below 3.6° d LOA betwe	-7.7; 5.9 M - Stand meter an Correlatic (Table 4.) een the da
Goniometer Abbreviations: Error of Measur	109.8 ± 5.6 (100.0 - 128.0) SD- Standard Deviation; ICC rement; MDC- Minimal detec 3.2. Hip pr 3.2.1. Con The ICC a goniomete between g Table 4. In gathered by	138.0) 110.1 ± 6.0 131.0) C- Intra Class Correlected Cone internal rotation current validity unalysis showed and er. LOA was below oniometer and incomposition tra Class Coefficient of different instrument	(100.0 - lation coeffic andard Error <i>ion</i> n excellent v 19.5° for ' linometer v 95% CI- 95%	0.91 cient; 99 ; LOA- correl Tester vas als 6 confid 1 and 2	0.3 5% CI- 95 Limits of 2 and b o excelle dence inter-	0.9 % confidence Agreement. tween IMU elow 3.7° fo nt with LOA erval, bias and nal rotation as	-0.9 ± 3.5 e interval; SE and inclino r Tester 1. C A below 3.6° d LOA betwe ssessment.	-7.7; 5.9 M - Stand meter an Correlatic (Table 4.) een the da
Goniometer Abbreviations: Error of Measur	109.8 ± 5.6 (100.0 - 128.0) SD- Standard Deviation; ICC rement; MDC- Minimal deter 3.2. Hip pr 3.2.1. Con The ICC a goniometer between g Table 4. In gathered by	138.0) 110.1 ± 6.0 131.0) C- Intra Class Correl table Change; SE-Sta cone internal rotatic current validity analysis showed and er. LOA was below oniometer and incomposition tra Class Coefficient different instrument Tester 1	(100.0 - lation coeffic andard Error <i>ion</i> n excellent v 19.5° for ' linometer v 95% CI- 95%	0.91 cient; 95 ; LOA- correl Tester vas als 6 confid 1 and 2	0.3 5% CI- 95 Limits of ation be 2 and b o excelle dence inter	0.9 % confidence Agreement. tween IMU elow 3.7° fo nt with LOA erval, bias and nal rotation as	-0.9 ± 3.5 e interval; SE and inclino r Tester 1. C A below 3.6° d LOA betwe ssessment. Tester 2	-7.7; 5.9 M - Stand meter an Correlatic (Table 4.) een the da
Goniometer Abbreviations: Error of Measur	109.8 ± 5.6 (100.0 - 128.0) SD- Standard Deviation; ICC rement; MDC- Minimal detec 3.2. Hip pr 3.2.1. Con The ICC a goniometec between g Table 4. In gathered by	138.0) 110.1 ± 6.0 131.0) C- Intra Class Correlected Cone internal rotation current validity unalysis showed and er. LOA was below oniometer and incomposition tra Class Coefficient offerent instrument Tester 1 CC Bias(°)	(100.0 - lation coeffic andard Error ion n excellent v 19.5° for linometer v 95% CI- 95% ats by Tester LOA	0.91 cient; 95 ; LOA- correl Tester vas als 6 confid 1 and 2 (°)	0.3 5% CI- 95 Limits of ation be 2 and b o excelle dence inter- for inter-	0.9 % confidence Agreement. tween IMU elow 3.7° fo nt with LOA erval, bias an nal rotation as Bias(°)	-0.9 ± 3.5 e interval; SE and inclino r Tester 1. C A below 3.6° d LOA betwe ssessment. Tester 2 LC	-7.7; 5.9 M - Stand meter an Correlatic (Table 4.) een the da
Goniometer Abbreviations: Error of Measur	109.8 ± 5.6 (100.0 - 128.0) SD- Standard Deviation; ICC rement; MDC- Minimal detect 3.2. Hip pr 3.2.1. Con The ICC a goniometec between g Table 4. Int gathered by	138.0) 110.1 ± 6.0 131.0) C- Intra Class Correl table Change; SE-Sta cone internal rotatic current validity analysis showed and er. LOA was below oniometer and incomposite tra Class Coefficient offerent instrument Tester 1 CC Bias(°) 0.97 -1.7 ± 2.6	(100.0 - lation coeffic andard Error ion n excellent v 19.5° for ' linometer v 95% CI- 95% tts by Tester LOA -6.8; 3	0.91 cient; 95 ; LOA- Correl Tester vas als 6 confid 1 and 2 (°) 3.3	0.3 5% CI- 95 Limits of ation be 2 and b o excelle dence inter for inter ICC 0.99	0.9 % confidence Agreement. tween IMU elow 3.7° fo nt with LOA erval, bias and nal rotation as Bias(°) -0.3 ± 10.	-0.9 ± 3.5 e interval; SE and inclino r Tester 1. C A below 3.6° d LOA betwe ssessment. Tester 2 LC 1 -20	-7.7; 5.9 M - Stand meter an Correlatic (Table 4.) een the da DA(°) 0.1; 19.5
Goniometer Abbreviations: Error of Measur	109.8 ± 5.6 (100.0 - 128.0) SD- Standard Deviation; ICC rement; MDC- Minimal detec 3.2. Hip pr 3.2.1. Con The ICC <i>a</i> goniometec between g Table 4 . Int gathered by IMU vs INCL IMU vs GON	138.0) 110.1 \pm 6.0 131.0) C- Intra Class Correlected Cone internal rotations cone internal rotations current validity unalysis showed and er. LOA was below oniometer and incomposition tra Class Coefficient offerent instrument Tester 1 CC Bias(°) 0.97 -1.7 \pm 2.6 0.99 -1.9 \pm 2.8	(100.0 - lation coeffic andard Error ion n excellent v 19.5° for ' linometer v 95% CI- 95% tts by Tester LOA -6.8; 3 -7.6; 3	0.91 cient; 95 ; LOA- correl Tester vas als 6 confid 1 and 2 (°) 3.3 3.7	0.3 5% CI- 95 Limits of ation be 2 and b o excelle dence inter for inter ICC 0.99 0.97	0.9 % confidence Agreement. tween IMU elow 3.7° fo nt with LOA erval, bias and hal rotation as Bias(°) $-0.3 \pm 10.$ $-0.2 \pm 10.$	-0.9 ± 3.5 e interval; SE and inclino r Tester 1. C A below 3.6° d LOA betwe ssessment. Tester 2 LC 1 -20 0 -19	-7.7; 5.9 M - Stand meter an Correlatic (Table 4.) een the da DA(°) 0.1; 19.5 0.8; 19.4
