

Gait Phases Detection in Elderly using Trunk-MIMU System

Original

Gait Phases Detection in Elderly using Trunk-MIMU System / Digo, Elisa; Agostini, Valentina; Pastorelli, Stefano; Gastaldi, Laura; Panero, Elisa. - ELETTRONICO. - (2021), pp. 58-65. (Intervento presentato al convegno BIODEVICES 2021) [10.5220/0010256400580065].

Availability:

This version is available at: 11583/2873294 since: 2021-03-08T08:31:34Z

Publisher:

Scitepress

Published

DOI:10.5220/0010256400580065

Terms of use:

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

Publisher copyright

(Article begins on next page)

Gait phases detection in elderly using trunk-MIMU system

Elisa Digo¹, Valentina Agostini², Stefano Pastorelli¹, Laura Gastaldi³ and Elisa Panero¹

¹Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Politecnico di Torino, Turin, Italy

²Department of Electronics and Telecommunications, Politecnico di Torino, Turin, Italy

³Department of Mathematical Sciences "G.L. Lagrange", Politecnico di Torino, Turin, Italy
{elisa.digo, stefano.pastorelli, valentina.agostini, laura.gastaldi, elisa.panero}@polito.it

Keywords: Gait phases, elderly population, MIMU, walking condition, accuracy

Abstract: The increasing interest towards wearable Magnetic Inertial Measurement Units (MIMUs) for gait analysis is justified by their low invasiveness, confirmed repeatability and complete independence from laboratory constraints. However, some crucial doubts about the identification of a suitable sensor set-up and algorithm in different gait conditions and populations still exist. In this context, the principal aim of the present study was to investigate the effect of different walking conditions on the accuracy of gait phases detection with a trunk-MIMU system. Eleven healthy elderly subjects performed gait trials in four different walking conditions (normal speed, slow speed, fast speed and normal speed with dual task). A stereophotogrammetric system was adopted as gold standard. The accuracy of the estimation of stance and swing phases was evaluated from the comparison of trunk-MIMU to the stereophotogrammetric system. Mean error values smaller than 0.03 s confirmed the accuracy of the trunk-MIMU algorithm for an elderly population. Consequently, trunk-MIMU system can be considered suitable for the characterization of gait phases in elderly subjects regardless of walking conditions.

1 INTRODUCTION

During the last decades, different applications highlighted the central role of locomotion in human daily activities, generating a strong interest towards gait analysis. Several studies have been directed to assess standard gait patterns (Davis 1997), to identify the conditioning factors (Hebenstreit et al. 2015), to select systems and set-ups (Benndorf, Gaedke, and Haenselmann 2019), as to characterize human gait phases and kinematics (Kadaba et al. 1989). In particular, clinical gait analysis is usually aimed at monitoring rehabilitation processes (Moon et al. 2017), characterizing normal and pathological locomotion (Prakash, Kumar, and Mittal 2018; Shirakawa et al. 2017) and verifying therapeutic treatments (Gastaldi et al. 2015). The objective measurement of gait parameters supports clinical experts during the observational assessment of gait.

Human locomotion can be mainly described by the identification of two gait events: the heel strike (HS) and the toe off (TO). In detail, the detection of gait events allows first to divide each walking trial into consecutive cycles, then to estimate different gait phases. The gait cycle (GC) of each limb can be mainly divided in stance and swing phases. The first one starts with the load acceptance from the foot and lasts the entire time the foot is in contact with the ground, while correspondingly the limb bears part or whole human weight. The swing phase depicts the time period of foot oscillation without floor contact. Durations of stance and swing phases are expressed as percentages of the GC duration. Generally, in healthy adults the stance phase represents approximately the 60% of the GC, while the swing phase the 40% of the GC.

Stance and swing phases can be crucially influenced by gait velocities, external disturbs or dual tasks (Liu et al. 2014). In addition, previous studies

^a <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5760-9541>

^b <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5887-1499>

^c <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7808-8776>

^d <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3921-3022>

^e <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5555-5818>

highlighted the aging effect on gait phases (Aboutorabi et al. 2016). Healthy elderly people demonstrated a compensatory strategy to overcome instability and loss of control, through the variation of spatio-temporal parameters. The percentage duration of the stance phase is increased, which entails a reduced percentage duration of the swing phase. More in general, in clinics, altered patterns of locomotion are assessed by different percentage distribution of time in the two phases (Trojaniello et al. 2014). Another important aspect of pathological gait is the symmetry between right and left limb. However reduced symmetry is not clearly associated with age in healthy elderly populations, as stressed in previous studies (Aboutorabi et al. 2016).

