

1 Article

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

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

4 ¹ Department of Orthopedic Surgery, Rehasport Clinic, 60-201 Poznan, Poland; lukasz.stolowski@rehasport.pl
5 (Ł.S.); maciej.niedziela@rehasport.pl (M.N), p.lubiowski@rehasport.pl(P.L) 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

12 * Correspondence: lukasz.stolowski@rehasport.pl; Tel.: +48693031595

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 compar-
28 able 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 mea-
30 surement unit (RSQ Motion) could be successfully used to assess the active hip range of motion in
31 healthy subjects with comparable to other methods accuracy.

32 **Keywords:** IMU; Hip range of motion; goniometer; inclinometer

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

Academic Editor: Firstname Lastname 34

Received: date 35

Revised: date 36

Accepted: date 37

Published: date 38



Copyright: © 2023 by the author 39

Submitted for possible open access 40

publication under the terms and 41

conditions of the Creative Common 42

Attribution (CC BY) license 43

([https://creativecommons.org/licenses](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) 44

[https://creativecommons.org/licenses](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) 45

1. Introduction

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

46 systems [6,7,8,9]. Each method has been proven to be reliable in measuring the range of
47 motion but also has limitations. A major factor is always a subjective assessment of the
48 examiner and therefore carries the risk of error[10]. Examination using an inclinometer,
49 goniometer, or smartphone is difficult due to the inability to stabilize the pelvis and take
50 a measurement simultaneously, especially if done by one tester. Previous studies have
51 shown the impact of pelvic or even knee movement on hip ROM assessment outcomes
52 [11,12]. In daily practice, photographic evaluation or advanced 3D motion capture seems
53 impractical, time-consuming, and expensive.

54 Inertial Measurement Unit(IMU) appears as an alternative measurement solution and is
55 gaining popularity in the field of human motion capture. The device is made of a gyro-
56 scope, accelerometer, and magnetometer, and uses an appropriate algorithm, which al-
57 lows the calculation of precise motion measurement results [13].

58 In previous studies, IMU was validated to assess the range of motion of the shoulder joint,
59 ankle joint, or cervical spine [14, 15, 16]. Their usefulness was also confirmed in the
60 analysis of more complex activities such as walking or running, where one of the ele-
61 ments was the analysis of the kinematics of the hip joint [17, 18]. However, in the studies
62 published so far, we have yet to encounter the use of IMU in assessing a hip range of
63 motion in clinical settings.

64 The small size of the device and the ease of assembly should allow for quick and precise
65 measurement, especially when working with a patient one-on-one. The use of sensors
66 should also allow for the elimination of compensatory movements of the pelvis by the
67 possibility of its stabilization by the examiner. This is particularly important when
68 measuring rotation, a crucial component of examining a patient with hip conditions [19].
69 In addition, if the sensor is attached to the body, it allows the user to assess the range of
70 motion on his own. It also gives the opportunity to use it during more complex activities
71 like sports or work.

72 Some widely available measurement systems on the market use IMU. In a recent review,
73 Garimella et al. point out that manufacturers use different computational algorithms in
74 their devices, making them impossible to compare [20].

75 This study aimed to evaluate one of the IMU devices - the RSQ Motion sensor and check
76 its reliability and validity against digital inclinometer and universal goniometer in
77 measuring the active range of motion of the hip in healthy individuals.

78 **2. Materials and Methods**

79 **2.1. Participants**

80 Twenty healthy participants (10 female, 10 men; age: 27 ± 5 years; height: 174.4 ± 10.6 cm;
81 body mass: 70.4 ± 13.6 kg) were recruited for the study based on inclusion criteria: no
82 history of surgeries or injuries in the lower limb or spine, no pain in the hip or spine
83 within last 6 months, and no other diseases that may affect the test result. For confirma-
84 tion of normal hip function, each of the participants completed the hip joint functional
85 assessment questionnaire - Polish Version of the Hip Disability and Osteoarthritis Out-
86 come Score (HOOS PL)(mean score \pm standard deviation: 99.7 ± 0.9) [21]. The study was
87 approved by the Bioethical Committee of the University of Medical Sciences in Poznań,
88 Poland(no.13/21) and met the criteria of the Declaration of Helsinki. Before the study, all
89 participants were informed about the purpose of the study and signed consent to partic-
90 ipate in the study.