Goniometer Abbreviations: Error of Measur	109.8 ± 5.6 (100.0 - 128.0) SD- Standard Deviation; ICC rement; MDC- Minimal detect 3.2. Hip pr 3.2.1. Con The ICC a goniometec between g Table 4. Int gathered by	138.0) 110.1 \pm 6.0 131.0) C- Intra Class Correl table Change; SE-State cone internal rotate current validity analysis showed and er. LOA was below oniometer and ince tra Class Coefficient r different instrument Tester 1 CC Bias(°) 0.97 -1.7 \pm 2.6 0.99 -1.9 \pm 2.8 0.99 -0.2 \pm 1.6	(100.0 - lation coeffic andard Error ion n excellent v 19.5° for ' linometer v 95% CI- 95% tts by Tester LOA -6.8; 3 -7.6; 3 -3.3; 2	0.91 cient; 95 ; LOA- Correl Tester vas als 6 confid 1 and 2 (°) 3.3 3.7 2.8	0.3 5% CI- 95 Limits of ation be 2 and b o excelled dence inter for inter ICC 0.99 0.97 0.98	0.9 % confidence F Agreement. tween IMU elow 3.7° fo nt with LOA erval, bias and hal rotation as Bias (°) -0.3 ± 10. -0.2 ± 10. 0.1 ± 1.7	-0.9 ± 3.5 e interval; SE and inclino r Tester 1. C A below 3.6° d LOA betwe ssessment. Tester 2 LC 1 -20 0 -19 -3.	-7.7; 5.9 M - Stand meter an Correlatic (Table 4.) een the da DA(°) 0.1; 19.5 9.8; 19.4 3; 3.6
Goniometer Abbreviations: Error of Measur	109.8 ± 5.6 (100.0 - 128.0) SD- Standard Deviation; ICC rement; MDC- Minimal detect 3.2. Hip pr 3.2.1. Con The ICC a goniometect between g Table 4. Int gathered by IMU vs INCL (IMU vs GON (INCL vs GON (Abbreviations: IMU - Internet of the second Abbreviations: IMU - Internet of the second State of the second seco	138.0) 110.1 \pm 6.0 131.0) C- Intra Class Correlected Change; SE-State cone internal rotate current validity unalysis showed and er. LOA was below oniometer and incomposition tra Class Coefficient r different instrument Tester 1 CC Bias (°) 0.97 -1.7 \pm 2.6 0.99 -1.9 \pm 2.8 0.99 -0.2 \pm 1.6 mertial Measurement	(100.0 - lation coeffic andard Error ion n excellent v 19.5° for ' linometer v 95% CI- 95% tts by Tester LOA -6.8; 3 -7.6; 3 -3.3; 2 Unit; INCL-	0.91 cient; 95 ; LOA- correl Tester vas als 6 confid 1 and 2 (°) 3.3 3.7 2.8 • digital	0.3 5% CI- 95 Limits of ation be 2 and b o excelled dence inter for inter ICC 0.99 0.97 0.98 inclinom	0.9 % confidence Agreement. tween IMU elow 3.7° fo nt with LOA erval, bias and hal rotation as Bias (°) -0.3 \pm 10. -0.2 \pm 10. 0.1 \pm 1.7 weter; GON - u	-0.9 ± 3.5 e interval; SE and inclino r Tester 1. C A below 3.6° d LOA betwe ssessment. Tester 2 LC 1 -20 0 -19 -3. universal goni	-7.7; 5.9 M - Stand meter an Correlatic (Table 4.) een the da DA(°) 0.1; 19.5 0.8; 19.4 3; 3.6 cometer;
Goniometer Abbreviations: Error of Measur	109.8 ± 5.6 (100.0 - 128.0) SD- Standard Deviation; ICC rement; MDC- Minimal detect 3.2. Hip pr 3.2.1. Con The ICC a goniometection between g Table 4. Interpreter by IMU vs INCL (1) IMU vs GON (1) INCL vs GON (1) Abbreviations: IMU - Interpreter by ICC- Intra Class Correl	138.0) 110.1 \pm 6.0 131.0) C- Intra Class Correle table Change; SE-State cone internal rotata current validity analysis showed and er. LOA was below oniometer and ince tra Class Coefficient r different instrument Tester 1 CC Bias (°) 0.97 -1.7 \pm 2.6 0.99 -0.2 \pm 1.6 mertial Measurement ation Coefficient; 959	(100.0 - lation coeffic andard Error ion n excellent v 19.5° for ' linometer v 95% CI- 95% its by Tester LOA -6.8; 3 -7.6; 3 -3.3; 2 Unit; INCL- % CI- 95% co	0.91 cient; 95 ; LOA- Tester vas als 6 confid 1 and 2 (°) 3.3 3.7 2.8 digital nfideno	0.3 5% CI- 95 Limits of ation be 2 and b o excelled dence inter for inter ICC 0.99 0.97 0.98 inclinom ce interva	0.9 % confidence F Agreement. tween IMU elow 3.7° fo nt with LOA erval, bias and hal rotation as Bias (°) -0.3 \pm 10. -0.2 \pm 10. 0.1 \pm 1.7 meter; GON - w l; LOA- Limit	-0.9 ± 3.5 e interval; SE and inclino r Tester 1. C A below 3.6° d LOA betwe ssessment. Tester 2 LC 1 -20 0 -19 -3. iniversal goni ts of Agreeme	-7.7; 5.9 M - Stand. meter an Correlatio (Table 4.) een the dat DA(°) 0.1; 19.5 9.8; 19.4 3; 3.6 cometer; nt.
Goniometer Abbreviations: Error of Measur	109.8 ± 5.6 (100.0 - 128.0) SD- Standard Deviation; ICC rement; MDC- Minimal detect 3.2. Hip pr 3.2.1. Con The ICC a goniometect between g Table 4. Int gathered by IMU vs INCL (IMU vs GON (Abbreviations: IMU - In ICC- Intra Class Correl	138.0) 110.1 \pm 6.0 131.0) C- Intra Class Correlectable Change; SE-State cone internal rotate current validity unalysis showed and er. LOA was below oniometer and incomposition tra Class Coefficient r different instrument Tester 1 CC Bias (°) 0.97 -1.7 \pm 2.6 0.99 -1.9 \pm 2.8 0.99 -0.2 \pm 1.6 mertial Measurement ation Coefficient; 959	(100.0 - lation coeffic andard Error ion n excellent v 19.5° for ' linometer v 95% CI- 95% tts by Tester LOA -6.8; 3 -7.6; 3 -3.3; 2 Unit; INCL- % CI- 95% co	0.91 cient; 99 ; LOA- Correl Tester vas als 6 confid 1 and 2 (°) 3.3 3.7 2.8 digital nfideno	0.3 5% CI- 95 Limits of ation be 2 and b o excelled dence inter for inter: ICC 0.99 0.97 0.98 inclinom ce interva	0.9 % confidence E Agreement. tween IMU elow 3.7° fo nt with LOA erval, bias and hal rotation as Bias (°) -0.3 \pm 10. -0.2 \pm 10. 0.1 \pm 1.7 where; GON - where the second sec	-0.9 ± 3.5 e interval; SE and inclino r Tester 1. C A below 3.6° d LOA betwee ssessment. Tester 2 LC 1 -2C 0 -19 -3 universal gonitiss of Agreeme	-7.7; 5.9 M - Stand meter an Correlatio (Table 4.) een the dat DA (°) 0.1; 19.5 0.8; 19.4 3; 3.6 cometer; nt.

