1 **3-D kinematic comparison of treadmill and overground running.**

2

3 *Sinclair, J. [1], Richards, J [2], Taylor PJ[3], Edmundson CJ[1], Brooks, D[1] and Hobbs SJ[1]*

4 [1] Division of Sport, Exercise and Nutritional Sciences, University of Central

5 Lancashire

6 [2] Allied Health Professionals, University of Central Lancashire

7 3. Department of Psychology, University of Central Lancashire

8

9 **Corresponding Author Contact Details:**

10 Jonathan Sinclair,

11 Division of Sport, Exercise and Nutritional Sciences

12 Centre for Applied Sport and Exercise Sciences,

13 University of Central Lancashire,

14 Preston

15 Lancashire

16 PR1 2HE.

17 e-mail: Jsinclair1@uclan.ac.uk

18

23 **Word count: 3221**

ABSTRACT

Studies investigating the mechanics of human movement are often conducted using the treadmill. The treadmill is an attractive device for the analysis of human locomotion. Studies comparing overground and treadmill running have analyzed discrete variables, however differences in excursion from footstrike to peak angle and range of motion during stance have yet to be examined. This study aimed to examine the 3-D kinematics of the lower extremities during overground and treadmill locomotion to determine the extent to which the two modalities differ. Twelve participants ran at 4.0m/s in both treadmill and overground conditions. 3-D angular kinematic parameters during the stance phase were collected using an eight camera motion analysis system. Hip, knee and ankle joint kinematics were quantified in the sagittal, coronal and transverse planes, then compared using paired t-tests. Of the parameters analyzed hip flexion at footstrike 12° hip range of motion 17°, peak hip flexion 12.7°, hip transverse plane range of motion 8° peak knee flexion 5° and peak ankle excursion range 6.6°, coronal plane ankle angle at toe-off 6.5° and peak ankle eversion 6.3° were found to be significantly different. These results lead to the conclusion that the mechanics of treadmill locomotion cannot be generalized to overground.

INTRODUCTION

A number of studies investigating the mechanics of human movement have been conducted using the treadmill. The treadmill presents an environment where

variables such as velocity and gradient can be standardized and reproduced consistently (Schache et al., 2001). Furthermore, the treadmill allows a larger number of steps to be captured and ensures that continuous movement kinematics are obtained. Thus the treadmill may facilitate a more repeatable pattern of movement in comparison to the short discontinuous trials associated with overground analyses (Fellin et al., 2010). Although this is advantageous it must be demonstrated that the treadmill does not alter the mechanics of the examined movements in comparison to overground motion (Brand and Crowninshield, 1984). There remains debate regarding the assumption that treadmill running approximates overground running. A number of investigations have been conducted examining the biomechanical differences between the two conditions (Nigg et al., 1995, Schache et al., 2001, Fellin et al., 2010, Riley et al 2008 Frishberg, (1983), and Gamble et al., (1988); the results however are often conflicting.

Using a theoretical literature review Van Ingen Schenau, (1980) proposed that the mechanics of overground and treadmill locomotion are similar provided that velocity is maintained. A number of studies have examined the kinematic differences between overground and treadmill walking. Lee and Hidler, (2007) established that peak flexion and extension measures of the lower extremities did not differ between the two conditions. Alton et al., (1998), Matsas et al., (2000) and Riley PO et al., (2007) found comparable sagittal plane knee kinematics during overground and treadmill locomotion. Strathy et al., (1983) found that knee joint angular kinematics in the coronal and transverse planes did not differ significantly between the two conditions. Alton et al., (1998) and Riley PO et al., (2007) reported significantly greater hip range of motion and flexion angles during treadmill locomotion.

74

75   The kinematics of running have also been compared between overground and

76   treadmill locomotion. Frishberg, (1983), Gamble et al., (1988) and Schache et al.,

77   (2001) observed that overground running was associated with increased hip flexion

78   at initial contact, whilst Schache et al., (2001) found no alterations in transverse

79   plane hip motion between the two conditions. There is currently a paucity of

80   comprehensive comparisons regarding the 3-D kinematics of the lower extremities

81   during treadmill and overground running during the stance phase. Riley PO et al.,

82   (2008) examined the differences in hip, knee and ankle joint kinematics from both

83   treadmill and overground motion. However they examined only maximum and

84   minimum angles of the full gait cycle, therefore as the majority of these occurred

85   during the swing phase; angles during the stance phase were not compared.