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 measurement every 1° on a 360° scale.

95

96

2. Baseline digital inclinometer (Fabrication Enterprises, White Plains, NY, USA). The manufacturer ensure a measurement accuracy of 0.5°.

97

98

3. IMU by RSQ Motion (RSQ Technologies, Poznan, Poland). The RSQ Motion system is a class I medical device with a measuring function, manufactured under the RSQ Technologies brand, intended for the analysis of body movement. RSQ Motion Sensor performs measurements using MEMS sensors: accelerometer, gyroscope, and magnetometer. This data is sent as a digital electrical signal to a microcontroller, which processes it, filters it and calculates the orientation of the Motion Sensor and presents it in the form of quaternions. The module with the microcontroller has a built-in Bluetooth LowEnergy antenna and communicates with the RSQ Motion Hub or an application using this protocol. The accuracy of the sensors was tested in laboratory conditions by comparing it to the Kuka robot (0.15°) The results showed excellent accuracy and repeatability, which allows us to believe that the device used will not affect the final results [22].

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

2.3. Study protocol

110

The study was conducted by two independent testers, both experienced physiotherapists working clinically with orthopedic patients and skilled in assessing range of motion. Before the current study, a pilot trial was conducted on a group of 5 subjects to establish a uniform measurement protocol.

111

112

113

114

Every study participant was evaluated on two independent days, in the same place and at a similar time of day. The subjects were wearing sports clothes and were without shoes. During the first day, two investigators performed an assessment (3 measurements for every direction of movement) with an hour interval to assess inter-rater reliability. After three days, another test was performed by one researcher to demonstrate intra-rater reliability.

115

116

117

118

119

120

Before the measurement to familiarize themselves with the measurements, all participants were asked to perform 2 test repetitions before each tested direction. The order of the tested movements was established according to the protocol: active flexion in the standing position, active external rotation, and internal rotation in the prone position.

121

122

123

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 himself with the opposite hand to the tested leg to maintain balance. During the examination, the patient is asked to lift the thigh with a flexed and relaxed knee as high as possible and maintain this position for about 1 second. The limb is held in the obtained position by the assistant for measurement with the goniometer and inclinometer. The examiner visually controls the occurrence of possible compensation - flexion of the other knee or lateral flexion of the trunk and corrects it if necessary. The measurement is made 3 times for both limbs using three devices:

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

- 133 1. IMU: The device is calibrated according to the protocol and zeroed at fixed vertical
134 reference. The sensor is attached with a sticker 5 cm above the patella of the examined
135 limb. When the maximum range of motion is reached, the recording is made by clicking
136 the button on the so-called „clicker” and saved in a connected application.
- 137 2. Inclinator: The device is zeroed at a fixed vertical surface. The measurement is made
138 by placing the inclinometer on the distal part of the thigh. The recording is made at the
139 same time as IMU.
- 140 3. Goniometer: The axis is placed at the height of the greater trochanter, one arm is di-
141 rected along the femur, and the other vertically, parallel to the wall. The measurement is
142 made right after the inclinometer and IMU.

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151



152

153

154

Figure 1. Active flexion range of motion assessment with goniometer.

155

156 2.3.2. Active external and internal rotation in the prone position (Figures 2&3).

157 Participant lying prone on the couch. To maintain the position of the limbs, a foam roller
158 with a diameter of 13 cm was placed between the knees to avoid adduction/abduction
159 movement of the hip. The knee of the test leg is bent to 90°. The assistant stabilizes the
160 pelvis manually while the participant performs an active external rotation movement as
161 far as possible. The obtained position is maintained by the assistant to take measure-
162 ments. The same test is performed for internal rotation. The measurement is made 3 times
163 for both limbs using three devices:

- 164 1. IMU: The device is calibrated according to the protocol and zeroed at a fixed vertical
165 surface. The sensor is attached with a sticker 5 cm proximal to the ankle joint of the ex-
166 amined limb. When the maximum range of motion is reached, the recording is made by
167 clicking the button on the so-called „clicker” and saved in a connected application.