Sensors 2023, 23, x FOR PEER REVIEW

265	Inter - rater reliability for prone internal rotation was poor for all tested instruments
266	with LOA below 33.6°. SEM was below 1.6° and MDC95 was below 4.3° for all tested in-
267	struments (Table 5.).

268

Table 5. Inter-rater reliability indicators in hip prone internal rotation for all of the measuring devices; Operator 1 vs Operator 2.

	Internal	Tester 1	Tester 2	ICC	SEM	MDC ₉₅	Bias (°)	LOA (°)
	rotation	Mean ± SD (min – max)	Mean ± SD (min –		(°)	(%) (°)	± SE	
		(°)	max) (°)					
	IMU	33.4 ± 12.0 (10.1 - 61.4)	33.3 ± 12.1 (10.6 - 58.9)	0.02	1.6	4.3	0.1 ± 16.8	-32.8; 33.6
	Inclinometer	35.2 ± 11.5 (12.0 - 60.2)	34.2 ± 11.5 (10.8 - 58.5)	0.04	1.5	4.1	0.6 ± 15.9	-30.5; 31.7
	Goniometer	35.4 ± 11.4 (12.0 - 60.0)	34.4 ± 11.5 (11.0 - 57.0)	0.04	1.5	4.1	0.9 ± 15.8	-30.0; 31.2
	Abbreviations: S	D- Standard Deviation; ICC-	Intra Class Correlation coeff	icient;	95% CI- 95	5% confiden	ce interval; S	EM - Standard
	Error of Measure	ement; MDC- Minimal detecta	ble Change; SE-Standard Erro	r; LOA	- Limits of	Agreement.		
270								

271	3.2.3. Intra - rater reliability
272	Intra - rater reliability for prone internal rotation was excellent for all tested instruments
273	with LOA below 5.8°. SEM was below 0.3° and MDC95 was below 0.7° for all tested in-
274	struments (Table 6.).

```
275
```

276 **Table 6**. Intra-rater reliability indicators in hip prone internal rotation for all of the measuring devices.

Internal rotation	Test	Retest	ICC	SEM (°)	MDC ₉₅	Bias ±	LOA (°)
	Mean ± SD	Mean ± SD			(%)(°)	SE	
	(min – max) (°)	(min – max) (°)					
IMU	32.4 ± 12.3 (10.6 -	32.0 ± 11.9 (10.2 -	0.96	0.3	0.7	0.3 ± 2.8	-5.1; 5.8
	58.9)	60.7)					
Inclinometer	33.6 ± 11.5 (10.8 -	33.2 ± 11.3 (11.9 -	0.99	0.2	0.6	0.3 ± 2.5	-4.6; 5.2
	58.5)	59.0)					
Goniometer	33.6 ± 11.6 (11.0 -	33.2 ± 11.5 (12.0 -	0.99	0.2	0.6	0.3 ± 2.5	-4.6; 5.2
	57.0)	60.0)					

Abbreviations: SD- Standard Deviation; ICC- Intra Class Correlation coefficient; 95% CI- 95% confidence interval; SEM - Standard Error of Meausurment; MDC- Minimal detectable Change; SE-Standard Error; LOA- Limits of Agreement.

