

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

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

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

Takeshi Akimoto<sup>1,2,\*</sup>, Kenji Kawamura<sup>1</sup>, Takaaki Wada<sup>2</sup>, Naomichi Ishihara<sup>2</sup>, Akane  
Yokota<sup>2</sup>, Takehiko Sugino-shita<sup>2</sup>, Shigeki Yokoyama<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Graduate School of Health Science, Kibi International University, Takahashi-shi, Okayama,  
Japan  
<sup>2</sup> Department of Orthopedics, Medical Corporation Sugino-shita Orthopedic Clinic, Rokujizo,  
Uji-shi, Kyoto, Japan  
<sup>3</sup> Graduate School of Health Science, Kyoto Tachibana University, Yamashina-ku, Kyoto-shi,  
Kyoto, Japan

\*Corresponding author:  
Email: sugino-shita.c.akimoto@gmail.com (TA)

## 22 Abstract

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

43

## 44 Introduction

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

86

## 87 **Materials and Methods**

88

### 89 **Participants**

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

included in the knee OA group [age:  $70.8 \pm 5.7$  years, height:  $1.56 \pm 0.05$  m, weight:  $56.6 \pm 6.4$  kg, body mass index (BMI):  $23.3 \pm 2.4$  kg/m<sup>2</sup>], and 12 healthy elderly women living in the community were included in the healthy group (age:  $69.8 \pm 8.1$  years, height:  $1.53 \pm 0.06$  m, weight:  $53.5 \pm 6.1$  kg, BMI:  $22.9 \pm 2.9$  kg/m<sup>2</sup>). The Kibi International University Ethics Committee approved all measures of this study (approval number: 19-14). All participants provided written informed consent before participating in the study.

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

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

## Measurement Method

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

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

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

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

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

141

## 142 **Statistical Analysis**

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

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

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

160

## 161 **Results**

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

165 **Table 1. Participant characteristics**

	Knee OA group (n=24)	Healthy group (n=12)	p- value	Effect size r
Age (years)	70.8 (5.7)	69.8 (8.1)	p=0.80	0.05
Height (m)	1.56 (0.05)	1.53 (0.06)	p=0.14	0.25
Body mass (kg)	56.6 (6.4)	53.5 (6.1)	p=0.38	0.15
BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	23.3 (2.4)	22.9 (2.9)	p=0.68	0.07
KL Score (n)				
Grade 0				
Grade 1				
Grade 2				
Grade 3				

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

167 Kellgren–Lawrence

168

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

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

177



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

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

180 Data are presented as mean ( $\pm$  SD). WOMAC: Western Ontario and McMaster Universities  
181 Osteoarthritis Index; OA: osteoarthritis; ROM: range of motion; 5MWT: 5-meter walk test;  
182 TUG: Timed Up & Go test;

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

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

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

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

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

## Discussion

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Research limitations

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

## Conclusion

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

275

## 276 Acknowledgments

277 We would like to thank Editage ([www.editage.com](http://www.editage.com)) for English language editing.

278

## 279 References

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

299 patients with knee osteoarthritis and healthy adults using 3D motion analysis and  
300 activity monitoring: an exploratory case-control analysis. *Orthop Res Rev.*  
301 2019;11:129-140.

302 [7] Ismailidis P, Hegglin L, Egloff C, Pagenstert G, Kernen R, Eckardt A, et al. Side to  
303 side kinematic gait differences within patients and spatiotemporal and kinematic gait  
304 differences between patients with severe knee osteoarthritis and controls measured  
305 with inertial sensors. *Gait Posture.* 2021;84:24-30

306 [8] Peixoto JG, de Souza Moreira B, Diz JBM, Timoteo EF, Kirkwood RN, Teixeira-  
307 Salmela LF. Analysis of symmetry between lower limbs during gait of older women  
308 with bilateral knee osteoarthritis. *Aging Clin Exp Res.* 2019;31:67-73.

309 [9] Clermont CA, Barden JM. Accelerometer-based determination of gait variability in  
310 older adults with knee osteoarthritis. *Gait Posture.* 2016;50:126-130.

311 [10] Tanimoto K, Takahashi M, Tokuda K, Sawada T, Anan M, Shinkoda K.  
312 Lower limb kinematics during the swing phase in patients with knee osteoarthritis  
313 measured using an inertial sensor. *Gait Posture.* 2017;57:236-240.

314 [11] Kiss RM. Effect of severity of knee osteoarthritis on the variability of gait  
315 parameters. *J Electromyogr Kinesiol.* 2011;21:695-703.

316 [12] Oka T, Asai T, Kubo H, Fukumoto Y. Association of fear of falling with  
317 acceleration-derived gait indices in older adults with knee osteoarthritis. *Aging Clin*  
318 *Exp Res.* 2019;31:645-651.