During past decades, several tools have been used for the analysis of human locomotion, especially to add an objective measure to the observational gait evaluation (Akhtaruzzaman, Shafie, and Khan 2016). Literature confirms optoelectronic systems as the gold standard technology, because of their high accuracy and precision. Several improvements, methodologies and innovative biomechanical models are proposed nowadays to be implemented with optoelectronic systems for deeper kinematic and dynamic investigations (Panero, Gastaldi, and Rapp 2018). However, these systems have some crucial disadvantages, as the cost, the restriction to the laboratory environment and the required expert operation.

Recently, wearable sensor technologies such as Magnetic Inertial Measurement Units (MIMUs) have shown promising results in measuring human body motion with limited cost and invasiveness, with a good reliability and without laboratory constraints (Cereatti, Trojaniello, and Croce 2015; Digo et al. 2020; Petraglia et al. 2019; G. Yang et al. 2019). The use of wearable systems may be more suitable for monitoring the subject for longer observation periods and during daily activities. However, some open issues related to MIMUs still exist, such as the definition of a suitable and reliable set-up (S. Yang and Li 2012) and the implementation of a robust algorithm for gait phases identification (Caldas et al. 2017) that can be used in different conditions. Several previous studies have proposed MIMUs set-ups and algorithms to assess gait parameters both in healthy and pathological subjects.

A previous pilot study has been conducted with three healthy young subjects performing gait trials for the evaluation of two MIMUs set-ups and associate algorithms for gait events detection (Panero et al. 2018). In the first set-up 1 MIMU was positioned on the trunk, while in the second one 2 MIMUs were

positioned on ankles. Results have demonstrated the suitability of the two MIMUs set-ups and algorithms, but the set-up involving 1 MIMU on the trunk showed the best accuracy and simplest usage. Considering these results and concentrating on the trunk-MIMU set-up, the analysis has been extended to a larger population of healthy elderly subjects, in order to validate the robustness of the algorithm in different walking conditions.

Consequently, the aim of the current study deals with the analysis of gait speeds and conditions effects on the accuracy of gait phases detection with a trunk-MIMU system. Eleven healthy subjects over 65 years old performed gait trials in four different walking conditions. Stance and swing phases have been monitored as outcomes of interest. Accuracy and error quantification, obtained from the comparison of trunk-MIMU results with an optoelectronic reference system, are analysed.

2 MATERIALS & METHODS

2.1 Participants

Eleven healthy elderly subjects (4 males and 7 females) participated in the research after giving their written informed consent. Four inclusion criteria were considered: (i) age over 65 years old, (ii) no declared neurological disorders, (iii) no musculoskeletal diseases in the last five years and (iv) no internal prostheses. The study was approved by the Local Institutional Review Board. All procedures were conformed to the Helsinki Declaration. Mean and standard deviation values of subjects' age and Body Mass Index (BMI) are reported in Table 1.

Table 1: Subjects' data (mean \pm standard deviation).

Age (years)	Height (m)	Weight (kg)	BMI (kg/m ²)
68.8 \pm 5.0	1.6 \pm 0.1	70.3 \pm 14.9	25.8 \pm 3.1

2.2 Instruments

Two motion capture systems were adopted for the study: an inertial one consisting of 1 MIMU and a stereophotogrammetric one composed of 6 infrared cameras and passive reflective markers.

2.2.1 Inertial system

One MTx MIMU (Xsens, The Netherlands) containing a tri-axial accelerometer (range ± 5 G), a tri-axial gyroscope (range ± 1200 dps) and a tri-axial magnetometer ($\pm 75 \mu\text{T}$) was used for the test. The MIMU was fixed on trunk (TRN) of participants at the level of T12-L1 vertebrae, with an elastic band provided by the Xsens kit. The sensor was oriented with the vertical x-axis pointing downward, the medio-lateral y-axis directed to the right side of participants and the anterior-posterior z-axis pointing in the opposite direction of the gait (Figure 1A). The MIMU was connected to the Xbus Master, the control unit able to send data to the PC via Bluetooth. Data were acquired through the Xsens proprietary software, MT Manager, with a sampling frequency of 50 Hz.

2.2.2 Stereophotogrammetric system

The stereophotogrammetric system adopted for the test was composed of two V120:Trio tracking bars (OptiTrack, USA) and 9 passive reflective markers with a diameter of 14 mm. Each bar was self-contained, pre-calibrated and equipped with three cameras able to detect infrared light.

