



Aalborg Universitet

AALBORG UNIVERSITY
DENMARK

Discrimination of knee osteoarthritis patients from asymptomatic individuals based on pain sensitivity and knee vibroarthrographic recordings

Samani, Afshin; Andersen, Rasmus Elbæk; Arendt-Nielsen, Lars; Madeleine, Pascal Max

Published in:
Physiological Measurement

DOI (link to publication from Publisher):
[10.1088/1361-6579/ab8857](https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6579/ab8857)

Publication date:
2020

Document Version
Accepted author manuscript, peer reviewed version

[Link to publication from Aalborg University](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Samani, A., Andersen, R. E., Arendt-Nielsen, L., & Madeleine, P. M. (2020). Discrimination of knee osteoarthritis patients from asymptomatic individuals based on pain sensitivity and knee vibroarthrographic recordings. *Physiological Measurement*, 41(5), [055002]. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6579/ab8857>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- ? Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- ? You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- ? You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at vbn@aub.aau.dk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

Discrimination of knee osteoarthritis patients from asymptomatic individuals based on pain sensitivity and knee vibroarthrographic recordings

To cite this article before publication: Afshin Samani *et al* 2020 *Physiol. Meas.* in press <https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6579/ab8857>

Manuscript version: Accepted Manuscript

Accepted Manuscript is “the version of the article accepted for publication including all changes made as a result of the peer review process, and which may also include the addition to the article by IOP Publishing of a header, an article ID, a cover sheet and/or an ‘Accepted Manuscript’ watermark, but excluding any other editing, typesetting or other changes made by IOP Publishing and/or its licensors”

This Accepted Manuscript is © 2020 Institute of Physics and Engineering in Medicine.

During the embargo period (the 12 month period from the publication of the Version of Record of this article), the Accepted Manuscript is fully protected by copyright and cannot be reused or reposted elsewhere.

As the Version of Record of this article is going to be / has been published on a subscription basis, this Accepted Manuscript is available for reuse under a CC BY-NC-ND 3.0 licence after the 12 month embargo period.

After the embargo period, everyone is permitted to use copy and redistribute this article for non-commercial purposes only, provided that they adhere to all the terms of the licence <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0>

Although reasonable endeavours have been taken to obtain all necessary permissions from third parties to include their copyrighted content within this article, their full citation and copyright line may not be present in this Accepted Manuscript version. Before using any content from this article, please refer to the Version of Record on IOPscience once published for full citation and copyright details, as permissions will likely be required. All third party content is fully copyright protected, unless specifically stated otherwise in the figure caption in the Version of Record.

View the [article online](#) for updates and enhancements.

1
2
3
4 1
5
6 2 **Discrimination of knee osteoarthritis patients from asymptomatic**
7
8
9 3 **individuals based on pain sensitivity and knee vibroarthrographic**
10
11 4 **recordings**
12
13
14 5
15 6

16 7 Afshin Samani^{*1}, Rasmus Elbæk Andersen^{1,2}, Lars Arendt-Nielsen², Pascal Madeleine¹
18
19

20 8 ¹ Sport Sciences – Performance and Technology, Department of Health Science and
21
22
23 9 Technology, School of Medicine, Aalborg University, Aalborg, Denmark
24

25 10 ² SMI[®], Department of Health Science and Technology, School of Medicine, Aalborg
26
27 11 University, Aalborg, Denmark
28
29
30 12

31 13 **Submission type:** Original article
32
33
34 14

35
36 15 **Address for correspondence:** Associate Professor Afshin Samani, Sport Sciences -
37
38 16 Performance and Technology, Department of Health Science and Technology, School of
39
40 17 Medicine, Aalborg University, Niels Jernes vej 12, 9220 Aalborg East, Denmark. Tel: 00 45
41
42 18 99402411. Fax: 00 45 98154008. Email: afsamani@hst.aau.dk
43
44
45 19
46
47
48 20
49
50 21
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 Recording of knee vibroarthrographic (VAG) activity during activities of daily living (ADL)
3 can contribute to diagnose knee osteoarthritis (KOA). However, classifying KOA patients
4 based on knee VAG during ADL has been an elusive problem not related to knee pain.
5 Therefore, the aims of this study was to classify KOA patients based on 1) VAG during ADL
6 and 2) knee pain sensitivity and then compare their results.

7 The experimental procedure consisted of the recording of VAG signals during four ADLs
8 (over-ground gait, stairs descent, stairs ascent and sit-to-stand) from eight patellar and peri-
9 patellar locations in 20 KOA and 20 asymptomatic participants. Pressure pain thresholds (PPT)
10 were obtained from eight locations around the knee joint to quantify pain sensitivity. A random
11 forest classifier was utilized to identify KOA patients based on VAG signal features and PPTs.
12 The most important features contributing to the classification accuracy were determined. The
13 KOA patients participated in a second identical experimental session to examine the day-to-
14 day reproducibility.

15 The participants were classified with accuracy of 90%, 70%, 64% and 82% during over-ground
16 gait, stairs descent, stairs ascent and sit to stand, respectively. However, the accuracy of the
17 classifier was reduced by about 10-25% due to a systematic bias in the extracted features across
18 days. Features of the VAG signals in time and frequency domains as well as nonlinear features
19 were found importantly contributing towards the classification accuracy. The VAG features
20 extracted from the lateral side of the knee was found to be more informative than other
21 locations. The classification based on PPT reached 77%. Medial and proximal knee PPT points
22 contributed to the classification accuracy. This study showed that using multichannel VAG
23 signals to identify KOA patients allows better accuracy than the use of PPTs. However, VAG
24 setup must be standardized to avoid day-to-day bias.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 **Key Words:** Accelerometer, random forest classification, cross-validation, pressure pain
2 thresholds, algometry

3

Accepted Manuscript

1. Introduction

Knee osteoarthritis (KOA) is a very common disease resulting in millions of years living with disability among affected people around the world [1]. Often excessive biomechanical loading and inflammatory processes involving bone erosion are believed to be of the underlying factors in the development of KOA [2]. Vibroarthrography (VAG) of the knee is a technique recording the vibrations due to intra-and extra-articular movements and frictions during joint motion [3]. VAG is of interest as it could be a new low-cost non-invasive diagnostic tool to provide insight into the relationship between KOA and activities of daily living [4]. With recent advances in developing miniature sensors, VAG can be recorded in a multichannel setup and allow for investigating the spatial dependencies of the VAG signal and its relationship to the underlying joint structure and pain locations [5].

It has recently been shown that common VAG signal features are spatially distributed non-uniformly around the knee joint during knee flexion-extension movements [4]. Such a spatial heterogeneity of the VAG signal distribution is suggested to be the results of variations in the internal pressure distribution applied to the cartilage and synovial fluid [6].

Most studies on VAG signal features have been conducted during open chain movements not characterizing activities of daily living (ADL). Closed kinetic chain exercises have been reported to be effective in rehabilitation of KOA patients [7]. However, studying VAG signals during closed kinetic chain movements has been an elusive problem due to movement artefacts [4].