277	
278	3.3. Hip prone external rotation
279	3.3.1. Concurrent validity
280	The ICC analysis showed an good-excellent correlation between IMU sensors and incli-
281	nometer and excellent correlation between IMU and goniometer. Limit of agree-
282	ment(LOA) was below 7.8°. Correlation between goniometer and inclinometer was also
283	excellent with LOA below 6.8°(Table 7).
284	
285	
286	
287	

Sensors 2023, 23, x FOR PEER REVIEW

9	of	15
---	----	----

288	Table 7. Intra Class Coefficient with 95% confidence interval, bias and LOA between the data										
289		gathered by different instruments by Tester 1 and 2 for external rotation assessment.									
290	-		Т	ester 1	<u> </u>			Tester 2			
291		IC	CC	Bias (°) LOA (ICC	Bias (°) I		LO	LOA (°)	
292		IMU vs INCL 0.8	88	-1.0 ± 3.3 -	7.5; 5.4	0.95	-0.4 ± 3	.2	-6.6	; 5.8	
293		IMU vs GON 0.9	97	1.1 ± 3.4 -	5.6; 7.8	0.99	1.1 ± 2.0	6	-4.0	; 6.2	
294		INCL vs GON 0.9	99	2.1 ± 2.4 -	2.5; 6.8	0.96	1.5 ± 2.4	4	-3.2	; 6.2	
295		Abbreviations: IMU - Ine	ertial N	leasurement Unit; IN	CL- digital in	clinometer	; GON - un	iversal g	goniom	eter;	
296		ICC- Intra Class Correlat	ion Co	efficient; 95% CI- 95%	confidence	interval; L(DA- Limits	of Agre	ement.		
297	-										
298	3.3.2. Inter - rater reliability										
299		Inter - rater reliability for prone external rotation was poor for all tested instruments									
300		with LOA below 25.7°. SEM was below 1.2° and MDC95 was below 3.2° for all tested in-									
301		struments (Table 8.).									
302											
303	Table 8. Inter - ra	nter reliability indicators ir	n hip p	orone external rotation	for all of the	measuring	g deviœs; T	ester 1 v	vs Teste	r 2.	
	External rota-	Tester 1	Т	ester 2	ICC	SEM	MDC95	Bias ((°)	LOA (°)	
	tion	Mean ± SD	Ν	∕lean ± SD		(°)	(%)(°)				
		(min – max) (°)	(1	min – max) (°)							
	IMU	44.4 ± 6.6 (25.0 – 56.3)	4	3.6 ± 7.8 (24.1 - 55.4)	-0.29	1.1	3.0	$0.8 \pm$	11.5	-21.8; 23.4	
	Inclinometer	45.5 ± 7.3 (30.0 - 60.4)	4	4.0 ± 8.4 (25.8 - 64.7)	-0.24	1.2	3.2	$1.4 \pm$	11.4	-22.8; 25.7	
	Goniometer	43.3 ± 7.3 (25.0 - 59.0)	4	2.5 ± 7.6 (24.0 - 57.0)	-0.33	1.1	3.0	$0.8 \pm$	12.1	-22.8; 24.4	

Abbreviations: SD- Standard Deviation; ICC- Intra Class Correlation coefficient; 95% CI- 95% confidence interval; SEM - Standard Error of Measurement; MDC- Minimal detectable Change; SE-Standard Error; LOA- Limits of Agreement.

304	
305	3.3.3. Intra - rater reliability
306	Intra - rater reliability for prone internal rotation was excellent for all tested instruments
307	with LOA below 7°. SEM was below 0.3° and MDC95 was below 0.8° for all tested in-
308	struments (Table 9.).
309	

310 **Table 9**. Intra - rater reliability indicators in hip prone external rotation for all of the measuring devices.

External	Test	Retest	ICC	SEM (°)	MDC ₉₅	Bias (°)	LOA (°)
rotation	Mean ± SD (min	Mean ± SD (min –			(%)(°)	± SE	
	– max) (°)	max) (°)					
IMU	44.5 ± 6.9 (27.7 -	$44.8 \pm 7.2 (30.9 -$	0.98	0.3	0.8	-0.2 ± 3.1	-6.3; 5.8
	55.4)	60.1)					
Inclinometer	44.9 ± 7.7 (29.4 –	44.3 ± 7.6 (27.3 -	0.95	0.3	0.8	0.7 ± 3.2	-5.6; 7.0
	64.7)	50.2)					