86   Similarly Fellin et al., (2010) investigated lower extremity motion during both treadmill

87   and overground locomotion; their examination utilized a trend symmetry design

88   which is an effective method of comparing the similarities between kinematic curves,

89   but it does not examine the differences in lower extremity angulation between the

90   two conditions. Furthermore, investigations that have been conducted to date, have

91   been restricted to discrete kinematic parameters and have thus failed to consider the

92   range of motion and excursion from footstrike to peak angle during stance.

93

94   The aim of the current investigation was to assess the extent to which the stance

95   phase mechanics of overground and treadmill locomotion are similar during running.

96   Specifically the 3-D angular kinematics of the lower extremity joints were observed

97   during overground running and compared to the corresponding data from the

98   treadmill.

99

METHOD

Participants

Eleven males and one female who were free from musculoskeletal injury volunteered to take part in this study. Participants were active recreational runners engaging in training at least 3 times per week whilst completing a minimum of 25 km per week and had previous experience of treadmill running. Participants encompassed a range of footstrike characteristics. The mean characteristics of the participants were; age 22.5 ± 4.2 years, height 1.71 ± 0.06m and body mass 75.4 ± 8.4 kg. An a priori power analysis was conducted using the Hopkins method based on a moderate effect size and a power measure of 80%, which suggested that 12 subjects were adequate for the design. The study was approved by the School of Psychology ethical committee, and all participants provided written informed consent.

Procedure

All kinematic data were captured at 250 Hz via an eight camera motion analysis system (Qualisys Medical, Goteburg, Sweden). Two separate camera systems were used to collect each mode of running. Calibration of the Qualysis™ systems was performed before each data collection session. Only calibrations which produced average residuals of less than 0.85 mm for each camera for a 750.5 mm wand length and points above 4000 in all cameras were accepted prior to data collection. The order in which participants performed in each condition was counterbalanced. The marker set used for the study was based on the calibrated anatomical systems technique (CAST) technique using a 6 degrees of freedom (DOF) model (Cappozzo et al., 1995). A static trial was conducted with the participant in the anatomical

position (Figure 1) allowing the positions of the anatomical markers to be referenced in relation to the tracking clusters, following which they were removed. Markers used for tracking remained in place for the duration of the treadmill and overground analyses.

Retro-reflective markers were attached to the 1st and 5th metatarsal heads, medial and lateral malleoli, medial and lateral epicondyle of the femur, greater trochanter of the right leg, iliac crest, anterior superior iliac spines and posterior superior iliac spines with tracking clusters positioned on the shank and thigh. All markers were positioned by the first author. Hip joint centre was determined based on the Bell, et al., (1989) equations via on the positions of the PSIS and ASIS markers. Each rigid cluster comprised four 19mm spherical reflective markers mounted to a thin sheath of lightweight carbon fiber with length to width ratios of 2.05:1 and 1.5:1 for the femur and tibia respectively, in accordance with Cappozzo et al., (1997) recommendations. Participants wore the same footwear throughout Saucony pro grid guide 2 in sizes 6-9.

@@@Figure 1 near here@@@

Given that the treadmill did not feature an integrated force platform, heel strike and toe-off events during both treadmill and overground running were determined using kinematic data based on the Dingwell et al., (2001) method. Footstrike was deemed to be the first occurrence of peak knee extension and toe-off was determined as the second occurrence of the peak knee extension (Sinclair et al., 2012).

6

148   *Overground*

149   In the overground condition participants ran at 4.0 m/s in one direction across a 22 m

150   long biomechanics laboratory floor (Altrosports 6 mm, Altro Ltd, Letchworth Garden

151   City, Hertfordshire). Running velocity was monitored using infrared timing gates

152   Newtest 300 (Newtest, Oulu Finland); a maximum deviation of ± 5% from the set

153   velocity was allowed. Runners completed a minimum of six successful trials. A

154   successful trial was defined as one within the specified velocity range, where all

155   tracking clusters were in view of the cameras and with no evidence of gait

156   modification due to the experimental conditions.