Even though VAG signals have been used in various studies to characterize KOA patients, it is not clear to what extent the discriminative power of VAG signal can improve the diagnosis beyond relatively simple clinical examinations probing altered sensory manifestations in KOA patients. Pain sensitization is a typical symptom of KOA, which is manifested as increased sensitivity to mechanical, thermal, electrical and chemical stimuli [8,9]. Pressure

1
2
3 1 algometry is a very common technique to assess pain sensitivity reflected in the pressure pain
4
5 2 threshold (PPT) segmentally and extra-segmentally in KOA patients [10]. Similar to
6
7 3 multichannel VAG recordings, multiple PPT assessments allows the spatial localization and
8
9 4 calculation of knee topographical pressure pain sensitivity maps [10]. A recent study has
10
11 5 shown that the assessment of PPTs in KOA patients is reliable over days [11] and enables the
12
13 6 assessment of somatic structures sensitivity over time in KOA patients. Therefore, multiple
14
15 7 PPT assessment can also potentially be utilized to differentiate the KOA patients from
16
17 8 asymptomatic individuals.

18
19 9 The aims of this explorative clinical study were 1) to examine the feasibility of utilizing a
20
21 10 multichannel VAG recorder to reveal the topographical distribution of VAG features and to
22
23 11 classify the KOA patients from asymptomatic controls during ADLs, 2) to examine whether
24
25 12 the classification accuracy of the KOA patients based on VAG signals can reach beyond the
26
27 13 classification accuracy solely based on the participants pain sensitivity reflected in
28
29 14 topographical PPT assessments and 3) determine the day-to-day reproducibility of the
30
31 15 classification results. The fulfillment of the aforementioned aims makes the basis of the novel
32
33 16 aspects of the study. In this paper, the method section describes the characteristics of
34
35 17 participants and their inclusion and exclusion criteria, the experimental protocol and data
36
37 18 recordings including VAG signals and PPTs, the data analysis approach and the adopted
38
39 19 statistical methods to classify the participants. The results section presents the obtained
40
41 20 results in terms of classification accuracy and important features contributing towards the
42
43 21 classification accuracy. Additionally, the distribution of important features across the
44
45 22 recorded anatomical locations and the day-to-day reproducibility of the results are outlined.
46
47 23 In the discussion section, the results are interpreted and compared to relevant existing
48
49 24 literature.

50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 **2. Related work**

1 A previous study has presented a thorough systematic review of existing studies on VAG
2 signals to diagnose KOA patients [12]. Previous studies have successfully utilized VAG
3 signals from one single accelerometer to classify KOA patients and asymptomatic controls
4 [6,13,14] but topographical mapping is now a viable solution using multi-channel recordings
5 [15]. High accuracy in classification (>90%) of KOA patients have been achieved in some
6 studies [16,17] but this has been mainly during activities with open kinetic chain [12]. Some
7 recent studies has shown that VAG signal characteristics may alter in KOA patients during
8 ADLs [15,18] but this has not shown whether that could be generalized and used to
9 effectively discriminate KOA patients from asymptomatic individuals. The non-uniformity of
10 the VAG signal features around the knee joint during ADLs has been indicated [15], but it is
11 not clear whether specific locations around the knee were more informative to differentiate
12 the KOA patients from asymptomatic controls based on VAG signals around the knee joint
13 and which features of the VAG signal are more important for this purpose.

14 **3. Methods**

15 *3.1. Design*

16 The study involved two groups of participants, namely, a KOA patient group (11 males and 9
17 females) and an asymptomatic control group consisting of 20 asymptomatic participants (10
18 males and 10 females). The participants were the same as in a recent cross-sectional study only
19 investigating VAG signal characteristics in KOA patients and controls during ADLs [15]. One
20 subject from each of the groups did not finalize the recording on the second experimental day
21 (see below), therefore, the analysis was performed on 19 subjects in each group. The study was
22 conducted according to the ethical guidelines of the Helsinki Declaration and was approved by
23 the North Denmark Region Committee on Health Research Ethics (VN-20160081). All
24 participants provided written informed consent.

25 *3.2. Participants*

1
2
3 1 The patient group was recruited from a database at the Centre for Clinical and Basic Research
4
5 2 (CCBR, Aalborg, Denmark) and the asymptomatic control group was recruited from the
6
7 3 dwelling community. The diagnosis of KOA was in accordance to the American College of
8
9 4 Rheumatology classification [19] and patients were clinically screened for inclusion. The
10
11 5 KOA patients were included if they were aged 18-80, clinically diagnosed KOA with
12
13 6 Kellgren-Lawrence grade ≥ 2 , self-reported pain during normal walking and BMI <35 , no
14
15 7 use of painkillers in the 24 hours prior to experimentation. The participants in the
16
17 8 asymptomatic control group were matched with the KOA patient group in terms of sex, body
18
19 9 height (169.0 (10.8) vs. 169.8 (9.0) cm), body mass (81.5 (13.0) vs. 77.7 (9.9) Kg) and BMI
20
21 10 (27.2 (3.2) vs. 28.1 (2.7) kg/cm²) but controls were about four years older than the KOA
22
23 11 patients (70.3 yrs. (5.9) vs. 66.2 yrs. (5.2)). The participants in the asymptomatic control
24
25 12 group had neither a history of pain nor use of pain killers 24 h prior the test.

31 13 *3.3. Experimental protocol*

32
33 14 The participants in the KOA patient group took part in two experimental days whereas the
34
35 15 asymptomatic control group had only one experimental day as the study also aimed at
36
37 16 examining the reliability of the study outcomes in the patient group. The experiment
38
39 17 consisted of VAG recordings during several relevant activities of daily living (ADL): (i)
40
41 18 over-ground gait for 40 m, (ii) stairs descent (10 stairs), (iii) stairs ascent (10 stairs) and (iv) 5
42
43 19 repetitions of sit to stand movement as recommended for testing physical functions in KOA
44
45 20 patients [20]. The ADLs (i-iv) were performed with a counterbalanced order and carried out
46
47 21 at a self-chosen speed meaning that the participants were allowed to perform five repetitions
48
49 22 of sit to stand in max of 60 s while their arms were kept alongside their body and not used to
50
51 23 help the movement. The hand railing was not used during stair descent and ascent and the
52
53 24 task was performed at the slowest pace which was comfortable enough for the participants
54
55 25 while maintaining their balance. The subjects were barefoot except wearing their socks.