Six markers were fixed on feet of participants with adhesive tape (Figure 1B): two on toes (right toe = TOR, left toe = TOL), two on malleolus (right malleolus = MAR, left malleolus = MAL) and two on ankles (right ankle = ANR, left ankle = ANL). Other three markers (A, B and C) were placed on the floor in order to define the Global Coordinate System (GCS) in which to report data recorded by the bars (Panero et al. 2018). Each bar was connected to a separate PC. Data acquisition was made with the OptiTrack proprietary software Motive, with a sampling frequency of 120 Hz.

2.3 Protocol

The experimental test was conducted indoor. The two OptiTrack bars were located one in front of the other parallel to a 6-meters linear walking path traced on the floor. Consequently, the obtained captured area was 2.5 m x 3.5 m, to guarantee the acquisition of at least three steps for each transition in front of the cameras. A static recording was made to obtain the coordinates of three fixed markers (A, B, C) on the floor (Figure 2).

Participants were first asked to hit their right heel on the floor to define an external event to synchronize the stereophotogrammetric system and the inertial sensors system. Subsequently, subjects walked barefoot on the linear path in four conditions. In the

first three conditions, they were asked to walk at different self-selected speeds: normal, fast and slow. In the fourth condition, participants were involved in a dual task condition. While walking at normal self-selected speed, they were asked many questions about their lives and habits. For each walking condition, all subjects performed 26 transitions in front of the cameras. The order of the four sets of walking conditions was randomized for all subjects. Coordinates of markers and signals of MIMUs were acquired at the same time with the two motion capture systems.




Figure 1: A) Configuration of trunk-MIMU and B) markers on body of participants.

2.4 Signal processing and data analysis

Signal processing and data analysis were conducted with customized Matlab routines. Considering the static recording of markers on the floor, a transformation matrix was built and used to express all markers trajectories collected during gait sessions in the GCS. Afterwards, the temporal synchronization of data from the two motion capture systems was guaranteed through the initial impact of the right foot on the floor (Panero et al. 2018). Gait events were then separately identified from data acquired by the MIMU system and the optoelectronic

system. This detection was made with two algorithms inspired by previous literature works. Considering the optoelectronic system, HSs and TOs were identified from horizontal and vertical coordinates of ankles and toes markers, respectively (Panero et al. 2018; Veilleux et al. 2016). Since each bar captured the lateral view of one side of the body, markers on malleolus were used to distinguish between right and left sides during gait. As regards the MIMU system, gait events were identified from the anterior-posterior acceleration of trunk-MIMU. More in detail, HSs and TOs were detected as maximum and minimum peaks of this signal, respectively (Panero et al. 2018; Zijlstra and Hof 2003). In addition, the distinction between right and left gait events was made by considering the alternation sign of trunk-MIMU angular velocity around the vertical axis (McCamley et al. 2012; Panero et al. 2018).

For each subject, a total number of gait cycles between 150 and 300 was collected. First, the average walking velocity was calculated for each participant in each testing condition, as the ratio between the total gait path and the travel time. Then, inter-subjects mean and standard deviation of walking speed values were estimated, for each testing conditions. Afterwards, using gait events obtained with both algorithms, spatio-temporal parameters of stance and swing times were estimated for each gait cycle of each participant in all walking conditions. For both stance and swing times, mean and standard deviation values were calculated intra- and inter-subjects for both right and left sides. Moreover, the symmetry of participants was evaluated by estimating the limp index as the ratio between right and left stance times. According to this confirmed symmetry, values of stance and swing times were averaged between right and left sides and represented through bar diagrams. In addition, stance and swing durations were estimated as percentages of the GC, in order to evaluate the effect of age on gait phases distribution.

The accuracy of the MIMU algorithm was evaluated as the relative error between the mean value estimated with the optoelectronic system and the mean value obtained with the MIMU system, for each participant. Subsequently, inter-subjects mean values of errors were calculated in all walking conditions. The sign of the error allowed the differentiation between overestimation (negative sign) and underestimation (positive sign) with respect to the reference value. Finally, a stem graph representation was adopted in order to compare errors for both stance and swing times in different walking conditions.




Figure 2: Top view of the setting with OptiTrack bars, measures of the capture volume, distances and GCS.

3 RESULTS

Table 2 depicts average and standard deviation values of walking velocity for the population in all the four conditions (m/s).