168
169
170

2. Inclinator: The device is zeroed at a fixed vertical surface. The measurement is made by placing the inclinometer along the tibia underneath the IMU sensor. The recording is made at the same time as IMU.

171
172

3. Goniometer: Axis of rotation set at the tibial tuberosity. Movable arm along the edge of the tibia, stationary arm set perpendicular to the couch.

173

174

175


176

177

178

179

180



181

(a)

(b)

183

Figure 2. Active internal rotation range of motion assessment with IMU and inclinometer(a) and goniometer(b).

184

185

186


187

188

189

190

191



192

(a)

(b)

193

194

195

Figure 3. Active external rotation range of motion assessment with IMU and inclinometer(a) and goniometer(b).

196

197

198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238

2.4. Statistical analysis

All statistical analyses were performed using the XLSTAT software program (Addinsoft Inc. NY. USA). The Shapiro-Wilk test was used for the determination of the data distribution. Wilcoxon’s signed-rank test was used to compare continuous variables between the two groups. The values were presented as the mean ± standard deviation (minimal – maximal value). To assess the agreement of active hip ROM between IMU - RSQ Motion sensors, a goniometer, and an inclinometer for each movement, Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC) and Bland-Altman analysis were used. Furthermore, inter-rater and intra-rater reliability were also assessed by using ICC and Bland-Altman analysis. Limits of agreement (LOA) were calculated using Bland-Altman plots. We defined ICCs of less than 0.50 as indicative of poor reliability, values between 0.50 and 0.75 as indicative of moderate reliability, values between 0.75 and 0.90 as indicative of good reliability, and values greater than 0.90 as indicative of excellent reliability [23]. The precision of the individual measurements (the absolute reliability) was assessed with the Standard Error of Measurement (SEM). The sensitivity to change (the minimal amount of a change that a measurement must show to be greater than the within-subject variability and measurement error) was calculated as Minimal Detectable Change (MDC) with 95% confidence (MDC95) [24].

3. Results

3.1. Hip Flexion in standing position:

3.1.1. Concurrent validity

The ICC analysis showed good correlation between IMU and inclinometer and goniometer. Limit of agreement (LOA) was below 9°. Correlation between goniometer and inclinometer was excellent with LOA below 2°(Table 1.)

Table 1. Intra Class Coefficient with 95% confidence interval, bias and LOA between the data gathered by different instruments by Tester 1 and 2 for flexion assessment.

	Tester 1			Tester 2		
	ICC	Bias (°)	LOA (°)	ICC	Bias (°)	LOA (°)
IMU vs INCL	0.88	3.3 ± 2.9	-2.4; 9.0	0.90	1.3 ± 3.2	-5.0; 7.6
IMU vs GON	0.90	-3.5 ± 3.2	-9.8; 2.8	0.91	-3.8 ± 3.7	-11.1; 3.4
INCL vs GON	0.94	-6.8 ± 4.1	-14.8; 1.3	0.93	-5.1 ± 3.6	-12.22; 2.0

Abbreviations: IMU - Inertial Measurement Unit; INCL- digital inclinometer; GON - universal goniometer; ICC- Intra Class Correlation Coefficient; 95% CI- 95% confidence interval; LOA- Limits of Agreement.

3.1.2. Inter - rater reliability

Inter - rater reliability was moderate for all tested instruments. LOA was lowest for goniometer - below 11.8° and 12.8° and 22.4° for inclinometer and IMU respectively. SEM was below 1° and MDC95 was below 2.8° for all tested instruments (Table 2.).

Table 2. Inter-rater reliability indicators in hip flexion for all of the measuring devices; Tester 1 vs Tester 2.

