

1 Abstract

2 The causes of able-bodied gait asymmetries are unclear. Mild (< 3 cm) leg-length
3 inequality (LLI) may be one cause of these asymmetries, however, this idea has not been
4 thoroughly investigated. The purpose of this study was to investigate the nature of the
5 relationship between LLI and able-bodied gait asymmetries. We hypothesized that subjects ($n =$
6 26) with greater LLI, quantified radiographically, would display less symmetrical gait than
7 subjects with smaller LLI. Gait asymmetries were determined using standard gait analysis
8 procedures. Symmetry coefficients were used to quantify gait symmetry for sagittal-plane hip,
9 knee, and ankle joint angles, moments, and powers. A Pearson product-moment correlation
10 coefficient (r) was used to evaluate the relationship between LLI and the aforementioned
11 symmetry coefficients. Additionally, the symmetry coefficients were compared between subjects
12 with relatively small LLI (< 1 cm; $n = 19$) and relatively large LLI (≥ 1 cm; $n = 7$). Statistically
13 significant relationships were observed between LLI and the symmetry coefficient for knee
14 moment ($r = -0.48$) and power ($r = -0.51$), and ankle moment ($r = -0.41$) and power ($r = -0.42$).
15 Similarly, subjects with relatively large LLI exhibited significantly lower symmetry coefficients
16 for knee moment ($p = 0.40$) and power ($p = 0.35$), and ankle moment ($p = 0.40$) and power ($p =$
17 0.22) than subjects with relatively small LLI. These results support LLI as a primary cause of
18 able-bodied gait asymmetries. However, other factors must also contribute to these asymmetries,
19 such as asymmetrical neuromuscular input to the lower limb muscles.

21

Introduction

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

Human able-bodied gait has been described extensively, but many fundamental aspects are still not well understood. For example, bilateral asymmetries, defined as a lack of perfect agreement between lower limbs [1, 2], have been documented during able-bodied gait for kinematic [3, 4], kinetic [1, 5], and electromyographic [6, 7] variables. The underlying causes of these asymmetries, however, remain unclear. An understanding of the causes of these asymmetries is important, as it could lead to enhanced rehabilitation programs for movement disorders characterized by asymmetrical gait, such as cerebral palsy and stroke. Several different explanations have been put forth as plausible causes of able-bodied gait asymmetries [2]. Most of these proposed explanations fall into one of two primary categories: 1) morphological asymmetry, and 2) asymmetrical neural input. Theoretically, if both legs are morphologically identical and receive the same neural input while in a controlled environment (e.g., a flat laboratory walkway), a symmetrical gait pattern should emerge. It is unlikely, however, that morphology or neuromuscular input are ever perfectly symmetrical, and both likely contribute to gait asymmetry. In this study, we focused on one possible morphological cause of gait asymmetry.

Mild leg-length inequality (LLI), defined as an anatomical LLI that does not exceed 3 cm [8], is a commonly suggested morphological cause of asymmetry in able-bodied gait [9-14]. The relationship between LLI and gait asymmetry, however, is not well understood. While it makes sense that bilateral differences in leg length would contribute to gait asymmetry, some prior research has contradicted this idea [15]. Among those who have suggested an association between LLI and gait asymmetry, some have concluded that any LLI greater than 1.0 cm will affect function [8, 16]. Others, however, have indicated that a LLI up to 2.5 cm will not affect

44 gait mechanics [17, 18]. A weakness of the existing literature in this area is that there are no
45 studies that have combined accurate measures of LLI (i.e., radiography) with quantitative
46 measures of gait asymmetry. Consequently, the purpose of this study was to investigate the
47 nature of the relationship between LLI, determined via X-ray, and able-bodied gait asymmetries,
48 determined using standard gait analysis procedures. We hypothesized that subjects with greater
49 LLI would exhibit a less symmetrical gait than subjects with smaller LLI. Specifically, we
50 predicted that there would be significant negative correlations between LLI and measures of gait
51 symmetry. In order to further investigate how LLI may influence gait asymmetries, we also
52 compared subjects with relatively smaller LLI (< 1 cm) to subjects with relatively larger LLI (\geq
53 1 cm). We expected that subjects with greater LLI would exhibit significantly less symmetrical
54 gait patterns. We chose 1 cm as the dividing point between relatively small and large LLI
55 because 1 cm has been suggested by some investigators [8, 16] as the magnitude of LLI that will
56 begin to affect biomechanical function during gait.