157

158   *Treadmill*

159   A Woodway^{TM} (ELG, Steinackerstrasse D-79576 Weil Rhein-Germany) high power

160   slatted treadmill maintained at a gradient of 0% was used throughout. Participants

161   were given a five minute habitation period, in which participants ran at the

162   determined velocity, following which the treadmill was stopped for 30's, and

163   participants dismounted the treadmill before mounting the treadmill for data analysis

164   in accordance with the Alton et al., (1998) recommendation. When participants

165   indicated that they were ready to begin, the treadmill was started and the velocity of

166   the belt was gradually increased until the speed matched that of overground

167   locomotion (4.0m/s). Six trials were recorded.

168

169   *Data Processing*

170   Trials were processed in Qualisys Track Manager in order to identify anatomical and

171   tracking markers then exported as C3D files. Kinematic parameters were quantified

172   using Visual 3-D (C-Motion, Gaithersburg, USA) after marker data was filtered using

173   a low pass Butterworth 4th order zero-lag filter at a cut off frequency of 10 Hz which

174   was selected as being the frequency at which 95% of the signal power was below. 3-

175   D kinematics of the hip, knee and ankle joints were calculated using an XYZ cardan

176   sequence of rotations (where X is flexion-extension; Y is ab-adduction and is Z is

177   internal-external rotation). All data were normalized to 100% of the stance phase

178   then processed gait trials were averaged. 3-D kinematic measures from the hip,

179   knee and ankle which were extracted for statistical analysis were 1) angle at

180   footstrike, 2) angle at toe-off, 3) range of motion from footstrike to toe-off during

181   stance, 4) peak angle during stance and 5) peak angular excursion from footstrike to

182   peak angle. These variables were extracted from each of the six trials for each joint

183   in all three planes of rotation and the data was then averaged across participants for

184   statistical analysis. Participants kinematic curves for each joint angle were time

185   normalized to stance were ensemble averaged for visual purposes only.

186

187   *Statistical analysis*

188   Descriptive statistics (mean ± standard deviation) were calculated for the outcome

189   measures. To compare differences in 3-D kinematic parameters paired t-tests were

190   utilized with an adjusted alpha level of $p=0.01$ based on the number of comparisons

191   made for each joint in each of the three planes of rotation. The Shapiro-Wilk statistic

192   for each condition confirmed that the data were normally distributed. All statistical

193   procedures were conducted using SPSS 17.0 (SPSS Inc, Chicago, USA).

194   **RESULTS**

195 Figure 2 presents mean 3-D angular motions of the hip, knee and ankle during the

196 stance phase of both treadmill and overground running. Tables' 1, 2 and 3 show

197 means, standard deviations and the results of the statistical analysis of the outcome

198 measures.

199

200 Of the 45 observed parameters 8 exhibited significant p≤0.01 differences between

201 overground and treadmill running (tables 1-3). The majority of the kinematic

202 differences between the two modalities were observed in the sagittal plane. At the

203 hip joint overground runners exhibited 12°, p=0.001 more hip flexion at footstrike,

204 17°, p=0.001 more hip range of motion and 12.7°, p=0.001 more peak flexion than in

205 the treadmill condition and 8°, p=0.01 more transverse plane range of motion. At the

206 knee overground runners were found to be associated with greater peak knee flexion

207 5°, p=0.01. At the ankle overground runners exhibited 6.5°, p=0.01 more excursion

208 from footstrike to peak angle and 5.7°, p=0.007 more inversion, whereas treadmill

209 runners were associated with 6.3°, p=0.006 more peak eversion.

210

211 **@@@@@ Figure 2 near here @@@@@**

212

213 **@@@@@ Table 1 near here @@@@@**

214 **@@@@@ Table 2 near here @@@@@**

215 **@@@@@ Table 3 near here @@@@@**

216 **DISCUSSION**

217   The aim of this study was to provide a 3-D kinematic comparison of treadmill and

218   overground running. This study represents the first comparative study specifically

219   concerning the lower extremity 3-D angular range of motion and peak excursion

220   parameters during the stance phase between the two conditions. The results indicate

221   that several kinematic differences were observed between the two running modalities.