Flexion	Tester 1	Tester 2	ICC	SEM	MDC95	Bias(°)	LOA(°)
	Mean ± SD (min – max)	Mean ± SD (min – max)		(°)	(%)(°)	± SE	

IMU	107.4 ± 8.2 (91.1 – 130.1)	107.1 ± 7.8 (89.3 - 129.6)	0.58	1.0	2.8	1.0 ± 10.9	-20.4; 22.4
Inclinometer	104.0 ± 8.8 (90.4 - 128.9)	105.8 ± 7.9 (93.0 - 127.8)	0.59	0.7	1.9	-1.8 ± 7.4	-16.4; 12.8
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; 11.8

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

239

240

3.1.3. Intra - rater reliability

241

Intra - rater reliability for flexion was excellent for IMU and goniometer and good for inclinometer with LOA below 6.7°. SEM was below 0.4° and MDC95 was below 1.1° for all tested instruments (Table 3.)

242

243

244

245 **Table 3.** Intra - rater reliability indicators in hip flexion for all of measuring devices.

Flexion	Test	Retest	ICC	SEM	MDC95	Bias (°)	LOA (°)
	Mean ± SD (min – max)	Mean ± SD (min – max)					
IMU	106.0 ± 7.2 (89.3 - 129.6)	106.8 ± 7.7 (89.2 – 133.8)	0.94	0.4	1.1	-1.4 ± 4.1	-9.6; 6.7
Inclinometer	104.3 ± 6.9 (93.0 - 127.8)	105.8 ± 7.5 (93.0 – 138.0)	0.87	0.4	1.1	-2.0 ± 4.3	-10.5; 6.5
Goniometer	109.8 ± 5.6 (100.0 - 128.0)	110.1 ± 6.0 (100.0 – 131.0)	0.91	0.3	0.9	-0.9 ± 3.5	-7.7; 5.9

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.

246

247

3.2. Hip prone internal rotation

248

3.2.1. Concurrent validity

249

The ICC analysis showed an excellent correlation between IMU and inclinometer and goniometer. LOA was below 19.5° for Tester 2 and below 3.7° for Tester 1. Correlation between goniometer and inclinometer was also excellent with LOA below 3.6°(Table 4.)

250

251

252

253

254 **Table 4.** Intra Class Coefficient 95% CI- 95% confidence interval, bias and LOA between the data gathered by different instruments by Tester 1 and 2 for internal rotation assessment.

255

	Tester 1			Tester 2		
	ICC	Bias(°)	LOA(°)	ICC	Bias(°)	LOA(°)
IMU vs INCL	0.97	-1.7 ± 2.6	-6.8; 3.3	0.99	-0.3 ± 10.1	-20.1; 19.5
IMU vs GON	0.99	-1.9 ± 2.8	-7.6; 3.7	0.97	-0.2 ± 10.0	-19.8; 19.4
INCL vs GON	0.99	-0.2 ± 1.6	-3.3; 2.8	0.98	0.1 ± 1.7	-3.3; 3.6

Abbreviations: IMU - Inertial Measurement Unit; INCL- digital inclinometer; GON - universal goniometer; ICC- Intra Class Correlation Coefficient; 95% CI- 95% confidence interval; LOA- Limits of Agreement.

261

262

263

264

3.2.2. Inter - rater reliability

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).

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

Internal rotation	Tester 1 Mean ± SD (min – max) (°)	Tester 2 Mean ± SD (min – max) (°)	ICC	SEM (°)	MDC ₉₅ (%)(°)	Bias (°) ± SE	LOA (°)
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: 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.

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).

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

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

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.

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

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.

	Tester 1			Tester 2		
	ICC	Bias (°)	LOA (°)	ICC	Bias (°)	LOA (°)
IMU vs INCL	0.88	-1.0 ± 3.3	-7.5; 5.4	0.95	-0.4 ± 3.2	-6.6; 5.8
IMU vs GON	0.97	1.1 ± 3.4	-5.6; 7.8	0.99	1.1 ± 2.6	-4.0; 6.2
INCL vs GON	0.99	2.1 ± 2.4	-2.5; 6.8	0.96	1.5 ± 2.4	-3.2; 6.2

295 Abbreviations: IMU - Inertial Measurement Unit; INCL- digital inclinometer; GON - universal goniometer;
296 ICC- Intra Class Correlation Coefficient; 95% CI- 95% confidence interval; LOA- Limits of Agreement.