Table 2: Inter-subjects mean and standard deviation values of walking speed (m/s) in four conditions

Speed (m/s)	Mean \pm St. Dev.
Fast	1.16 \pm 0.16
Normal	0.87 \pm 0.12
Slow	0.74 \pm 0.14
Dual	0.82 \pm 0.15

Figure 3 shows inter-subject mean and standard deviation values of stance and swing times (s) estimated with both OptiTrack and trunk-MIMU in all walking conditions. In Figure 4 two stem graphs represent mean errors for stance and swing times in all walking conditions (red circle for fast speed, green diamond for normal speed, blue square for slow speed and black pentagram for dual task).

Table 3 contains inter-subjects mean and standard deviation values of limp index, stance duration (% GC) and swing duration (% GC) obtained from the two algorithms in all walking conditions.




Figure 3: Stance and swing time estimation in different walking conditions with OptiTrack (blue) and trunk-MIMU (red) system.

4 DISCUSSIONS

The main aim of the current study was to evaluate how the accuracy and robustness of a trunk-MIMU algorithm in gait phases identification are influenced by four different walking conditions (speeds and dual task). In order to fulfill this purpose, inter-subjects mean and standard deviation values of walking speeds (Table 2) were calculated. As reported by Aboutorabi and colleagues, walking speed of 1.30 m/s can be considered the standard reference value for normal walking in healthy adults (Aboutorabi et al. 2016). Moreover, they referred to previous studies showing a loss of gait speed predicted based on age (1.2%/year). In the present work, inter-subjects mean walking speed in normal condition (0.87 m/s) confirms this reduction provoked by age.




Figure 4: Errors of trunk-MIMU algorithm with respect to OptiTrack for both stance and swing times in the four walking conditions.

Moreover, even the registered walking velocity in fast speed condition (1.16 m/s) is lower than the reference value of normal walking speed in healthy adults. In the dual task condition, walking speed of subjects (0.82 m/s) was lower than the one of normal condition (0.87 m/s), but higher with respect to the slow speed condition (0.74 m/s). This aspect could be justified considering that participants were involved in answering questions and consequently were less focused on walking.

The effect of age on symmetry has been previously investigated by different studies (Aboutorabi et al. 2016). In the present work, the symmetry of participant was evaluated by estimating the limp index in all walking conditions both with trunk-MIMU and OptiTrack (Table 3). Since inter-subjects mean values were always around 1 as expected in a healthy gait, symmetry of participants was confirmed. Consequently, right and left values of stance and swing times (Figure 3) and percentage durations (Table 3) were averaged.

Table 3: Limp index, stance duration and swing duration estimated by OptiTrack and trunk-MIMU systems in all walking conditions (inter-subjects mean \pm standard deviation)

Condition	System	Limp index	Stance duration (%GC)	Swing duration (%GC)
Fast	OptiTrack	1.01 \pm 0.03	61.76 \pm 1.42	38.24 \pm 1.42
	Trunk-MIMU	1.01 \pm 0.03	60.44 \pm 1.61	39.56 \pm 1.61
Normal	OptiTrack	1.00 \pm 0.01	63.20 \pm 1.66	36.80 \pm 1.66
	Trunk-MIMU	1.01 \pm 0.03	62.09 \pm 2.40	37.91 \pm 2.40
Slow	OptiTrack	1.01 \pm 0.03	64.57 \pm 1.70	35.43 \pm 1.70
	Trunk-MIMU	1.00 \pm 0.04	62.77 \pm 2.01	37.23 \pm 2.01
Dual	OptiTrack	1.00 \pm 0.02	64.31 \pm 1.71	35.69 \pm 1.71
	Trunk-MIMU	1.01 \pm 0.04	62.39 \pm 2.13	37.61 \pm 2.13

Low cost, low invasiveness and confirmed repeatability of inertial sensors make them a suitable alternative to optoelectronic systems for gait analysis. Despite large investigations and many applications, some crucial gaps still exist for the identification of a robust and accurate sensor configuration and algorithm that can be applied in different gait conditions and populations. Considering young subjects, the trunk-MIMU solution resulted to be the most suitable one (Panero et al. 2018). In the present study, stance time and swing time have been selected as outcomes of interest for the validation of accuracy and robustness of the trunk-MIMU algorithm and set-up on an elderly population. As Figure 3 shows, both stance and swing times increase with the reduction of gait speed. In the dual task condition, values of stance and swing times are halfway between the correspondent ones of normal and slow speed conditions. Moreover, small standard deviation values depict a repeatability of the measure inside the tested sample of elderly subjects (Pacini Panebianco et al. 2018). Considering the accuracy in gait phases detection with the trunk-MIMU system with respect to the OptiTrack one, bar diagrams of Figure 3 show very similar values of both stance and swing times in all walking conditions. This correspondence could be evaluated with stem graphs in Figure 4. Smaller errors were obtained for conditions at fast (+0.01 s for stance time, -0.01 s for swing time) and normal speeds (+0.01 s for stance time, -0.01 s for swing time). Stance time error is greater in dual task condition (+0.03 s), while the greater error for swing time was registered in slow speed condition (-0.03 s). However, in all walking conditions, errors are lower than 0.03 s for both stance and swing times. In addition, stance times were always overestimated