Sensors 2023 , 23, 3	x FOR PEER REVIEW							10 of 1
Goniometer	43.3 ± 6.9 (27.0 -	3.7 ± 7.5 (26	5.0 <i>-</i>	0.97	0.2	0.7	-0.3 ± 2.6	-5.3; 4
	57.0)	58.0)						
Abbreviations: Error of Measu	SD- Standard Deviati rement; MDC- Minim	on; ICC- Intra Cla al detectable Chang	ass Co ge;SE-l	rrelation c Standard I	oefficient; 95 Error; LOA- I	5% CI- 95% con Limits of Agree	nfidence interval; SE ment.	M - Stand
	4. D	iscussion	<u> </u>					
	Acc	ording to our kno	owled	lge, this i	s the first st	udy to evalua	te the validity and	reliabilit
	of a	n IMU for active	nip jo	int range	e of motion	assessment in	healthy subjects.	The signi
		t findings in the	stuay	are that	the INIU sh	owed mostly	excellent validity	compare
	with	the gold stand	ard i	universal	goniometer	and digital i	the measurements	raing rei
		ty, our results si	low a	goou-ex	When the c	elation when	measurements	s are mau
	by t	ator) then the re	er(inti serrite	wore me	derate for t	he flevion an	d poor for both ev	tornal an
	inte	nal That reliabil	lity w	as inferio	r for every i	nstrument us	ed likely associate	d with th
	asse	ssment method	and n	ot with T	MU or othe	r devices We	also found out th	at if relia
	bilit	v was excellent f	hen I	OA was	lower than '	10° Our resul	ts are consistent w	ith Koeo
	et al	, who reported I	CC > 0	0.75. LOA	< +9.8°, an	$d SEM < 5^{\circ} as$	criteria for good y	alidity fo
	sma	rtphone assessm	ent [2	51. Small	values of SI	$EM(<1.6^\circ)$ and	1 MDC95 (<4.3°) in	our stud
	indi	cate good absolu	te reli	ability				
	It is	difficult to comp	oare o	ur results	s with other	s due to the l	ack of studies exar	nining th
	IMU	in the assessme	ent of	the hip jo	oint range o	f motion in th	ie available literatu	ıre. This
	also	the first study a	assess	ing activ	e hip flexio	n in the stand	ding position. We	chose th
	posi	tion because it is	s used	more of	en than lyir	ng on the bacl	k in everyday life.	Moreove
	isola	ting the flexion	mov	ement ir	ı the hip jo	oint without	additional pelvis	and spin
	mov	ement is difficul	t and	could dis	turb the me	easurement [1	2].	
	Con	sidering the test	ed po	sition, th	e results of	the research	in which IMU wa	s tested i
	gait	analysis are the	closes	st to our	position [26	,27]. Zugner	et al. used inertial	sensors f
	asse	ss gait in peopl	e afte	er hip arl	hroplasty a	and showed	a good correlatior	n with th
	opto	electric system f	or the	hip flexi	on gait phas	e(Left hip - IC	C:0.73; Right hip -	ICC: 0.75
	[17]	It should be no	ted, h	lowever,	that the rar	ge of flexion	during gait is mu	ch small
	thar	that used in our	r stud	у.				
	As 1	nentioned, previ	ious s	tudies di	d not use I	MU for the h	ip joint range of 1	motion a
	sess	ment. The most	simil	ar are th	ose studies	assessing sn	nartphone applica	tions wit
	buil	in inertial unit	s. Ma	rshall et	al. used ir	nertial sensor	s located in the p	ohone an
	com	pared them to tl	he 3D	motion	analysis sys	tem[28]. The	y tested active flex	cion in th
	supi	ne position with	the s	ensor pla	ced in front	of the thigh a	ns in our study. Co	mpared †
	the	3D system, they	show	ed good a	agreement (ICC: 0.81, SEI	M: 1.55°). Reported	l inter an
	intra	reliability for fl	exion	range of	motion in tl	ne mentioned	study was lower t	han in oı
	stud	y, with ICCs of	f 0.52	and 0.5	9, respectiv	ely. A simila	ar study was con	ducted b
	Cha	rlton et al., who	addit	ionally u	sed an anal	og inclinomet	er for measuremen	nt[29]. Th
	mai	n difference betv	veen o	our studi	es is that th	ey tested the	passive range of n	notion. Iı
	tra-t SEN	ester reliability [:2.3°) and incline	corre omete	lation w er(ICC:0.9	as similar ; SEM:2.8°).	to our resul	ts for smartphone	e(ICC:0.8
		lorly to flowing :	n m -	, total:-		ation is assess	ad pagainal multi-	h males-
	Sim	narry to nexton, I	ui mai	ity stuale	s, prone rot 7 9 121 Maa	ation is assess shall at all are	eu passively, which	tion in H
	com	parison to active	e one (anneuit [d good ee	reemont fo	sildii et al. eV	ation and near acre	aomont fr
	proi	ie position and s	nowe	u goou ag	sieement 10	i external rota	anon anu poor agre	eenient I