1 3.4. *Vibroarthrographic recording*

2 During each of the ADLs (i-iv) mentioned above, VAG recording was carried out using a
3 custom-made device based on a Trentadue wireless multichannel recorder (OT Bioelettronica,
4 Torino, Italy), a custom 16 channel accelerometers adaptor and micro machined
5 accelerometers LIS344ALH (ST microelectronics, Geneva, Switzerland). The recording
6 chain has a sensitivity of 600 mV/g and 0-1800 Hz linear transmission. The miniature size
7 (8.5×7 mm) and light weighted (approx. 0.75 g) accelerometers were set to only record the
8 acceleration in the orthogonal direction. The measurement setup is equipped with a band-pass
9 hardware filter (10-500Hz) sampling the VAG signal at 2000 Hz and a gain of three. The data
10 collection was carried out by a custom script (IOIVibcorder, Aalborg University, Aalborg,
11 Denmark) implemented in MATLAB 2016a (The MathWorks, Inc, Natick, Massachusetts,
12 United States).

13 The accelerometers were placed on the most painful knee in the KOA patient group (all right
14 knee except one). In the asymptomatic control group, the accelerometers were placed on the
15 right knee except one participant to keep the knee side balanced between the two groups.

16 Accelerometers were attached to the skin with double sided tape on eight significant points
17 on the knee joint. Four accelerometers were placed on the patella in square form with the side
18 of 1-2 cm, one on the tibial tuberosity below the patella, two on the lateral and medial side of
19 the knee with 1-2 cm from their respective epicondyle of femur towards the patella and
20 finally, one over the quadriceps tendon [4] (see figure 1(b)). The recording package was
21 placed in a belt bag fastened around the participants' waist and the wires were taped to the
22 thigh without any obstruction to natural movements.

23 3.5. *Pressure pain threshold*

24 The PPTs were assessed while the participants lied in a supine position. A handheld
25 algometer (type II, Somedic AB, Hoerby, Sweden) with a tip area of 1 cm² was utilized to

1 register PPTs from eight anatomical locations [11] around the most painful knee in a
2 randomized order (see figure 2(b)). The eight locations were: 2 cm distal to the inferomedial
3 and inferolateral edge of patella, 3 cm lateral to the center of the lateral edge of patella, 2 cm
4 proximal to the superolateral, superior and superomedial edge of patella, 3 cm medial to the
5 center of the medial edge of patella and on the center of patella. The entire procedure for all
6 participants was performed by the same examiner. The procedure involved applying a
7 continuous pressure with an ascending pressure gradient of 30 kPa/s until the participants felt
8 pain and pressed a stop button. The pressure threshold indicated the onset of pain sensation,
9 was registered, and noted by the examiner as the PPT for the specific location. This
10 procedure was repeated three times and the mean value was used for the analysis. A 1-min
11 resting interval was considered between the repetitions to avoid temporal summation [21].

12 *3.6. Data analysis*

13 The VAG signals were converted into SI units (ms^{-2}) and digitally filtered using a band pass
14 FIR filter using a Kaiser window, 10-500 Hz (1453-points, beta: 5.6533). Since the VAG
15 signals captured during ADL were influenced by the mechanical impact of the movement
16 pattern (i.e. cyclic pattern of the movement), the VAG signals were adaptively filtered to
17 further reduce the effect of the common components on the VAG signals due to the
18 movement pattern [6]. For each of the VAG signals recorded from a specific location, the rest




Figure 1 a) Average maps of the spatial interpolation of extracted vibroarthrographic features in 3D. Averaged rectified value (ARV, $\text{mm}\cdot\text{s}^{-2}$), mean power frequency (MPF, Hz), form factor (FF, a.u.), variance of means squared (VoMS, $\text{mm}^4\cdot\text{s}^{-8}$), % of recurrence (%REC), and % of determinism (%DET) of the vibroarthrographic signals recorded using eight accelerometers (depicted to the right side of the figure) during activities of daily living (gait, stairs descent, stairs ascent and sit to stand) among patients with knee osteoarthritis ($N = 19$) and asymptomatic participants ($N = 19$). The interpolation was based on an inverse distance weighting interpolation method (inverse distance weighted interpolation [32]) and solely used for visualization purposes. b) the anatomical location of placing the accelerometers.

1 of the VAG signals were used to render the reference input in a recursive least square
2
3 adaptive filter ($\delta=0.2$ and $\lambda=0.97$) [22]. The reference input was obtained based on the
4
5 synchronized averaging of the VAG signals to improve the signal to noise ratio of the
6
7 common component due to the movement pattern [23]. Additionally, independent component
8
9 analysis was performed to remove components causing unstable baseline [24]. The first and
10
11 last second of the VAG signals were removed to avoid any transient effect at the beginning
12
13 and end of each activity. The VAG signals were analyzed in epochs of four seconds during
14
15 the ADLs [14]. Six features of the signals, i.e., averaged rectified values (ARV), mean power
16
17 frequency (MPF), variance of means squared (VoMS), form factor (FF), the % of
18
19 determinism and recurrence (%DET and %REC) have been suggested reflecting the
20
21 characteristics of the VAG signal thoroughly [12]. ARV represents the signal amplitude,
22
23 MPF is to reflect the central tendency of the frequency spectrum, VoMS and FF indicate the
24
25 relative and absolute variability of the VAG signals [13] and finally (%DET and %REC) are
26
27 to reflect the regularity and deterministic nature of the VAG signals [25]. Recurrent analysis
28
29 was performed on the Z-score of the VAG signals and it was based on portraying the signal
30
31 in a multidimensional space known as embedded space [26]. %REC quantifies how much the
32
33 trajectories of the signal in the embedded space recur (returns to the vicinity of past points).
34
35 %DET determines the fraction of the recurrent points which constitute a deterministic
36
37 pattern. The feature of recurrent analysis have been shown to be reflecting the dynamics of
38
39 the underlying system [25]. To construct the embedding space, the embedding dimension,
40
41 delay and tolerance values were determined based on the global false nearest neighbor
42
43 approach, the drop of auto correlation function below 0.2 and %REC minimization
44
45 optimization method, respectively [26]. As reported previously [4], an embedding dimension
46
47 of five, the delay of 19 ms and the tolerance of 0.2839 were found to be appropriate. As the
48
49 duration of the recordings were different across subjects (self-chosen pace), out of the
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 calculated features equal number of epochs in the middle of the activity were chosen for
 2 conducting the statistical analysis. This resulted in eight, five, two and two epochs during the
 3 over-ground gait, the sit to stand movement, the stairs descent and the stairs ascent,
 4 respectively.




Figure 2 Average maps of the spatial interpolation of pressure pain threshold (PPT, kPa) in 3D. a) PPT maps are depicted for patients with knee osteoarthritis (KOA; $N = 19$) and asymptomatic participants ($N = 19$). The interpolation was based on an inverse distance weighting interpolation method (inverse distance weighted interpolation [32]) and solely used for visualization purposes. b) the anatomical location of obtained PPT points.