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).

303 **Table 8.** Inter - rater reliability indicators in hip prone external rotation for all of the measuring devices; Tester 1 vs Tester 2.

External rota- tion	Tester 1 Mean ± SD (min – max) (°)	Tester 2 Mean ± SD (min – max) (°)	ICC	SEM (°)	MDC ₉₅ (%)(°)	Bias (°) ± SE	LOA (°)
IMU	44.4 ± 6.6 (25.0 – 56.3)	43.6 ± 7.8 (24.1 - 55.4)	-0.29	1.1	3.0	0.8 ± 11.5	-21.8; 23.4
Inclinometer	45.5 ± 7.3 (30.0 - 60.4)	44.0 ± 8.4 (25.8 - 64.7)	-0.24	1.2	3.2	1.4 ± 11.4	-22.8; 25.7
Goniometer	43.3 ± 7.3 (25.0 - 59.0)	42.5 ± 7.6 (24.0 - 57.0)	-0.33	1.1	3.0	0.8 ± 12.1	-22.8; 24.4

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

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).

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

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

Goniometer	43.3 ± 6.9 (27.0 - 57.0)	3.7 ± 7.5 (26.0 - 58.0)	0.97	0.2	0.7	-0.3 ± 2.6	-5.3; 4.8
------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	------	-----	-----	------------	-----------

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.

311 **4. Discussion**

312 According to our knowledge, this is the first study to evaluate the validity and reliability
313 of an IMU for active hip joint range of motion assessment in healthy subjects. The signif-
314 icant findings in the study are that the IMU showed mostly excellent validity compared
315 with the "gold standard" universal goniometer and digital inclinometer. Regarding reli-
316 ability, our results show a good-excellent correlation when the measurements are made
317 by the same examiner (intra-rater). When the study is performed by two examiners (in-
318 ter-rater), then the results were moderate for the flexion and poor for both external and
319 internal. That reliability was inferior for every instrument used, likely associated with the
320 assessment method and not with IMU or other devices. We also found out that if reli-
321 ability was excellent then LOA was lower than 10°. Our results are consistent with Koegh
322 et al. who reported ICC > 0.75, LOA < ±9.8°, and SEM < 5° as criteria for good validity for
323 smartphone assessment [25]. Small values of SEM (<1,6°) and MDC95 (<4.3°) in our study
324 indicate good absolute reliability.

325 It is difficult to compare our results with others due to the lack of studies examining the
326 IMU in the assessment of the hip joint range of motion in the available literature. This is
327 also the first study assessing active hip flexion in the standing position. We chose this
328 position because it is used more often than lying on the back in everyday life. Moreover,
329 isolating the flexion movement in the hip joint without additional pelvis and spine
330 movement is difficult and could disturb the measurement [12].

331 Considering the tested position, the results of the research in which IMU was tested in
332 gait analysis are the closest to our position [26,27]. Zugner et al. used inertial sensors to
333 assess gait in people after hip arthroplasty and showed a good correlation with the
334 optoelectric system for the hip flexion gait phase (Left hip - ICC: 0.73; Right hip - ICC: 0.75)
335 [17]. It should be noted, however, that the range of flexion during gait is much smaller
336 than that used in our study.

337 As mentioned, previous studies did not use IMU for the hip joint range of motion as-
338 sessment. The most similar are those studies assessing smartphone applications with
339 built-in inertial units. Marshall et al. used inertial sensors located in the phone and
340 compared them to the 3D motion analysis system [28]. They tested active flexion in the
341 supine position with the sensor placed in front of the thigh as in our study. Compared to
342 the 3D system, they showed good agreement (ICC: 0.81, SEM: 1.55°). Reported inter and
343 intra reliability for flexion range of motion in the mentioned study was lower than in our
344 study, with ICCs of 0.52 and 0.59, respectively. A similar study was conducted by
345 Charlton et al., who additionally used an analog inclinometer for measurement [29]. The
346 main difference between our studies is that they tested the passive range of motion. In-
347 tra-tester reliability correlation was similar to our results for smartphone (ICC: 0.86;
348 SEM: 2.3°) and inclinometer (ICC: 0.9; SEM: 2.8°).