252	the smartphone application to a 3D system and showed a good correlation in both rota-
354	tion directions: however, the passive position was tested [9]
557	ton directions, nowever, the passive position was tested [7].
355	Regarding inter-rater reliability mentioned, Marshall et al. reported ICCs of 0.95 and 0.94
356	for internal and external rotation, respectively, compared to our study that found ICCs of
357	0.02 for prone internal rotation and -0.29 for external rotation [28]. Intra-rater values were
358	lower than ours, with ICCs of 0.44 for internal and 0.50 for external rotation. Their SEM
359	and MDC values for internal rotation were 5.54° and 6.52° respectively which is also
360	higher than ours SEM: 0.3° and MDC: 0.7°. Similarly for external rotation, their SEM and
361	MDC values were also higher - 7.05° and 7.36° respectively compared to ours - SEM - 0.3°
362	and MDC95 - 0.8° for IMU. Aefsky et al., in their work, used a similar method to assess
363	rotation but with a standard goniometer [30]. Compared to our work, they also showed a
364	higher level of inter-rater agreement (ICCs > 0.9) and a similar level of intra-rater agree-
365	ment: 0.87-0.95 versus 0.96-0.99 in our study.
366	Similarly, higher inter-rater ICCs were reported by mentioned Canokroi et al. of 0.81 and
367	0.76 for prone internal and external rotation with SFM values of 4.1° and 3.9° respectively.
368	tively [9] Again intra-rater agreement was close to our work. ICCs of 0.90 with SEM 2.8
369	for external rotation and 0.91 with SEM 3.22° for internal rotation. The LOA was similar
370	to ours ($<10^\circ$).
371	The goniometer, inclinometer, and IMU showed similar levels of reliability. Considering
372	this, the low level of inter-rater reliability, especially for prone rotation, may potentially
373	result from technical errors during measurement, not from the precision of the tools used.
374	One of the possible causes may be the compensatory movement of the pelvis and its po-
375	sition itself, which may distort the result. Previous studies have shown that an increased
376	pelvis anteversion may reduce the possibility of flexion or rotation [31]. Nussbaumer et
377	al. showed that the goniometer examination of the range of flexion and rotation is subject
378	to error mainly due to additional pelvic movement [12]. In our study, we wanted the
379	tested positions to be as close as possible to everyday clinical practice. Therefore, during
380	the prone rotation assessment, the tester stabilized the pelvis manually, which is associ-
381	ated with the risk of differences in the pressure on the pelvis and the determination of the
382	moment of its movement, which may occur between assessors. In addition, there is a
383	difference in clinical experience between researchers (12 vs 5 years), which may also af-
384	fect the differences in measurement [32].
385	Interestingly, we achieved significantly better levels of inter-rater agreement in standing
386	active flexion. During flexion, it is reported that up to 1/3 of the movement may come
387	from the pelvic movement, which is one of the reasons why we decided on such an ex-
388	amination position that will assess the entire functional range of motion [33]. Therefore, it
389	seems reasonable to believe that the better inter-rater reliability values for flexion than
390	rotation resulted from the lack of additional pelvis stabilization. Another issue is the po-
391	sition of the research tool during the measurement. Despite the established study proto-
392	col, researchers may consider reference points differently, which may also result from the
393	individual constitution of participants. In the case of a goniometer, it may not be easy to
394	set one of the arms on the vertical axis, especially since it was not equipped with spirit
395	In placement of the inclinometer along the long axis of the tibia or thigh is also to
396	some extent based on the subjective assessment of the examiner. During the measure-
397	ment using the INIU, errors may also result from subtle differences in sticking the device
<i>১</i> সে বিজ্ঞান ব	and additional skill movements during active movement, which also occur with other
377	systems, such as the 5D motion capture [54].
400	Examination of the range of motion is one of the basic elements of clinical assessment in
401	orthopedics or physiotherapy. In clinical practice, the most commonly used measure-

Sensors 2023, 23, x FOR PEER REVIEW

402

403

404 405

406

407

408

409 410

411

412

413

414

415

416

417

418

419

420

421 422

423

424

425

426

427

428

429

430

431

432 433

434 435

436

437

438 439

440

441

442 443

444

445

446

447 448

449

450 451 ment tools are the goniometer or the inclinometer. Both of these tools require the examiner to measure with a second person who will control the pelvic movements, or alone, which makes it much more challenging to make a precise measurement. The solution to this problem may be inertial sensors such as RSQ Motion, which can be easily mounted on the examined limb and allow pelvis stabilization simultaneously. The small size of the device and the ease of assembly also allow it to be used at home by the patient. This creates the opportunity for better monitoring of progress, as well as compliance with home exercise. However, the reliability of the measurement performed by the patient requires further research. The proposed study protocol with IMU may be used in future studies to assess the range of motion or proprioception of patients with hip complaints or after hip surgery.

Like any study, ours also has limitations. Firstly, we examined young and healthy people; with possibly more flexibility and spine hip therefore, the results cannot be transferred to people with hip conditions or in older age and no symptoms. Yet the methods of evaluation would not be different in clinical scenarios. Secondly, the results may be affected by other movements of the surrounding joints; therefore, it seems reasonable to use two sensors in the future, one of which would be located, for example, on the pelvis. Another problem may be the issue of artifacts related to the movement of the skin in the case of glued sensors, as well as anatomical differences of the subjects [34]. To minimize this, we placed the stickers on an area with limited adipose tissue at precisely defined points. Thirdly, the tested range of motion was active and subjectively determined by the participant; therefore, the results cannot be directly related to the more frequently used passive assessment in clinical practice.

5. Conclusions

The use of a single inertial measurement unit (IMU, represented by RSQ Motion) in assessing active hip motion is valid compared to the universal goniometer and digital inclinometer. All instruments (including IMU) showed comparable and mostly good-to-excellent reliability for both at two different sessions of assessment and between both testers except for interrater reliability of prone internal and external rotation (regardless of the device). Due to better access, relatively low cost, and ease of use, inertial systems could be increasingly used in the field of orthopedics and physical therapy. More improvements could be anticipated with two or more sensors used to depict a hip range of motion without possible compensations and the need for specialist evaluation.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, Ł.S. and T.P; methodology, Ł.S. and T.P.; validation, Ł.S., M.N. and T.P.; formal analysis, Ł.S., M.N., T.P.; investigation, Ł.S., M.N.; resources, Ł.S, M.N.; data curation, Ł.S.; writing—original draft preparation, Ł.S.; writing—review and editing, Ł.S., T.P., P.L.; visualization, Ł.S.; supervision, T.P., P.L; project administration, T.P.; funding acquisition, T.P., P.L. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding

Institutional Review Board Statement: The study was approved by the Bioethical Committee of the University of Medical Sciences in Poznań, Poland (no of resolution 13/21) and met the criteria of the Declaration of Helsinki.