57 Methods

58 Twenty six young adults (13 females; 13 males; age = 30 ± 6 yrs; height = 1.74 ± 0.10 m;
59 mass = 73.9 ± 5.7 kg) who reported no lower-limb impairment participated in this study.

60 Nineteen subjects exhibited a LLI that was less than 1 cm (11 females; 8 males; age = 30 ± 5 yrs;
61 height = 1.73 ± 0.11 m; mass = 71.5 ± 16.8 kg). Seven subjects had a LLI that was greater than
62 or equal to 1 cm (2 females; 5 males; age = 28 ± 8 yrs; height = 1.76 ± 0.07 m; mass = $74.6 \pm$
63 16.2 kg). Subjects gave informed consent in accordance with local ethical committee regulations.

64 LLI was determined using total body dual energy absorptiometry (DXA; Lunar DPX-IQ,
65 Lunar Inc., Madison, WI, USA) scans. Total limb length was computed as the summed lengths
66 of the tibia and femur [19] and was quantified using the 'ruler' function of the Lunar 4.3

67 software. Femoral length was the distance between the superior greater trochanter and most
68 distal aspect of the lateral femoral epicondyles [19]. Tibial length was the distance between the
69 distal lateral femoral epicondyle and most inferior aspect of the lateral malleolus [19]. LLI was
70 the absolute difference between left and right total limb lengths.

71 During a separate lab visit, subjects underwent a standard gait analysis. Six high-speed
72 video cameras (60 Hz; Motion Analysis Inc., Santa Rosa, CA, USA) and two force platforms
73 (960 Hz; Kistler Instrument Corp., Amherst, NY, USA) were used to collect kinematic and
74 kinetic data. Reflective markers were applied to anatomical landmarks in a modified Cleveland
75 Clinic marker arrangement, and five successful walking trials were performed across a 10-m
76 walkway at a self-selected pace. A trial was considered successful when the right foot and left
77 foot each contacted a separate force platform during consecutive steps. Three-dimensional
78 coordinates describing marker positions were determined using Motion Analysis EvaRT 4.0
79 software (Motion Analysis, Santa Rosa, CA, USA). Coordinate data were smoothed using a
80 dual-pass Butterworth filter with a 6-Hz cutoff [20] in Motion Analysis EvaRT 4.0 software.
81 Coordinate data were then exported into OrthoTrac 5.0.2 software (Motion Analysis, Santa Rosa,
82 CA, USA) for the calculation of joint kinematics and kinetics.

83 *Data Analysis.* Bilateral sagittal-plane joint angles, net joint moments, and joint powers
84 were calculated for the hip, knee, and ankle over five successful trials. For each successful trial,
85 data were time normalized to one complete gait cycle. Bilateral ensemble average curves for
86 joint angle, moment, and power were created by averaging the data across the five trials for each
87 subject. A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to evaluate the degree of
88 symmetry between limbs [6, 21] for the ensemble averaged joint angles, moments, and powers,
89 for each subject. This measure of between-limb symmetry will be referred to as the “*symmetry*”

90 *coefficient*” to avoid confusion with the correlation coefficients later used as part of the statistical
91 analysis, as described in the next section. Larger symmetry coefficient values indicated greater
92 between-limb symmetry.

93 *Statistical Analysis.* The relationship between LLI (quantified via DXA) and gait
94 symmetry (quantified via the symmetry coefficient) was evaluated using the Pearson product-
95 moment correlation coefficient (r). Negative r values would indicate that subjects with greater
96 LLI tended to exhibit less symmetrical gait. Additionally, the mean symmetry coefficients for
97 hip, knee, and ankle joint angles, moments, and powers were compared between the group of
98 subjects with relatively small LLI ($LLI < 1$ cm; $n = 19$) and the group of subjects with relatively
99 large LLI ($LLI \geq 1$ cm; $n = 7$). We used a nonparametric statistic (Mann-Whitney; $p = 0.05$) to
100 make this comparison.

101 Results

102 For the entire sample ($n = 26$), the mean absolute value for LLI was 0.8 ± 0.7 (Mean \pm
103 SD) cm and ranged from 0.0 to 2.3 cm. Sample means and standard deviations for the symmetry
104 coefficients are presented in Table 1, recalling that a larger symmetry coefficient indicates
105 greater between-limb gait symmetry. Graphical examples of a variable that was very
106 symmetrical (hip angle) and a variable that was less symmetrical (hip power) are shown in
107 Figure 1A and 1B, respectively. Within each joint, angle tended to be highly symmetrical, while
108 power was least symmetrical. The results for moment differed across joints (Table 1), with the
109 ankle moment being most symmetrical and the knee moment the least symmetrical.