3.7. Statistical analysis

A random forest classifier (RFC) was utilized to discriminate between KOA patients and asymptomatic individuals based on the extracted features of VAG signals. The RFC was chosen due to its resistance to overfitting to the training dataset [27] and its invariance to the scaling of the features [28] used in this study. The minimum leaf node size was set to 15 based on a search method to avoid overfitting of the RFC [29]. A set of 100 decision trees were included in the construct of RFC. To choose the features for splitting at the nodes of the decision trees, a curvature test was performed between the features and the class labels, i.e., patient and asymptomatic [30]. The curvature test examines the association of the features and the class label. The importance of the features towards the classification accuracy was

1 determined based a permutation test of the data points not used in the train phase of the trees
2 [31]. The classification error of the RFC was tested by a leave-one-person-out approach to
3 use one participant as the test dataset and the rest of the participants as the training dataset.
4 This procedure was repeated so that all participants used as the test dataset once.
5 Additionally, to examine the reproducibility of the results across days, the error of RFC was
6 calculated with the dataset collected from KOA patients in the second experimental day. As
7 outlined in section 3.6, the VAG recording from each subject was divided into multiple
8 epochs, since the ultimate aim was to classify the participants and not the epochs, each
9 participant was classified based the majority of the assigned labels of his/her epochs. A
10 similar approach was adopted to differentiate between the subjects based on the PPTs with
11 the minimum leaf node size of three as in this case as the number of observations in the
12 dataset was the same as the number of participants and no epoch could be defined for the
13 PPTs.
14 A Mann-Whitney U test was performed to compare the VAG signal features with an
15 important contribution towards the classification performance across the participant groups
16 and across experimental days in the KOA group. A similar approach was performed for the
17 important PPTs for the classification based on the PPTs. If not specified otherwise, the results
18 were presented as the mean (SD).

19 **4. Results**

20 *4.1 Classification accuracy*

21 The classification error for the training, the testing datasets and the second experimental day
22 dataset of the KOA patients were provided (Table 1). The test error was lowest for over-
23 ground gait (16%) and highest for stair ascent (38%). The classification error in the second
24 experimental day increased for all ADLs except for stair descent but the increased error in the
25 second day was more marked for stair ascent (50%). When the participants were classified

1 based on the majority of their epochs, the classification errors of 10%, 30%, 36% and 18%
2 were found for over-ground gait, stairs descent, stairs ascent and sit to stand, respectively.
3 However, the classification error in the second experimental day was increased to 37%, 21%,
4 58% and 25% for over-ground gait, stairs descent, stairs ascent and sit to stand, respectively.
5 The sensitivity, specificity and the area under the receiver operating characteristics of the
6 RFC in all tested ADLs were obtained (Figure 3). The test error based on the PPTs was 23%
7 (42%) and the in the second experimental day the error was quite consistently about 25%.
8 The sensitivity, specificity and the area under the receiver operating characteristics of the
9 RFC based on the PPT points were also obtained (Figure 4).

10 *4.2 Important VAG features and PPT locations*

11 The VAG features extracted from the lateral side of the knee made an important contribution
12 to the classification in all the ADLs (Table 1). Additionally, the features extracted from the
13 medial and distal side of the knee were not found significant in any of the ADLs. Nonlinear
14 features were only found significant in stair decent and sit to stand. The spatial distribution of
15 the extracted VAG signal features are depicted in Figure 1(a). Of note, the maps depicted in
16 this figure visualizes the overall spatial distribution of VAGs of the underlying tissue due to
17 intra-and extra-articular movements as well as frictions during joint motion and are not
18 specific to bone articular surfaces. For illustration of the spatial distribution of VAG features,
19 the VAG features were interpolated based on an inverse distance weighted interpolation
20 approach [32].

21 The detailed results of the comparison between the participant groups in terms of important
22 features in the classification can be found in Table 2. Generally, the KOA patients were
23 characterized by higher ARV, MPF, VoMS, %REC, %DET and lower FF where they found
24 to be important features for classification of the groups. The important features that exhibited
25 a significant bias across the experimental days are presented in Table 3. Wherever a bias

1
2
3 1 across days was found, ARV, MPF and VOMS were found to slightly drop in the second day
4
5 2 and FF was found to slightly increase.
6

7
8 3 The detailed results of the comparison between the participant groups in terms of important
9
10 4 PPT points contributed towards the classification of the participant groups are presented in
11
12 5 Table 4. Increased pain sensitivity, i.e., lower PPT in KOA patients was verified. Particularly,
13
14 6 the contribution of the PPT points on the medial and proximal side of the knee were found
15
16 7 important for the classification. As expected spatial heterogeneity of PPT maps was also
17
18 8 observed (figure 2(a)). The maps depicted in this figure visualizes the overall spatial
19
20 9 distribution of mechanical sensitivity to pain in the underlying tissue and are not specific to
21
22 10 bone articular surfaces. For illustration of the spatial distribution of PPT maps, the PPT
23
24 11 assessments were interpolated based on an inverse distance weighted interpolation approach
25
26 12 [32].
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 3 The receiver operating characteristics for the classification of participants groups based on vibroarthrographic features (the group of knee osteoarthritis participants was set as the positive class). The area under the curve (AUC) is displayed on the figure and the sensitivity and specificity of classification during activities of daily living (over-ground gait, stairs descent, stairs ascent and sit to stand) are presented below the figure. The round black point on the figure is where the discrimination threshold was set to 0.5 and the sensitivity and specificity were computed at this point.

Table 1 The mean (SD) of the error rate of the classification of the random forest classification method in the train dataset, testing dataset and the second experimental day for knee osteoarthritis (KOA) patients. Furthermore, the important features for the classification of the groups, i.e., symptomatic KOA and asymptomatic participants during activities of daily living (gait, stairs descent, stairs ascent and sit to stand) among patients with knee osteoarthritis.

	Training error (%)	Test error (%)	Second day error (%)	Important features
Gait	14.4 (0.8)	16.1 (31.0)	32.9	VAG2_MPF, VAG2_FF, VAG5_MPF
Stair descent	14.1 (1.8)	25.6 (36.0)	15.8	VAG2_ARV, VAG1_FF, VAG2_%REC, VAG1_MPF
Stair ascent	17.8 (2.4)	38.5 (43.6)	50.0	VAG2_ARV, VAG6_ARV, VAG4_FF, VAG2_FF
Sit to stand	15.9 (1.1)	23.1 (31.6)	30.0	VAG4_ARV, VAG4_%DET, VAG2_%REC, VAG4_VoMS

Table 2 The results of the Mann-Whitney U test comparing the symptomatic and asymptomatic groups in term of the important features contributing to the classification performance. The Median [25th -75th percentile] are reported in each case.