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Data Availability Statement: Not applicable.

Acknowledgments: Łukasz Stołowski is a participant of STER Internationalisation of Doctoral Schools Programme from NAWA Polish National Agency for Academic Exchange No. PPI/STE/2020/1/00014/DEC/02.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Sensors 2023, 23, x FOR PEER REVIEW

452 **References**

453

- Verrall, G. M., Slavotinek, J. P., Barnes, P. G., Esterman, A., Oakeshott, R. D., & Spriggins, A. J. (2007). Hip joint range of motion restriction precedes athletic chronic groin injury. Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport, 10(6), 463–466. doi: 10.1016/j.jsams.2006.11.006
- 457 2. Williams, J. G. (1978). Limitation of hip joint movement as a factor in traumatic osteitis pubis. British Journal of Sports Medi-458 cine, 12(3), 129–133. doi: 10.1136/bjsm.12.3.129
- Verrall, G. M., Hamilton, I. A., Slavotinek, J. P., Oakeshott, R. D., Spriggins, A. J., Barnes, P. G., & Fon, G. T. (2005). Hip joint range of motion reduction in sports-related chronic groin injury diagnosed as public bone stress injury. Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport, 8(1), 77–84. doi: 10.1016/s1440-2440(05)80027-1
- 462 4. Arnason, A., Sigurdsson, S. B., Gudmundsson, A., Holme, I., Engebretsen, L., & Bahr, R. (2004). Risk factors for injuries in 463 football. The American journal of sports medicine, 32(1 Suppl), 55–16S. doi: 10.1177/0363546503258912
- 464 5. Bohannon, R. W., Gajdosik, R. L., & LeVeau, B. F. (1985). Relationship of pelvic and thigh motions during unilateral and bilat-465 eral hip flexion. Physical therapy, 65(10), 1501–1504. doi: 10.1093/ptj/65.10.1501
- Yuan, B. J., Bartelt, R. B., Levy, B. A., Bond, J. R., Trousdale, R. T., & Sierra, R. J. (2013). Decreased range of motion is associatwith structural hip deformity in asymptomatic adolescent athletes. The American journal of sports medicine, 41(7),
 1519–1525. doi: 10.1177/0363546513488748
- Kouyoumdjian, P., Coulomb, R., Sanchez, T., & Asencio, G. (2012). Clinical evaluation of hip joint rotation range of motion in adults. Orthopaedics & traumatology, surgery & research : OTSR, 98(1), 17–23. doi: 10.1016/j.otsr.2011.08.015
- 8. Roach, S., San Juan, J. G., Suprak, D. N., & Lyda, M. (2013). Concurrent validity of digital inclinometer and universal goniometer in assessing passive hip mobility in healthy subjects. International journal of sports physical therapy, 8(5), 680–688.
- Ganokroj, P., Sompornpanich, N., Kerdsomnuek, P., Vanadurongwan, B., & Lertwanich, P. (2021). Validity and reliability of
 smartphone applications for measurement of hip rotation, compared with three-dimensional motion analysis. BMC
 musculoskeletal disorders, 22(1), 166.doi: 10.1186/s12891-021-03995-2
- Woerner, M., Weber, M., Sendtner, E., Springorum, R., Worlicek, M., Craiovan, B., Grifka, J., & Renkawitz, T. (2016). Visual
 intraoperative estimation of range of motion is misleading in minimally invasive total hip arthroplasty. Archives of
 orthopaedic and trauma surgery, 136(7), 1015–1020. doi:10.1007/s00402-016-2478-9
- Vigotsky, A. D., Lehman, G. J., Contreras, B., Beardsley, C., Chung, B., & Feser, E. H. (2015). Acute effects of anterior thigh
 foam rolling on hip angle, knee angle, and rectus femoris length in the modified Thomas test. PeerJ, 3,
 e1281.doi:10.7717/peerj.1281
- 12. Nussbaumer, S., Leunig, M., Glatthorn, J. F., Stauffacher, S., Gerber, H., & Maffiuletti, N. A. (2010). Validity and test-retest
 reliability of manual goniometers for measuring passive hip range of motion in femoroacetabular impingement patients. *BMC musculoskeletal disorders*, 11, 194. doi: 10.1186/1471-2474-11-194
- Luinge, H. J., & Veltink, P. H. (2005). Measuring orientation of human body segments using miniature gyroscopes and accel erometers. Medical & biological engineering & computing, 43(2), 273–282. doi:10.1007/BF02345966
- Rigoni, M., Gill, S., Babazadeh, S., Elsewaisy, O., Gillies, H., Nguyen, N., Pathirana, P. N., & Page, R. (2019). Assessment of
 Shoulder Range of Motion Using a Wireless Inertial Motion Capture Device-A Validation Study. Sensors (Basel,
 Switzerland), 19(8), 1781.doi:10.3390/s19081781
- Raya, R., Garcia-Carmona, R., Sanchez, C., Urendes, E., Ramirez, O., Martin, A., & Otero, A. (2018). An Inexpensive and Easy
 to Use Cervical Range of Motion Measurement Solution Using Inertial Sensors. Sensors (Basel, Switzerland), 18(8), 2582. doi:
 10.3390/s18082582
- Kim, B. H., Hong, S. H., Oh, I. W., Lee, Y. W., Kee, I. H., & Lee, S. Y. (2021). Measurement of Ankle Joint Movements Using
 IMUs during Running. Sensors (Basel, Switzerland), 21(12), 4240. doi:10.3390/s21124240