349 Similarly to flexion, in many studies, prone rotation is assessed passively, which makes a
350 comparison to active one difficult [7,9,12]. Marshall et al. evaluated active rotation in the
351 prone position and showed good agreement for external rotation and poor agreement for
352 internal rotation compared to the 3D motion capture [28]. Ganokroj et al. also compared

353 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].

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 Ganokroj et al. of, 0.81 and
367 0.76 for prone internal and external rotation, with SEM values of 4.1° and 3.9°, respec-
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°).

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 levels. The 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 IMU, errors may also result from subtle differences in sticking the device
398 and additional skin movements during active movement, which also occur with other
399 systems, such as the 3D motion capture [34].

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-

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

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

425 5. Conclusions

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

436 **Author Contributions:** Conceptualization, Ł.S. and T.P.; methodology, Ł.S. and T.P.; validation,
437 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.;
438 data curation, Ł.S.; writing—original draft preparation, Ł.S.; writing—review and editing, Ł.S.,
439 T.P., P.L.; visualization, Ł.S.; supervision, T.P., P.L.; project administration, T.P.; funding acquisi-
440 tion, T.P., P.L. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

441 **Funding:** This research received no external funding

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

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

447 **Data Availability Statement:** Not applicable.

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

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

452 References

453

- 454 1. 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 Medicine*, 12(3), 129–133. doi: 10.1136/bjism.12.3.129
- 459 3. 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 pubic 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 football. *The American journal of sports medicine*, 32(1 Suppl), 5S–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 bilateral hip flexion. *Physical therapy*, 65(10), 1501–1504. doi: 10.1093/ptj/65.10.1501
- 466 6. Yuan, B. J., Bartelt, R. B., Levy, B. A., Bond, J. R., Trousdale, R. T., & Sierra, R. J. (2013). Decreased range of motion is associated with structural hip deformity in asymptomatic adolescent athletes. *The American journal of sports medicine*, 41(7), 1519–1525. doi: 10.1177/0363546513488748
- 469 7. 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
- 471 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.
- 473 9. Ganokroj, P., Sompornpanich, N., Kerdsonnuek, 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
- 476 10. 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
- 479 11. 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
- 482 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
- 485 13. Luinge, H. J., & Veltink, P. H. (2005). Measuring orientation of human body segments using miniature gyroscopes and accelerometers. *Medical & biological engineering & computing*, 43(2), 273–282. doi:10.1007/BF02345966
- 487 14. 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
- 490 15. 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
- 493 16. 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