	Feature	Mann-Whitney	KOA	Asymptomatic
Gait	VAG2_MPF (Hz)	U= 14611, p< 0.001	66.2 [56.8-90.7]	40.9 [34.7-49.6]
	VAG2_FF (a.u.)	U= 31908, p< 0.001	2.5 [2.0-2.8]	3.4 [3.1-3.8]
	VAG5_MPF (Hz)	U= 16847, p< 0.001	67.0 [51.8-82.5]	43.4 [35.8-54.4]
Stair descent	VAG2_ARV (mm.s ⁻²)	U= 1502, p= 0.4	0.3 [0.1-0.4]	0.2 [0.1-0.3]
	VAG1_FF (a.u.)	U= 1959, p< 0.001	2.3 [1.9-2.9]	3.2 [2.4-3.9]
	VAG2_%REC (%)	U= 1310, p= 0.007	0.7 [0.2-3.2]	0.3 [0.1-0.5]
Stair ascent	VAG1_MPF (Hz)	U= 1201, p< 0.001	79.7 [59.9-102.7]	51.6 [35.4-74.9]
	VAG2_ARV (mm.s ⁻²)	U= 1368, p= 0.03	0.2 [0.1-0.3]	0.2 [0.1-0.3]
	VAG6_ARV (mm.s ⁻²)	U= 1324, p= 0.01	0.3 [0.2-0.3]	0.2 [0.1-0.3]
	VAG4_FF (a.u.)	U= 1796, p= 0.03	1.9 [1.8-2.0]	2.3 [1.8-2.9]
	VAG2_FF (a.u.)	U= 1830, p= 0.01	2.2 [1.8-2.6]	2.7 [2.0-3.2]
Sit to stand	VAG4_ARV (mm.s ⁻²)	U= 6748, p< 0.001	0.1 [0.1-0.1]	0.1 [0.0-0.1]
	VAG4_%DET (%)	U= 6537, p< 0.001	51.1 [31.3-72.0]	22.9 [14.9-38.4]
	VAG2_%REC (%)	U= 6707, p< 0.001	0.4 [0.1-1.4]	0.1 [0.0-0.2]
	VAG4_VoMS (mm ⁴ .s ⁻⁸)	U= 6801, p< 0.001	2.11e-3 [3.58e-4 - 1.93e-2]	1.68e-4 [3.08e-5 - 6.49e-4]

Table 3 The results of the Mann-Whitney U test comparing the experimental days in term of the important features contributing to the classification performance. The Median [25th -75th percentile] are reported in each case.

	Feature	Mann-Whitney	KOA Day 1	KOA Day 2
Gait	VAG2_MPF (Hz)	U= 26163, p< 0.001	66.2 [56.8-90.7]	59.1 [46.0-72.2]
	VAG2_FF (a.u.)	U= 20127, p< 0.001	2.5 [2.0-2.8]	2.7 [2.4-3.1]
	VAG5_MPF (Hz)	U= 24965, p= 0.02	67.0 [51.8-82.5]	60.6 [47.2-74.3]
Stair descent	VAG2_ARV (mm.s ⁻²)	U= 1675, p= 0.03	0.3 [0.1-0.4]	0.2 [0.1-0.3]
	VAG1_FF (a.u.)	U= 1358, p= 0.2	2.3 [1.9-2.9]	2.5 [2.0-2.9]
	VAG2_%REC (%)	U= 1436, p= 0.7	0.7 [0.2-3.2]	0.8 [0.3-3.4]
	VAG1_MPF (Hz)	U= 1610, p= 0.1	79.7 [59.9-102.7]	67.2 [53.2-95.5]
Stair ascent	VAG2_ARV (mm.s ⁻²)	U= 1685, p= 0.02	0.2 [0.1-0.3]	0.1 [0.1-0.2]
	VAG6_ARV (mm.s ⁻²)	U= 1575, p= 0.2	0.3 [0.2-0.3]	0.2 [0.2-0.3]
	VAG4_FF (a.u.)	U= 1327, p= 0.1	1.9 [1.8-2.0]	2.1 [1.8-2.5]
Sit to stand	VAG2_FF (a.u.)	U= 1452, p= 0.9	2.2 [1.8-2.6]	2.3 [1.8-2.8]
	VAG4_ARV (mm.s ⁻²)	U= 11238, p= 0.004	0.1 [0.1-0.1]	0.1 [0.1-0.1]
	VAG4_%DET (%)	U= 10024, p= 0.9	51.1 [31.3-72.0]	53.5 [31.3-74.0]
	VAG2_%REC (%)	U= 9999, p= 0.9	0.4 [0.1-1.4]	0.3 [0.1-2.1]
	VAG4_VoMS (mm ⁴ .s ⁻⁸)	U= 10993, p= 0.02	2.1e-3 [3.58e-4 - 1.93e-2]	6.8e-4 [1.05e-4 - 7.83e-3]

Table 4 The results of the Mann-Whitney U test comparing the symptomatic and asymptomatic groups in term of the important location of registering pressure pain thresholds (PPT) contributing to the classification performance. The Median [25th -75th percentile] are reported in each case

Feature	Mann-Whitney	KOA	Asymptomatic
PPT7 (kPa)	U= 505, p< 0.001	281.5 [227.5-365.0]	482.0 [431.3-753.0]
PPT4 (kPa)	U= 510.5, p< 0.001	280.0 [175.0-383.5]	509.0 [438.3-658.8]
PPT6 (kPa)	U= 496.5, p= 0.001	302.5 [188.0-401.5]	464.0 [379.8-633.8]
PPT1 (kPa)	U= 497, p= 0.001	368.5 [212.5-445.0]	519.0 [405.3-810.0]

5. Discussion

This study showed that multichannel topographical VAG signals captured during ADLs could discriminate between the asymptomatic control group and KOA patients with an accuracy ranging from 64% to 90% (100 minus the error mean) depending on the type of ADL. However, the accuracy dropped by about 10-25% when the KOA patients were tested again on a second experimental day, suggesting the importance of the placement of the accelerometers on the affected knee.

The information obtained from the lateral side of the knee made a very marked contribution to the classification accuracy likely related to the mild to moderate severity of pain in the KOA patients in this study.




Figure 4 The receiver operating characteristics for the classification of participants groups based on pressure pain threshold (the group of knee osteoarthritis participants was set as the positive class). The area under the curve (AUC) is displayed on the figure and the sensitivity and specificity of classification during activities of daily living (gait, stairs descent, stairs ascent and sit to stand) are presented below the figure. The round black point on the figure is where the discrimination threshold was set to 0.5 and the sensitivity and specificity were computed at this point.

The classification based on the PPT reached about 77% accuracy and kept its consistency in the second experimental day by about 75% accuracy. This highlights the classification based on the VAG signals in certain ADLs can perform better than the classification based on the pressure pain thresholds, however, the VAG classification consistency across days needs improvement.

In contrast to VAG signal features, PPT points on the medial and proximal side made an important contribution to the classification accuracy. This contrast in sensory manifestation of KOA and the features of mechanical vibrations of the underlying tissue may highlight the

1 complex structure of the knee joint and the interconnection between the medial to the lateral
2 side of the knee. The discussion presents first our findings in terms of classification accuracy.
3 Then, VAG features are reviewed in relation to the classification results. This section is
4 followed by the evaluation of the investigated ADLs.