- Zügner, R., Tranberg, R., Timperley, J., Hodgins, D., Mohaddes, M., & Kärrholm, J. (2019). Validation of inertial measurement
 units with optical tracking system in patients operated with Total hip arthroplasty. BMC musculoskeletal disorders, 20(1), 52.
 doi: 10.1186/s12891-019-2416-4
- Zeng, Z., Liu, Y., Li, P., & Wang, L. (2022). Validity and reliability of inertial measurement units measurements for running kinematics in different foot strike pattern runners. Frontiers in bioengineering and biotechnology, 10, 1005496.doi: 10.3389/fbioe.2022.1005496
- Pålsson, A., Kostogiannis, I., & Ageberg, E. (2020). Combining results from hip impingement and range of motion tests can increase diagnostic accuracy in patients with FAI syndrome. Knee surgery, sports traumatology, arthroscopy : official journal of the ESSKA, 28(10), 3382–3392. doi: 10.1007/s00167-020-06005-5
- 20. Garimella, R., Peeters, T., Beyers, K., Truijen, S., Huysmans, T., & Verwulgen, S. (2018). Capturing Joint Angles of the Off-Site Human Body. 2018 IEEE SENSORS, 1–4. doi: 10.1109/ICSENS.2018.8589711
- Glinkowski, W., Żukowska, A., Dymitrowicz, M., Wołyniec, E., Glinkowska, B., & Kozioł-Kaczorek, D. (2019). Translation, Cross-Cultural Adaptation, and Psychometric Properties of the Polish Version of the Hip Disability and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score (HOOS). Medicina (Kaunas, Lithuania), 55(10), 614. doi.org/10.3390/medicina55100614
- Białecka, Martyna, Kacper Gruszczyński, Paweł Cisowski, Jakub Kaszyński, Cezary Baka, and Przemysław Lubiatowski.
 (2023). Shoulder Range of Motion Measurement Using Inertial Measurement Unit Validation with a Robot Arm. Sensors 23, no. 12: 5364. https://doi.org/10.3390/s23125364
- Portney L.G., Watkins M.P. Foundations of Clinical Research: Applications to Practice. 2nd ed. Prentice Hall; Upper Saddle
 River, NJ, USA: 2000. p. 273
- Weir J. P. (2005). Quantifying test-retest reliability using the intraclass correlation coefficient and the SEM. Journal of strength and conditioning research, 19(1), 231–240. doi:10.1519/15184.1
- Keogh, J. W. L., Cox, A., Anderson, S., Liew, B., Olsen, A., Schram, B., & Furness, J. (2019). Reliability and validity of clinically
 accessible smartphone applications to measure joint range of motion: A systematic review. PloS one, 14(5), e0215806.
 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0215806
- Bailey, C. A., Uchida, T. K., Nantel, J., & Graham, R. B. (2021). Validity and Sensitivity of an Inertial Measurement
 Unit-Driven Biomechanical Model of Motor Variability for Gait. Sensors (Basel, Switzerland), 21(22), 7690. doi:
 10.3390/s21227690
- Horenstein, R. E., Goudeau, Y. R., Lewis, C. L., & Shefelbine, S. J. (2020). Using Magneto-Inertial Measurement Units to Pervasively Measure Hip Joint Motion during Sports. Sensors (Basel, Switzerland), 20(17), 4970. doi: 10.3390/s20174970
- Marshall, C. J., El-Ansary, D., Pranata, A., Ganderton, C., O'Donnell, J., Takla, A., Tran, P., Wickramasinghe, N., & Tirosh, O.
 (2022). Validity and Reliability of a Novel Smartphone Tele-Assessment Solution for Quantifying Hip Range of Mo tion. Sensors (Basel, Switzerland), 22(21), 8154. doi: 10.3390/s22218154
- Charlton, P. C., Mentiplay, B. F., Pua, Y. H., & Clark, R. A. (2015). Reliability and concurrent validity of a Smartphone, bubble
 inclinometer and motion analysis system for measurement of hip joint range of motion. Journal of science and medicine in
 sport, 18(3), 262–267. doi: 10.1016/j.jsams.2014.04.008
- 30. Aefsky, B., Fleet, N., Myers, H., & Butler, R. J. (2016). Reliability and Validity of a Novel Approach to Measure Hip Rotation. Journal of sport rehabilitation, 25(4), 330–337. doi: 10.1123/jsr.2015-0013
- Ross, J. R., Nepple, J. J., Philippon, M. J., Kelly, B. T., Larson, C. M., & Bedi, A. (2014). Effect of changes in pelvic tilt on range of motion to impingement and radiographic parameters of acetabular morphologic characteristics. The American journal of sports medicine, 42(10), 2402–2409. doi: 10.1177/0363546514541229
- 32. Elveru, R. A., Rothstein, J. M., & Lamb, R. L. (1988). Goniometric reliability in a clinical setting. Subtalar and ankle joint measurements. Physical therapy, 68(5), 672–677. doi: 10.1093/ptj/68.5.672

Sensors 2023, 23, x FOR PEER REVIEW

537 33. Tully, E. A., Wagh, P., & Galea, M. P. (2002). Lumbofemoral rhythm during hip flexion in young adults and
 538 children. Spine, 27(20), E432–E440. doi: 10.1097/00007632-200210150-00013

Gao, B., & Zheng, N. N. (2008). Investigation of soft tissue movement during level walking: translations and rotations of skin
 markers. Journal of biomechanics, 41(15), 3189–3195. doi: 10.1016/j.jbiomech.2008.08.028

541 **Disclaimer/Publisher's Note**: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual 542 author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury 543 to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.