- 495 17. Zügner, R., Tranberg, R., Timperley, J., Hodgins, D., Mohaddes, M., & Kärrholm, J. (2019). Validation of inertial measurement
496 units with optical tracking system in patients operated with Total hip arthroplasty. *BMC musculoskeletal disorders*, 20(1), 52.
497 doi: 10.1186/s12891-019-2416-4
- 498 18. Zeng, Z., Liu, Y., Li, P., & Wang, L. (2022). Validity and reliability of inertial measurement units measurements for running
499 kinematics in different foot strike pattern runners. *Frontiers in bioengineering and biotechnology*, 10, 1005496. doi:
500 10.3389/fbioe.2022.1005496
- 501 19. Pålsson, A., Kostogiannis, I., & Ageberg, E. (2020). Combining results from hip impingement and range of motion tests can
502 increase diagnostic accuracy in patients with FAI syndrome. *Knee surgery, sports traumatology, arthroscopy : official journal*
503 *of the ESSKA*, 28(10), 3382–3392. doi: 10.1007/s00167-020-06005-5
- 504 20. Garimella, R., Peeters, T., Beyers, K., Truijen, S., Huysmans, T., & Verwulgen, S. (2018). Capturing Joint Angles of the Off-Site
505 Human Body. 2018 IEEE SENSORS, 1–4. doi: 10.1109/ICSENS.2018.8589711
- 506 21. Glinkowski, W., Żukowska, A., Dymitrowicz, M., Wołyniec, E., Glinkowska, B., & Koziół-Kaczorek, D. (2019). Translation,
507 Cross-Cultural Adaptation, and Psychometric Properties of the Polish Version of the Hip Disability and Osteoarthritis Out-
508 come Score (HOOS). *Medicina (Kaunas, Lithuania)*, 55(10), 614. doi.org/10.3390/medicina55100614
- 509 22. Białecka, Martyna, Kacper Gruszczyński, Paweł Cisowski, Jakub Kaszyński, Cezary Baka, and Przemysław Lubiowski.
510 (2023). Shoulder Range of Motion Measurement Using Inertial Measurement Unit – Validation with a Robot Arm. *Sensors* 23,
511 no. 12: 5364. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s23125364>
- 512 23. Portney L.G., Watkins M.P. *Foundations of Clinical Research: Applications to Practice*. 2nd ed. Prentice Hall; Upper Saddle
513 River, NJ, USA: 2000. p. 273
- 514 24. Weir J. P. (2005). Quantifying test-retest reliability using the intraclass correlation coefficient and the SEM. *Journal of strength*
515 *and conditioning research*, 19(1), 231–240. doi:10.1519/15184.1
- 516 25. Keogh, J. W. L., Cox, A., Anderson, S., Liew, B., Olsen, A., Schram, B., & Furness, J. (2019). Reliability and validity of clinically
517 accessible smartphone applications to measure joint range of motion: A systematic review. *PloS one*, 14(5), e0215806.
518 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0215806>
- 519 26. Bailey, C. A., Uchida, T. K., Nantel, J., & Graham, R. B. (2021). Validity and Sensitivity of an Inertial Measurement
520 Unit-Driven Biomechanical Model of Motor Variability for Gait. *Sensors (Basel, Switzerland)*, 21(22), 7690. doi:
521 10.3390/s21227690
- 522 27. Horenstein, R. E., Goudeau, Y. R., Lewis, C. L., & Shefelbine, S. J. (2020). Using Magneto-Inertial Measurement Units to Perva-
523 sively Measure Hip Joint Motion during Sports. *Sensors (Basel, Switzerland)*, 20(17), 4970. doi: 10.3390/s20174970
- 524 28. Marshall, C. J., El-Ansary, D., Pranata, A., Ganderton, C., O'Donnell, J., Takla, A., Tran, P., Wickramasinghe, N., & Tirosh, O.
525 (2022). Validity and Reliability of a Novel Smartphone Tele-Assessment Solution for Quantifying Hip Range of Mo-
526 tion. *Sensors (Basel, Switzerland)*, 22(21), 8154. doi: 10.3390/s22218154
- 527 29. Charlton, P. C., Mentiplay, B. F., Pua, Y. H., & Clark, R. A. (2015). Reliability and concurrent validity of a Smartphone, bubble
528 inclinometer and motion analysis system for measurement of hip joint range of motion. *Journal of science and medicine in*
529 *sport*, 18(3), 262–267. doi: 10.1016/j.jsams.2014.04.008
- 530 30. Aefsky, B., Fleet, N., Myers, H., & Butler, R. J. (2016). Reliability and Validity of a Novel Approach to Measure Hip Rota-
531 tion. *Journal of sport rehabilitation*, 25(4), 330–337. doi: 10.1123/jsr.2015-0013
- 532 31. 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
533 of motion to impingement and radiographic parameters of acetabular morphologic characteristics. *The American journal of*
534 *sports medicine*, 42(10), 2402–2409. doi: 10.1177/0363546514541229
- 535 32. Elveru, R. A., Rothstein, J. M., & Lamb, R. L. (1988). Goniometric reliability in a clinical setting. Subtalar and ankle joint
536 measurements. *Physical therapy*, 68(5), 672–677. doi: 10.1093/ptj/68.5.672

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

539 34. Gao, B., & Zheng, N. N. (2008). Investigation of soft tissue movement during level walking: translations and rotations of skin
540 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.