5 *5.1 Classification accuracy*

6 Even though the accuracy of the classification of the participants based on the majority of
7 their VAG epochs can reach up to 90% accuracy during over-ground gait, the accuracy of
8 VAG epochs classification ranged from 61% to 84% when a leave-one-out testing approach
9 was adopted. Additionally, a large variability (reflected by a high SD in the classification
10 error) was found. The classification accuracy of the VAG epochs in some of the ADLs was
11 lower than what has been reported (90%) elsewhere [12]. However, most of the previous
12 studies have been performed on knee movements during open-kinetic chain activities and
13 used an identical dataset (Calgary group [13]) to develop their algorithms which may be a
14 source of bias in their results even though using an identical dataset allows for inter-study
15 comparison [12].

16 Recent studies have emphasized the importance of movements with closed kinetic chain and
17 highlighted their importance in loading of the patellofemoral joint [33,34]. Due to
18 contribution of movement artefacts to the VAG signal characteristics, analyzing VAG in
19 closed-kinetic chain movement poses a challenge. In this study, the effect of movement
20 artefacts was reduced by the application of adaptive filtering, independent component
21 analysis and multichannel recording of the VAG signals [6]. Although a previous study has
22 investigated the VAG signal during sit to stand activity, the study only performs an
23 inferential statistics to report higher VAG signal energy in certain frequency bands in KOA
24 patients [18,35]. Similarly, in a previous study using the same dataset as the current one, the
25 VAG signal characteristics in KOA and asymptomatic participants were studied [15],

1 however, the study has been limited to performing a statistical inference to find significant
2 differences between the two groups. Developing statistical models for predictions is essential
3 to discriminate between the groups and testing generalizability of the results for diagnoses of
4 the KOA. Thus, in this respect, the current study is among the very few studies investigating
5 VAG signal features in movements with closed kinetic chain and using the signal features to
6 discriminate between the KOA patients and the asymptomatic group.

7 Even though the obtained accuracy in the current study is not as high as reported in the
8 literature, all the epochs of the signal captured in the timeline of the recording were classified
9 in this study. Ultimately, as the aim was to classify the participants and not the epochs, the
10 participants were classified based on the majority of the assigned labels of his/her epochs.

11 Adopting this approach improved the classification accuracy up to about 90% in over-ground
12 gait even though due to very few (two) epochs during stair ascent and stair descent, not much
13 of improvement was observed during these two ADLs.

14 The classification accuracy in the second experimental day when the RFC was trained based
15 on the first day dropped markedly. As examined statistically, the VAG signal characteristics
16 exhibited a significant bias on the second day compared with the first experimental day. This
17 suggests that the researcher consistency in setting up the accelerometers, inherent variations
18 in KOA symptoms across days and/or diurnal variation in the water content of soft tissue
19 around the knee joint [36] resulted in observing such a bias resulting in a poorer classification
20 accuracy.

21 The classification accuracy based on the PPT reached about 77% accuracy and was quite
22 consistent across the experimental days. The PPT assessments have previously been reported
23 to be reliable in this population despite a tendency towards increased PPTs on the second
24 experimental day [11]. Even though the classification based on the VAG signal features can
25 reach higher classification accuracy as mentioned above, PPT assessments are more

1 straightforward to perform. However, it requires for a trained practitioner to carry out the
2 procedure whereas the VAG signal recordings could potentially be embedded into an
3 ambulatory recording system.

4 *5.2 Important features*

5 In this study, relevant features of VAG signals were extracted as these features have been
6 commonly utilized in previous studies [12]. In addition, features of VAG signals based on the
7 recurrence map analysis were extracted as these features reflect the nonlinear characteristics
8 of the signals [26]. These features have been shown to be relevant to quantify the
9 heterogeneity of VAG signals around the knee during unloaded extension-flexion in an
10 asymptomatic group of subjects [4]. In the current study, a combination of extracted features
11 of VAG signal were importantly contributing to the classification accuracy but the influence
12 of extracted features was dependent on the location of the recording and the type of the ADL.
13 This partly stands in contrast to previously reported results where only VAG ARV and
14 %REC were found to differentiate the groups [15]. Most particularly, a lower %REC in the
15 KOA group has been reported previously, whereas in the current study, a higher %REC was
16 found in the KOA group in some recording locations. Apart from the preprocessing
17 procedure which has been completely modified in the current study, the previous results
18 corresponded to a statistical inference based on a linear mixed model which compared to a
19 RFC is more rigid in modeling the dataset variability, most particularly, a lack of modeling
20 nonlinear separability between the groups [37]. Additionally, the previous results present the
21 main effect of the participant group on the extracted features whereas the current results show
22 the importance of localized features of VAG in a non-homogenous spatial distribution to
23 classify the participant groups. In the aforementioned study, a significant interaction between
24 participant group and the location of the recording has been reported. The current study sheds
25 light on such an interaction and finds the specific locations of the recording which seem to be

1 more discriminative across the participant group. For example, location #2 on the lateral side
2 of the knee turned out to be an important site of information in all tested ADLs. Additionally,
3 all the important features were obtained from the lateral, proximal and patellar location and in
4 this list no important feature has been obtained from the medial or distal side of the knee.
5 This seems to be in contrast to clinical findings which report the medial compartment of the
6 knee as often most frequently affected by KOA [38]. However, the localized pain sensitivity
7 is found to be different among patients with mild to moderate KOA (similar to the current
8 KOA group) compared with patients with severe cases of KOA [9]. The categorization of
9 KOA patient into mild to moderate or severe has been based on the reported pain on a visual
10 analogue scale (VAS) in the last 24 h before the experiment where $VAS \geq 6$ has been the
11 decisive threshold for categorization into strong/server and mild to moderate [39]. Based on
12 such a criterion, most patients (12 out 20) in the current study should have been categorized
13 into mild to moderate group and the highest pain sensitivity was observed on the
14 superolateral side of the knee [11]. The importance of the VAG signal features on the top of
15 patella, proximal and lateral side of the knee is likely related to the patellar cartilage damage
16 often reported in KOA patients [40].
17 Out of the extracted features only ARV and VoMS were presented in absolute scale and
18 therefore may be sensitive to a normalization procedure. Even though some previous studies
19 have normalized the VAG signal to its amplitude range [e.g. 13], we opted out normalizing
20 these two features because previous results have shown the sensitivity of these features to the
21 interaction between load, movement type and the location of recording [4,15]. Since the RFC
22 is invariant to the scaling of the used features, we believe that the not-normalized scales of
23 ARV and VoMS are not likely to be a major source of concern.
24 PPT assessments on the medial and proximal side of the knee contributed importantly to the
25 classification. This may seem in contrast to the contribution of the VAG signals extracted

1 from the lateral side being important features for classification based on the VAG signal
2 features. However, the knee joint construct is interconnected, for example, the anterior and
3 posterior cruciate ligaments connect the medial to lateral side of the knee and could
4 contribute to establish a link between the recorded VAG signals on the lateral side and the
5 pain sensitivity on the medial side of the painful knee. In support of that, a history of anterior
6 cruciate ligament injury has been associated with an increased risk of KOA development
7 [41]. All in all, the present findings suggest that KOA have two different signatures
8 conveying the VAG or PPT information.