222

223   It has been proposed that the mechanics of treadmill locomotion are similar to

224   overground provided that velocity remains constant (Van Ingen Schenau, 1980).

225   However, in this study significant differences between overground and treadmill

226   running were found for sagittal plane hip rotation. Overground running was associated

227   with increased peak hip flexion and flexion angle at initial contact. This concurs with

228   the findings of Schache et al., (2001) who observed similar increases in hip flexion

229   during overground running.

230

231   Overground running in this experiment was also associated with an increased range of

232   motion in hip flexion-extension, which was a product of increased hip flexion at

233   footstrike during overground running, as hip flexion at toe-off was found to be similar

234   for the two conditions. This finding agrees with the findings of Frishberg (1983),

235   Gamble et al., (1988) and Schache et al., (2001). These findings may be attributable to

236   the reduced stride lengths that have been observed previously during treadmill running

237   (Wank et al., 1998). Furthermore, it is hypothesized that the slatted treadmill belt may

238   have acted as a visual cue which served to further accentuate this adaptation causing

239   the large difference between the two conditions. Future, research may therefore wish

240 to investigate the influence of both slatted and smooth treadmill belts of the 3-D

241 kinematics of running.

242

243 Furthermore, Alton et al., (1998) hypothesized that participants utilized these

244 mechanics as a means of avoiding falling off the back of the treadmill and/or keeping

245 up with the belt speed. The results of the current investigation appear to oppose this

246 notion in that participants did not exhibit similar patterns, despite moving at a greater

247 velocity, as fear of falling and pressure to maintain a stipulated speed would

248 theoretically be amplified by an increased belt velocity. It is also probable that the

249 length of the treadmill utilized during this investigation (1.0m longer than that reported

250 by Alton et al., 1998), decreased participants concern that they might fall off the

251 treadmill. Future investigations may wish to assess subjective feedback from

252 participants in order to determine the underlying mechanisms behind gait alterations.

253

254 The significant increase in transverse plane range of motion contradict the results of

255 Schache et al., (2001) and Fellin et al., (2010) who found no differences in transverse

256 plane hip joint angular kinematics between overground and treadmill locomotion.

257 Furthermore, the transverse plane hip rotation curve appears to contrast previous

258 research investigating running kinematics, in that participants exhibited external

259 rotation at footstrike and continued externally rotating throughout stance. It is

260 hypothesized that this is attributable to the predominantly male sample utilized in the

261 current investigation, as males have been shown to exhibit greater active hip external

262 rotation than females (Ferber et al., 2003).

263

The increase in peak knee flexion during overground running has not been reported previously. It is proposed that this finding is attributable to the difference in centre of mass progression during overground running as the centre of mass moves over the stance limb the proximal end of the tibia must move forwards, facilitating an increase in knee flexion. Similarly, the significant increase in the angular excursion from footstrike to peak dorsiflexion has not been reported previously within the literature. It is proposed that this is also attributable to the increase in centre of mass progression in the overground condition. Given that the foot is fixed during the majority of the stance phase, forward motion of the centre of mass forces the tibia to move over the ankle joint creating the dorsiflexion range of motion. This finding may also relate to differences in surface hardness between the two conditions. The increase in dorsiflexion range of motion in conjunction with peak knee flexion may act as a deceleration mechanism which serves to reduce loading of the lower extremity structures (Bobbert et al., 1992).

278

Observation of the statistical data and kinematic curves of the knee joint in the coronal plane suggests that the knee is biased towards abduction for the entire stance phase. This is perhaps surprising given the predominantly male sample (Malinzak et al., 2001), yet this finding does concur with the findings of Ferber et al., (2003) who also observed that male runners were biased towards abduction. Given that knee angular kinematics outside the sagittal plane are sensitive to the method used to predict the hip joint centre (Stagni et al., 2000); it is possible that inter-study variations in knee coronal plane mechanics may relate to the different methods of

quantifying the location of the hip joint centre. A number of techniques currently exist which may include radiographic (Bell et al., (1990), anatomical Bell et al., (1989), functional (Cappozzo, 1984; Leardini et al., 1999) and projection (Weinhandl and O'Connor, 2010) based methods, all of which may influence the resultant knee position (Stagni et al., 2000). Although the efficacy and validity of each method have been reported to justify their utilization, there is currently a lack of consensus regarding the most appropriate technique which future research may wish to address.