(positive sign of errors), while an underestimation interested swing times (negative signs of errors). Better performance at fast and normal speeds could be explained by an easier identification of peaks of interest in acceleration and angular velocity signals used for HSs and TOs detection. Despite this aspect, the trunk-MIMU algorithm could be considered accurate for gait phases detection also in elderly subjects.

Considering Table 3, values of stance and swing durations obtained as percentages of GC were observed. Reference values of stance and swing duration in normal gait are 60% and 40% of the GC, respectively. The current elderly population shows an increased stance duration (around 63% GC for OptiTrack and 62% GC for trunk-MIMU) and a consequent reduction of swing duration (around 37% GC for OptiTrack and 38% GC for trunk MIMU) in normal walking condition. In faster walking speed, the reduction of stance duration with respect to normal speed can be underlined both with OptiTrack (62% GC) and trunk-MIMU (60% GC), with a resulting increase of swing phase duration. In slow walking speed, the increase of stance duration with respect to normal speed can be underlined both with OptiTrack (65% GC) and trunk-MIMU (63% GC), with a resulting reduction of swing phase duration. Finally, the walking condition with dual task shows percentage times distribution similar to the slow speed condition, both for OptiTrack and trunk-MIMU.

5 CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, the presented analysis confirms that trunk-MIMU system is suitable for the

characterization of gait phases not only in healthy young subjects (Panero et al. 2018), but also in a healthy elderly population. The trunk-MIMU system depicts small errors of stance and swing times calculation at different walking conditions, revealing its accuracy and robustness. Moreover, the singular MIMU configuration might reveal advantages in terms of ease of use, limited cost and reduced invasiveness. For all these reasons, the trunk-MIMU system demonstrates to be a strategic and potential alternative to traditional stereophotogrammetric systems to evaluate gait phases.

The principal limitation of this study consists in the involvement of a small sample of participants. However, this limit is expected to be overcome in the future, by testing a larger number of elderly subjects and considering the possibility to identify subgroups based on gender, healthy conditions and specific age.

Future perspectives will concentrate first on the evaluation of more spatio-temporal parameters, including symmetry indices. Then, plans are to test the same MIMU set-up and algorithm on pathological populations, in order to define a complete protocol for the evaluation of rehabilitation progress and therapeutic treatments benefits.