9 *5.3 Role of ADL type*

10 Among the captured ADLs, the classification accuracy has generally been highest during gait.
11 This could potentially be related to the consistency of the movement pattern during gait
12 compared with the other ADLs tested in this study. Supporting such a premise, stride-to stride
13 variability of the knee motion in KOA patients has been shown not to be significantly
14 different from an asymptomatic control group [42]. A more plausible explanation may be
15 related to the duration of recording as a relatively shorter recording during stair descent, stair
16 ascent and sit to stand compared with the over-ground gait results in a reduced ratio between
17 the number of observations to the features of VAG signals. This ratio is important to achieve
18 a robust performance of a multivariate analysis [43]. However, it is trivial to imagine that a
19 longer recording during stair descent and stair ascent was quite difficult for KOA patients to
20 carry out and further safety measures must have been implemented in the setup.
21 Even though we have included the commonly used VAG features in the analysis, one may
22 assume that feature extraction can be even further optimized if novel methods such as deep
23 learning is used in that front [44,45]. However, deep learning usually encounters some
24 limitations including low interpretability, high computational costs, and the need for large

1 datasets [46]. Increasing the number of participants could potentially improve the
2 generalizability of the RFC.

3 *5.4 Computational complexity*

4 The bottleneck of the computational cost in the proposed approach was the recurrent map
5 analysis, which in the current implementation, the computational order of growth for %DET
6 algorithm was of the order $O(N^2)$ for a time-series with N samples. Given that the feature set
7 is available, the average execution time, including the testing and training the RFC the
8 elapsed times were as follows. The calculations took 2.8, 1.4, 1.4 and 2.3 s when the original
9 dataset was used for classification and finding the important features and 0.7, 0.6, 0.6 and 0.7
10 s when only the selected important features were used for classification in over-ground gait,
11 stairs descent, stairs ascent and sit to stand, respectively. These times were 1.4 and 0.6 when
12 the PPT assessments were used for classification. These time were obtained on a laptop
13 running with an Intel(R) Core (TM) i5-5300U@ 2.3 GHz and 8 GB RAM and the analysis
14 was performed on MATLAB 2019b. Given that such analysis is expected to be performed
15 offline, the computational cost of the proposed approach is not of major concern.

16 *5.5 Conclusion*

17 In conclusion, this is the first study investigating the discrimination of the multichannel
18 topographical knee VAG signal between KOA patients and asymptomatic controls during
19 ADLs. The classification accuracy to label the subjects as KOA patient reaches up to 90%
20 accuracy during gait but with a large day-to-day variation. The VAG classification accuracy
21 was higher than the classification based on the pressure pain thresholds but this method
22 showed lower day-to-day variation.

24 **Conflict of interest statement**

1 The authors did not receive financial support or other benefits from commercial sources for
2
3 the work reported in this manuscript, or any other financial support that could create a
4
5 potential conflict of interest or the appearance of a conflict of interest concerning the work.
6
7
8
9

10 11 12 **Acknowledgments** 13

14 This study was part of the individualized osteoarthritis interventions (IOI) project and has
15
16 received funding from Innovation Fund Denmark (grant nr. 40-2014-3). The authors are
17
18 grateful to CCBR (Aalborg, Denmark) for the recruitment of participants. The authors are
19
20 also thankful to Neeraja Srimurugan Pratheep for performing PPT assessments.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

1. Vos T, Flaxman AD, Naghavi M, Lozano R, Michaud C, Ezzati M, et al. Years lived with disability (YLDs) for 1160 sequelae of 289 diseases and injuries 1990-2010: A systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2010. *Lancet*. 2012;380:2163–96.
2. Wallace IJ, Worthington S, Felson DT, Jurmain RD, Wren KT, Maijanen H, et al. Knee osteoarthritis has doubled in prevalence since the mid-20th century. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2017;14(35):9332–9336.
3. Walters CF. THE VALUE OF JOINT AUSCULTATION. *Lancet*. 1929;213:920–1.
4. Andersen RE, Arendt-Nielsen L, Madeleine P. Knee joint vibroarthrography of asymptomatic subjects during loaded flexion-extension movements. *Med Biol Eng Comput*. 2018;56(12):2301–12.
5. Mascaro B, Prior J, Shark LK, Selfe J, Cole P, Goodacre J. Exploratory study of a non-invasive method based on acoustic emission for assessing the dynamic integrity of knee joints. *Med Eng Phys*. 2009;31(8):1013–22.
6. Wu Y, Chen P, Luo X, Huang H, Liao L, Yao Y, et al. Quantification of knee vibroarthrographic signal irregularity associated with patellofemoral joint cartilage pathology based on entropy and envelope amplitude measures. *Comput Methods Programs Biomed*. 2016;130:1–12.
7. Cardoso R, Porto P, Burin A, Daitx R, Dohnert M. Ground or Swimming Pool Exercises for Women with Knee Osteoarthritis? A Double-blind Randomized Clinical Trial. *J Adv Med Med Res*. 2017;23(10):1–13.
8. Suokas AK, Walsh DA, McWilliams DF, Condon L, Moreton B, Wylde V, et al. Quantitative sensory testing in painful osteoarthritis: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Osteoarthr Cartil*. 2012;20(10):1075–85.
9. Arendt-Nielsen L, Nie H, Laursen MB, Laursen BS, Madeleine P, Simonsen OH, et al. Sensitization in patients with painful knee osteoarthritis. *Pain*. 2010;149:573–81.
10. Albuquerque-Sendín F, Madeleine P, Fernández-De-Las-Peñas C, Camargo PR, Salvini TF. Spotlight on topographical pressure pain sensitivity maps: A review. *J Pain Res*. 2018;11:215.
11. Srimurugan Pratheep N, Madeleine P, Arendt-Nielsen L. Relative and absolute test-retest reliabilities of pressure pain threshold in patients with knee osteoarthritis. *Scand J Pain*. 2018;18(2):229–36.
12. Andersen RE, Arendt-Nielsen L, Madeleine P. A Review of Engineering Aspects of Vibroarthrography of the Knee Joint. *Crit Rev Phys Rehabil Med*. 2016;28(1_2):13–32.
13. Rangayyan RM, Wu Y. Analysis of vibroarthrographic signals with features related to signal variability and radial-basis functions. *Ann Biomed Eng*. 2009;37(1):156–63.
14. Wu Y, Yang S, Zheng F, Cai S, Lu M, Wu M. Removal of artifacts in knee joint vibroarthrographic signals using ensemble empirical mode decomposition and detrended fluctuation analysis. *Physiol Meas*. 2014;35(3):429.
15. Madeleine P, Andersen RE, Larsen JB, Arendt-Nielsen L, Samani A. Wireless multichannel vibroarthrographic recordings for the assessment of knee osteoarthritis during three activities of daily living. *Clin Biomech*. 2020;72:16–23.
16. Rangayyan RM, Oloumi F, Wu Y, Cai S. Fractal analysis of knee-joint vibroarthrographic signals via power spectral analysis. *Biomed Signal Process Control*. 2013;8:23–9.
17. Kim KS, Seo JH, Kang JU, Song CG. An enhanced algorithm for knee joint sound classification using feature extraction based on time-frequency analysis. *Comput Methods Programs Biomed*. 2009;94:198–206.