During during treadmill running, the ankle was found to be slightly more dorsiflexed at footstrike. This finding contrasts the findings of Wank et al., (1998), Fellin et al., (2010) and Nigg et al., (1995), who found decreased ankle dorsiflexion at footstrike. This change in sagittal plane ankle position at foot contact may relate to a change in strike pattern as plantar/dorsi flexion of the ankle is one of the mechanisms by which leg stiffness is regulated (Bishop et al., 2006). It is hypothesized that the reduced stiffness of the treadmill surface may have led to the increased dorsiflexion at footstrike as runners have been found to adjust their leg stiffness in response to differences in surface hardness (Bishop et al., 2006).

The significant increase in eversion magnitude is in contrast to the observations of Fellin et al (2010) who reported no differences in rearfoot eversion parameters between treadmill and overground running. This finding may relate to the deformation characteristics of the surface during the treadmill condition and has potential clinical significance. These findings suggest that running on this type of treadmill may be

311 associated with an increased risk from injury as rearfoot eversion is implicated in the

312 aetiology of a number of overuse injuries (Willems et al., 2004, Lee et al ., 2010,

313 Taunton et al ., 2002 and Duffey et al., 2000). Therefore treadmill runners may be at a

314 greater risk from overuse syndromes such as tibial stress syndrome, plantar fasciitis

315 and anterior knee pain (Willems et al., 2004, Lee et al., 2010, Taunton et al., 2002 and

316 Duffey et al., 2000).

317 A number of previous investigations examining the mechanics of treadmill and

318 overground locomotion attribute the differences between the two conditions to a lack of

319 familiarization to the treadmill protocol (Wall and Charteris, 1981). Mastas et al., (2000)

320 proposes studies reporting significant differences between the two conditions

321 locomotion have generally put little emphasis on subject familiarisation to treadmill

322 locomotion and concluded that differences may disappear following an appropriate

323 accommodation period. The results of this study appear to oppose this claim as a

324 number of significant differences were observed despite the utilization of a five minute

325 accommodation period. Furthermore, the findings of the current investigation appear to

326 be representative and as Matsas et al., (2000) found that reliable kinematic

327 measurements could be obtained following 4 minutes of treadmill habituation.

328

329 *Limitations*

330 The means by which footstrike and toe-off were determined differed from conventional

331 methods as the treadmill did not feature an integrated force platform. Given this

332 limitation the stance and swing phases were separated using kinematic data using the

333 Dingwell et al., (1998) method. A number of methods have been utilized for the

334 determination of gait events using kinematic data (Alton et al., 1998, Hreljac and

14

335 Stergiou., 2001, Zeni et al., 2008, O'Connor et al., 2003 and Schache et al., 2001).

336 However, although these computational methods are repeatable they are known to be

337 associated with error when contrasted to the gold-standard method using force

338 platform data (Fellin et al., 2010 and Sinclair et al., 2011).

339 A possible limitation is that this study observed right foot contact only. Bilateral studies

340 are considered to be more appropriate as symmetry between limbs is unlikely

341 (Cavanagh and Lafortune, 1980). Another prospective restriction of the current

342 investigation is that the results are specific exclusively to the treadmill and surface

343 conditions as well as the velocity of motion and variations in these parameters would

344 likely cause changes in the runners movement strategy, additional work should

345 therefore be conducted examining the effect of different treadmills on gait mechanics.

346

347 *Conclusions*

348 The results of this study suggest that treadmill should be utilized with caution within

349 clinical and research settings in terms of its ability to mimic the mechanics of

350 overground running. Furthermore, given that injury patterns may to differ between the

351 two conditions it is also recommended that runners consider their primary method of

352 training when selecting the most appropriate footwear for their needs as treadmill

353 runners are likely to require footwear with additional medial stability properties, aimed

354 at reducing rearfoot eversion.

355

356

357

References

358

359   1. Alton, F., Baldey, L., Caplan, S., and Morrissey, M.C., (1998). A kinematic

360   comparison of overground and treadmill walking. Clinical Biomechanics, **13**,

361   434-440.