REFERENCES

- Aboutorabi, Atefeh et al. 2016. "The Effect of Aging on Gait Parameters in Able-Bodied Older Subjects: A Literature Review." *Aging Clinical and Experimental Research* 28(3): 393–405. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s40520-015-0420-6> (September 29, 2020).
- Akhtaruzzaman, Md, Amir Akramin Shafie, and Md Raisuddin Khan. 2016. "GAIT ANALYSIS: SYSTEMS, TECHNOLOGIES, and IMPORTANCE." *Journal of Mechanics in Medicine and Biology* 16(7).
- Benndorf, Maik, Martin Gaedke, and Thomas Haenselmann. 2019. "Towards Gait Analysis - Creating a Setup for the Analyses under Laboratory Conditions." In *ACM International Conference Proceeding Series*, New York, New York, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 1–5. <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?doid=3341325.3342005> (September 29, 2020).
- Caldas, Rafael et al. 2017. "A Systematic Review of Gait Analysis Methods Based on Inertial Sensors and Adaptive Algorithms." *Gait and Posture* 57: 204–10.
- Cereatti, Andrea, Diana Trojaniello, and Ugo Della Croce. 2015. "Accurately Measuring Human Movement Using Magneto-Inertial Sensors: Techniques and Challenges." In *2nd IEEE International Symposium on Inertial Sensors and Systems, IEEE ISISS 2015 - Proceedings*, Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc.
- Davis, Roy B. 1997. "Reflections on Clinical Gait Analysis." In *Journal of Electromyography and Kinesiology*, Elsevier, 251–57.
- Digo, Elisa, Giuseppina Pierro, Stefano Pastorelli, and Laura Gastaldi. 2020. "Evaluation of Spinal Posture during Gait with Inertial Measurement Units." *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part H: Journal of Engineering in Medicine* 234(10): 1094–1105.
- Gastaldi, Laura et al. 2015. "Effects of Botulinum Neurotoxin on Spatio-Temporal Gait Parameters of Patients with Chronic Stroke: A Prospective Open-Label Study." *Eur J Phys Rehabil Med* 51(5): 609–18.
- Hebenstreit, Felix et al. 2015. "Effect of Walking Speed on Gait Sub Phase Durations." *Human Movement Science* 43: 118–24.
- Kadaba, M. P. et al. 1989. "Repeatability of Kinematic, Kinetic, and Electromyographic Data in Normal Adult Gait." *Journal of Orthopaedic Research* 7(6): 849–60. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/jor.1100070611> (September 29, 2020).
- Liu, Yancheng et al. 2014. "Gait Phase Varies over Velocities." *Gait and Posture* 39(2): 756–60.
- McCamley, John, Marco Donati, Eleni Grimpampi, and Claudia Mazzà. 2012. "An Enhanced Estimate of Initial Contact and Final Contact Instants of Time Using Lower Trunk Inertial Sensor Data." *Gait and Posture* 36(2): 316–18.
- Moon, Sang Bok et al. 2017. "Gait Analysis of Hemiplegic Patients in Ambulatory Rehabilitation Training Using a Wearable Lower-Limb Robot: A Pilot Study." *Int J Prec Eng and Manufacturing* 18(12): 1773–81.
- Pacini Panebianco, Giulia, Maria Cristina Bisi, Rita Stagni, and Silvia Fantozzi. 2018. "Analysis of the Performance of 17 Algorithms from a Systematic Review: Influence of Sensor Position, Analysed Variable and Computational Approach in Gait Timing Estimation from IMU Measurements." *Gait and Posture* 66(April): 76–82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2018.08.025>.
- Panero, E., E. Digo, V. Agostini, and L. Gastaldi. 2018. "Comparison of Different Motion Capture Setups for Gait Analysis: Validation of Spatio-Temporal Parameters Estimation." In *MeMeA 2018 - 2018 IEEE International Symposium on Medical Measurements and Applications, Proceedings*, Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc.
- Panero, E, L Gastaldi, and W Rapp. 2018. "Two-Segments Foot Model for Biomechanical Motion

- Analysis.” In *Mechanisms and Machine Science*, Springer Netherlands, 988–95.
- Petraglia, Federica et al. 2019. “Inertial Sensors versus Standard Systems in Gait Analysis: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis.” *Eur J of Phy and Rehab Med* 55(2): 265–80.
- Prakash, Chandra, Rajesh Kumar, and Namita Mittal. 2018. “Recent Developments in Human Gait Research: Parameters, Approaches, Applications, Machine Learning Techniques, Datasets and Challenges.” *Artificial Int Review* 49(1): 1–40.
- Shirakawa, Tomohiro et al. 2017. “Gait Analysis and Machine Learning Classification on Healthy Subjects in Normal Walking.” *Int J Parallel, Emergent and Distributed Systems* 32(2): 185–94.
- Trojaniello, Diana et al. 2014. “Estimation of Step-by-Step Spatio-Temporal Parameters of Normal and Impaired Gait Using Shank-Mounted Magneto-Inertial Sensors: Application to Elderly, Hemiparetic, Parkinsonian and Choreic Gait.” *J NeuroEng and Rehab* 11(1): 1–12.
- Veilleux, Louis Nicolas et al. 2016. “Agreement of Spatio-Temporal Gait Parameters between a Vertical Ground Reaction Force Decomposition Algorithm and a Motion Capture System.” *Gait and Posture* 43: 257–64. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2015.10.007>.
- Yang, Gelan et al. 2019. “Review Wearable Sensing System for Gait Recognition.” *Cluster Computing* 22(2): 3021–29.
- Yang, Shuozi, and Qingguo Li. 2012. “Inertial Sensor-Based Methods in Walking Speed Estimation: A Systematic Review.” *Sensors* 12(5): 6102–16.
- Zijlstra, Wiebren, and At L. Hof. 2003. “Assessment of Spatio-Temporal Gait Parameters from Trunk Accelerations during Human Walking.” *Gait and Posture* 18(2): 1–10.