- 1 18. Kalo K, Niederer D, Sus R, Sohrabi K, Banzer W, Groß V, et al. The detection of knee
2 joint sounds at defined loads by means of vibroarthrography. *Clin Biomech.*
3 2020;74:1–7.
- 4 19. Kellgren JH, Lawrence JS. Radiological assessment of osteo-arthrosis. *Ann Rheum*
5 *Dis.* 1957;16(4):494.
- 6 20. Dobson F, Hinman RS, Roos EM, Abbott JH, Stratford P, Davis AM, et al. OARSI
7 recommended performance-based tests to assess physical function in people diagnosed
8 with hip or knee osteoarthritis. *Osteoarthr Cartil.* 2013;21(8):1042–52.
- 9 21. Binderup AT, Arendt-Nielsen L, Madeleine P. Pressure pain threshold mapping of the
10 trapezius muscle reveals heterogeneity in the distribution of muscular hyperalgesia
11 after eccentric exercise. *Eur J Pain.* 2010;14(7):705–12.
- 12 22. Diniz PSR. Adaptive filtering: Algorithms and practical implementation. *Adaptive*
13 *Filtering: Algorithms and Practical Implementation.* New York: Springer; 2013.
- 14 23. Rangayyan RM. Introduction to Biomedical Signals. In: *Biomedical Signal Analysis.*
15 2nd ed. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons Inc; 2010.
- 16 24. Hyvärinen A, Oja E. Independent component analysis: Algorithms and applications.
17 *Neural Networks.* 2000;13:411–30.
- 18 25. Samani A, Srinivasan D, Mathiassen SE, Madeleine P. Nonlinear metrics assessing
19 motor variability in a standardized pipetting task: Between-and within-subject variance
20 components. *J Electromyogr Kinesiol.* 2015;25(3):557–64.
- 21 26. Jr CLW, Zbilut JP. Recurrence quantification analysis of nonlinear dynamical systems.
22 *Tutorials Contemp nonlinear methods Behav Sci.* 2005;26–94.
- 23 27. Kleinberg EM. An overtraining-resistant stochastic modeling method for pattern
24 recognition. *Ann Stat.* 1996;24(6):2319–49.
- 25 28. Hastie T, Tibshirani R, Friedman J. *Elements of Statistical Learning* 2nd ed. Springer.
26 Springer; 2009.
- 27 29. Hutter F, Lücke J, Schmidt-Thieme L. Beyond Manual Tuning of Hyperparameters. *KI*
28 *- Künstliche Intelligenz.* 2015;29(4):329–37.
- 29 30. Loh WY, Shin YS. Split selection methods for classification trees. *Stat Sin.*
30 1997;7:815–40.
- 31 31. Archer KJ, Kimes R V. Empirical characterization of random forest variable
32 importance measures. *Comput Stat Data Anal.* 2008;52(4):2249–60.
- 33 32. Franke R, Nielson G. Smooth interpolation of large sets of scattered data. *Int J Numer*
34 *Methods Eng.* 1980;
- 35 33. Adouni M, Shirazi-Adl A. Knee joint biomechanics in closed-kinetic-chain exercises.
36 *Comput Methods Biomech Biomed Engin.* 2009;12(6):661–70.
- 37 34. Baczkowicz D, Kręciszk K, Borysiuk Z. Analysis of patellofemoral arthrokinematic
38 motion quality in open and closed kinetic chains using vibroarthrography. *BMC*
39 *Musculoskelet Disord.* 2019;20(1):48.
- 40 35. Tanaka N, Hoshiyama M. Vibroarthrography in patients with knee arthropathy. *J Back*
41 *Musculoskelet Rehabil.* 2012;25:117–22.
- 42 36. Waterton JC, Solloway S, Foster JE, Keen MC, Gandy S, Middleton BJ, et al. Diurnal
43 variation in the femoral articular cartilage of the knee in young adult humans. *Magn*
44 *Reson Med.* 2000;43(1):126.
- 45 37. Denil M, Matheson D, De Freitas N. Narrowing the gap: Random forests in theory and
46 in practice. In: *31st International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2014.* 2014.
- 47 38. Kerrigan DC, Lelas JL, Goggins J, Merriman GJ, Kaplan RJ, Felson DT. Effectiveness
48 of a lateral-wedge insole on knee varus torque in patients with knee osteoarthritis.
49 *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2002;83:889–93.
- 50 39. Collins SL, Moore RA, McQuay HJ. The visual analogue pain intensity scale: What is

- 1 moderate pain in millimetres? *Pain*. 1997;72(1-2):95-7.
- 2
- 3
- 4 1 40. Dong B, Kong Y, Zhang L, Qiang Y. Severity and distribution of cartilage damage and
5 2 bone marrow edema in the patellofemoral and tibiofemoral joints in knee osteoarthritis
6 3 determined by MRI. *Exp Ther Med*. 2017;13(5):2079-84.
- 7 4
- 8 5 41. Vina ER, Kwok CK. Epidemiology of osteoarthritis: literature update. *Curr Opin*
9 6 *Rheumatol*. 2018;30(2):160-7.
- 10 7 42. Lewek MD, Scholz J, Rudolph KS, Snyder-Mackler L. Stride-to-stride variability of
11 8 knee motion in patients with knee osteoarthritis. *Gait Posture*. 2006;23(4):505-11.
- 12 9 43. Hair JF, Anderson RE, Tatham RL, Black WC. Multivariate data analysis, 5th ed.
13 10 Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ; 1998. 730-787 p.
- 14 11 44. Hochreiter S, Schmidhuber JJ. Long short-term memory. *Neural Comput*.
15 12 1997;9(8):1-32.
- 16 13 45. Reddy BK, Delen D. Predicting hospital readmission for lupus patients: An RNN-
17 14 LSTM-based deep-learning methodology. *Comput Biol Med*. 2018;101:199-209.
- 18 15 46. Ching T, Himmelstein DS, Beaulieu-Jones BK, Kalinin AA, Do BT, Way GP, et al.
19 16 Opportunities and obstacles for deep learning in biology and medicine. *J R Soc*
20 17 *Interface*. 2018;15(141):20170387.
- 21 18
- 22 19
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28
- 29
- 30
- 31
- 32
- 33
- 34
- 35
- 36
- 37
- 38
- 39
- 40
- 41
- 42
- 43
- 44
- 45
- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60