319 [13] Yakhdani HR, Bafghi HA, Meijer OG, Bruijn SM, van den Dikkenberg N,  
320 Stibbe AB, et al. Stability and variability of knee kinematics during gait in knee  
321 osteoarthritis before and after replacement surgery. *Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon).*  
322 2010;25:230-236.

323 [14] Hausdorff JM, Rios DA, Edelberg HK. Gait variability and fall risk in  
324 community-living older adults: a 1-year prospective study. Arch Phys Med Rehabil.  
325 2001;82:1050-1056.

326 [15] Balasubramanian CK, Clark DJ, Gouelle A. Validity of the gait variability  
327 index in older adults: effect of aging and mobility impairments. Gait Posture.  
328 2015;41:941-946.

329 [16] Bogen B, Moe-Nilssen R, Aaslund MK, Ranhoff AH. Muscle Strength as a  
330 Predictor of Gait Variability after Two Years in Community-Living Older Adults. J  
331 Frailty Aging. 2020;9:23-29.

332 [17] Matsuda K, Ikeda S, Nakahara M, Ikeda T, Okamoto R, Kurosawa K, et al.  
333 Factors affecting the coefficient of variation of stride time of the elderly without  
334 falling history: a prospective study. J Phys Ther Sci. 2015;27:1087-1090.

335 [18] Borg G. Perceived exertion as an indicator of somatic stress. Scand J Rehabil  
336 Med. 1970;2:92-98

337 [19] Amano T, Suzuki N. Minimal Detectable Change for Motor Function Tests in  
338 Patients with Knee Osteoarthritis. Prog Rehabil Med. 2018;3:20180022.

339 [20] Podsiadlo D, Richardson S. The timed "Up & Go": a test of basic functional  
340 mobility for frail elderly persons. J Am Geriatr Soc. 1991;39:142-148.

341 [21] Bellamy N, Buchanan WW, Goldsmith CH, Campbell J, Stitt LW. Validation  
342 study of WOMAC: a health status instrument for measuring clinically important  
343 patient relevant outcomes to antirheumatic drug therapy in patients with osteoarthritis  
344 of the hip or knee. J Rheumatol. 1988;15:1833-1840.

345 [22] Asai T, Misu S, Sawa R, Doi T, Yamada M. The association between fear of  
346 falling and smoothness of lower trunk oscillation in gait varies according to gait speed  
347 in community-dwelling older adults. J Neuroeng Rehabil. 2017;14:5.



348 [23] Ayoubi F, Launay CP, Kabeshova A, Fantino B, Annweiler C, Beauchet O.  
349 The influence of fear of falling on gait variability: results from a large elderly  
350 population-based cross-sectional study. *J Neuroeng Rehabil*. 2014;11:128.

351 [24] Espinosa SE, Costello KE, Souza RB, Kumar D. Lower knee extensor and  
352 flexor strength is associated with varus thrust in people with knee osteoarthritis. *J*  
353 *Biomech*. 2020;107:109865.

354 [25] Uritani D, Fukumoto T, Myodo T, Fujikawa K, Usui M, Tatara D. The  
355 association between toe grip strength and osteoarthritis of the knee in Japanese  
356 women: A multicenter cross-sectional study. *PLoS One*. 2017;12:e0186454.

357 [26] Kalsi-Ryan S, Rienmueller AC, Riehm L, Chan C, Jin D, Martin AR, et al.  
358 Quantitative assessment of gait characteristics in degenerative cervical myelopathy: a  
359 prospective clinical study. *J Clin Med*. 2020;9:E752.

360 [27] Inoue W, Ikezoe T, Tsuboyama T, Sato I, Malinowska KB, Kawaguchi T, et  
361 al. Are there different factors affecting walking speed and gait cycle variability  
362 between men and women in community-dwelling older adults. *Aging Clin Exp Res*.  
363 2017;29:215-221.

364 [28] Lord S, Howe T, Greenland J, Simpson L, Rochester L. Gait variability in  
365 older adults: a structured review of testing protocol and clinimetric properties. *Gait*  
366 *Posture*. 2011;34:443-450.

367 [29] Owings TM, Grabiner MD. Measuring step kinematic variability on an  
368 instrumented treadmill: how many steps are enough. *J Biomech*. 2003;36:1215-1218.

369 [30] Barden JM, Clermont CA, Kobsar D, Beauchet O. Accelerometer-based step  
370 regularity is lower in older adults with bilateral knee osteoarthritis. *Front Hum*  
371 *Neurosci*. 2016;10:625.

372

## 373    **Supporting information**

### 374    **S1 Table. Research Data**