362   2. Bell, A.L., Brand, R.A., and Pedersen, D.R., (1989). Prediction of hip joint

363   centre location from external landmarks, Human Movement Science, **8**, 3-16.

364   3. Bell, A.L., Pedersen, D.R., and Brand, R.A., (1990). A comparison of the

365   accuracy of several hip center location prediction methods, Journal of

366   Biomechanics, **23**, 617–621.

367   4. Bishop, M., Fiolkowski, P., Conrad, B., Brunt, D., and Horodyski, M. (2006).

368   Athletic footwear, leg stiffness, and running kinematics. Journal of Athletic

369   Training, **41**, 387-392.

370   5. Bobbert, M.F., Yeadon, M.R., and Nigg, B.M., (1992). Mechanical analysis of

371   the landing phase in heel-toe running. Journal of Biomechanics, **28**, 661–668.

372   6. Brand, R.A., and Crowninshield, R.D., (1984). Comment on criteria for patient

373   evaluation tools. Journal of Biomechanics, **14**, 655.

374   7. Cappozzo, A., Catani, F., Leardini, A., Benedeti, M.G., and Della, C.U.,

375   (1995). Position and orientation in space of bones during movement:

376   Anatomical frame definition and determination. Clinical Biomechanics, **10**,

377   171-178.

378   8. Cappozzo, A., Cappello, A., Croce U., and Pensalfini F., (1997). Surface-

379   marker cluster design criteria for 3-D bone movement reconstruction. IEEE

380   Transactions on Biomedical Engineering. **44**, 1165-1174.

381   9. Cappozzo, A., (1984). Gait analysis methodology. Human Movement Science

382   **3**, 27–50.

383   10. Cavanagh, P.R., and Lafortune, M.A., (1980). Ground reaction forces in
384   distance running. Journal of Biomechanics. **13**, 397-406.

385   11. Duffey, M.J., Martin, D.F., Cannon, D.W., Craven, T., and Messier, S.P.,
386   (2000). Etiologic factors associated with anterior knee pain in distance
387   runners, Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise, **32**, 1825-3182.

388   12. Dingwell, J.B., Cusumano, J.P., Sternad, D., and Cavanagh, P.R., (2001).
389   Local Dynamic Stability versus Kinematic Variability of Continuous Overground
390   and Treadmill Walking. Journal of Biomechanical Engineering, **123**, 27-32.

391   13. Fellin, R.E., Rose, W.C., Royer, T.D., and Davis, I.S., (2010). Comparison of
392   methods for kinematic identification of footstrike and toe-off during overground
393   and treadmill running. Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport, **13**, 646-650.

394   14. Fellin, R.E., Manal, K., and Davis, I.S., (2010). Comparison of lower extremity
395   kinematic curves during overground and treadmill running. Journal of Applied
396   Biomechanics, **26**, 407-414.

397   15. Ferber, R., Davis, I.M., and Williams, D.S., (2003). Gender differences in lower
398   extremity mechanics during running. Clinical Biomechanics. **18**, 350– 357.

399   16. Frishberg, B.A., (1983). An analysis of overground and treadmill sprinting.
400   Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise, **15**, 478-485.

401   17. Gamble, D.J., Bartlett, R.M. and Jakeman, P.M., (1988). A comparison of non-
402   motorized treadmill, motorized tread-mill, and overground running pattern. In:
403   Biomechanics in Sport: Papers Prepared for the Engineering in Medicine Group
404   of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Mechanical Engineering Publication
405   Limited, London, 25–32.

406   18. Hreljac, A., and Stergiou, N,. (2000). Phase determination during normal

407   running using kinematic data. Medical and Biological Engineering and

408   Computing, **38**, 503-506.

409   19. Leardini, A., Cappozzo, A., Catani, F., Toksvig-Larsen, S., Petitto, A., Sforza,

410   V., Cassanelli, G., and Giannini, S., (1999). Validation of a functional method

411   for the estimation of hip joint centre location. Journal of Biomechanics, **32**, 99–

412   103.

413   20. Lee, S.J., and Hidler, J., (2007). Biomechanics of overground vs. treadmill

414   walking in healthy individuals. Journal of Applied Physiology, **104**, 747-755.

415   21. Lee, S.Y., Hertel, J., and Lee S.C., (2010). Rearfoot eversion has indirect

416   effects on plantar fascia tension by changing the amount of arch collapse. The

417   foot, **20**, 64-70.

418   22. Malinzak, R.A., Colby, S.M., Kirkendall, D.T., Yu, B., and Garrett, W.E., (2001).

419   A comparison of knee joint motion patterns between men and women in

420   selected athletic tasks, Clinical Biomechanics, **16**, 438–445.

421   23. Mastas, A., Taylor, N., and McBurney, H., (2000). Knee joint kinematics from

422   familiarised treadmill walking can be generalised to overground walking in

423   young unimpaired subjects. Gait and Posture, **11**, 46–53.

424   24. Nigg, B.M., De Boer, R., and Fisher, V., (1995). A kinematic comparison of

425   overground and treadmill running. Medicine and science in sport and exercise,

426   **27**, 98-105.

25. O'Connor, C.M., Thorpe, S.K., O'Malley, M.J., and Vaughan, C.L., (2003). Automatic detection of gait events using kinematic data. Gait and Posture, **25**, 469-474.

26. Riley, P.O., Paolini, G., Croce, U.G., Paylo, K.W,. and Kerrigan, D.C (2007). A kinematic and kinetic comparison of overground and treadmill walking in healthy subjects. Gait and Posture, **26**, 17–24.

27. Riley, P.O., Dicharry, J., Franz, J., Della Croce, U., Wilder, R.P., and Kerrigan D.C., (2008). A kinematics and kinetic comparison of overground and treadmill running. Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise, **40**, 1093-1100.

28. Schache, A.G., Blanch, P.D., Rath, D.A., Wrigley, T.V., Starr, R. and Bennell, K.L., (2001). A comparison of overground and treadmill running for measuring the three-dimensional kinematics of the lumbo-pelvic-hip complex. Clinical Biomechanics, **16**, 667-680.

29. Sinclair, J., Edmundson, C.J., Brooks, D., and Hobbs, S.J., (2011). Evaluation of kinematic methods of identifying gait Events during running. International Journal of Sports Science and Engineering, **5**, 188-192.

30. Stagni, R., Leardini, A., Cappozzo, A., Grazia Benedetti, M., Cappello, A., (2000). Effects of hip joint centre mislocation on gait analysis results. Journal of Biomechanics, **33**, 1479–1487.

31. Strathy, G.M., Chao, E.Y., and Laughton, R.K., (1983). Changes in knee function associated with treadmill ambulation. Journal of Biomechanics, **16**, 517-519.

32. Taunton J.E., Clement, D.B., and McNicol,. K (1982). Plantar Fasciitis in Runners. Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences, **7**, 41-44.

19

451   33. Van Ingen Schenau, G.J., (1980). Some fundamental aspects of the

452   biomechanics of overground versus treadmill locomotion. Medicine and

453   Science in Sports and Exercise, **12**, 257–261.

454   34. Wall, J., and Charteris, A., (1981). Kinematic study of long-term habituation to

455   treadmill walking. Ergonomics, **24**, 531–542.

456   35. Wank, V., Frick, U., and Schmidtbleicher, D., (1998). Kinematics and

457   electromyography of lower limb muscles in overground and treadmill running.

458   International Journal of Sports Medicine, **19**, 455-461.

459   36. Weinhandl, J.T. and O'Connor, K.M., (2010). Assessment of a greater

460   trochanter-based method of locating the hip joint center, Journal of

461   Biomechanics, **43**, 2633–2636.

462   37. Willems, T.M., De Clercq, D., Delbaere, K., Vanderstraeten, G., De Cock, A.,

463   and Witvrouw, E., (2006). A prospective study to gait related risk factors for

464   exercise-related lower leg pain. Gait and Posture, **23**, 91-98.

465   38. Zeni, J.A., Richards, J.G., and Higginson, J.S. (2008). Two simple methods

466   for determining gait events during treadmill and overground walking using

467   kinematic data. Gait and Posture, **27**, 710–714.