110 The strength of the correlations between LLI and gait symmetry are presented in Table 2.
111 Significant moderate correlations existed between LLI and gait symmetry for knee moment ($r = -$
112 0.48 ; $p = 0.013$), knee power ($r = -0.51$; $p = 0.008$), ankle moment ($r = -0.41$ $p = 0.035$), and

113 ankle power ($r = -0.42$, $p = 0.032$). Figure 2A depicts the weakest relationship between LLI and
114 gait symmetry (knee joint angle, not significant), while Figure 2B depicts the strongest
115 relationship between LLI and gait symmetry (knee joint power, significant). The negative
116 correlation coefficients for all variables indicate that subjects with greater LLI tended to
117 exhibited less symmetrical gait, while the statistical significance tests revealed that joint
118 moments and powers tended to be more strongly related to LLI than joint angles.

119 Table 3 presents the mean symmetry coefficients for hip, knee, and ankle angle, moment,
120 and power for the two subsamples of subjects ($LLI < 1$ cm and $LLI \geq 1$ cm). No significant
121 between-group differences for symmetry coefficients were observed for hip joint angle ($p =$
122 0.285), moment ($p = 0.174$), or power ($p = 0.069$). There were significant between-group
123 differences, however, in symmetry coefficients for knee joint moment ($p = 0.040$) and power (p
124 $= 0.035$), but not for knee joint angle ($p = 0.418$). Similar to the knee, significant between-group
125 differences for the asymmetry coefficients existed for ankle joint moment ($p = 0.040$) and power
126 ($p = 0.022$), but not for ankle joint angle ($p = 0.064$). These differences at the knee and ankle
127 joints indicate that joint moment and power were less symmetrical for subjects with a relatively
128 large LLI (≥ 1.0 cm). While not quite reaching statistical significance, hip joint power ($p =$
129 0.069) and ankle joint angle ($p = 0.064$) also exhibited a tendency towards being less
130 symmetrical for subjects with relatively large LLI.

131 Discussion

132 Bilateral able-bodied gait asymmetries have been well documented [1-3, 5-7, 22, 23], yet
133 their causes have not been fully explained. LLI may be one cause of gait asymmetries [9-14], and
134 the purpose of this study was to investigate the nature of the relationship between LLI and able-
135 bodied gait asymmetries. This was accomplished by accurately quantifying LLI and gait

136 asymmetries within a relatively large sample of subjects. Our results showed that LLI is not
137 strongly related to the degree of bilateral symmetry for joint angles during gait. Our results do,
138 however, support the idea that LLI influences gait symmetry for hip, knee, and ankle joint
139 moments and powers. Each of the correlations for moments and powers were negative (r values
140 ranged from -0.36 to -0.51), and nearly all of them met statistical significance. The two p values
141 that exceeded 0.05 (0.053: hip moment, and 0.072: hip power) did so only by small margins.
142 These moderate negative correlations indicate that in able-bodied walking, subjects with larger
143 LLI tend to exhibit a greater degree of asymmetry in joint kinetics. It should be emphasized,
144 however, that the highest r value was -0.51, meaning that no more than 26% of the observed gait
145 asymmetries can be explained by LLI. Other morphological asymmetries, such as segment mass
146 or moment of inertia, or neuromuscular factors, must also contribute to the observed gait
147 asymmetries.

148 The results from the comparisons between subjects with relatively small and large LLI
149 also supported the idea that LLI influences joint moment and power symmetry during gait.
150 Subjects with relatively large LLI showed less symmetry for knee and ankle moment and power
151 than subjects with relatively small LLI (Table 3). In combination, the moderate negative
152 correlations described in the previous paragraph, and the between-group (large vs. small LLI)
153 differences described here, indicate that gait symmetry for joint moments and powers is related
154 to LLI. In contrast, our results provided little evidence that joint angle asymmetries are strongly
155 influenced by LLI. Particularly at the hip and knee, the joint angles were so bilaterally
156 symmetrical that there was little variance to be explained by LLI, or any other variable. This may
157 reflect a tendency for humans to maintain stable and consistent kinematics, by varying their joint

158 kinetics. A similar phenomenon, referred to as kinematic invariance, has been reported in both
159 normal [24] and amputee gait [25].

160 Our data are consistent with previous research regarding gait symmetry and LLI for
161 impaired subjects [12, 13]. Conclusions from this prior research also indicated that gait
162 symmetry decreases with increases in LLI. The present data are consistent with one previous
163 report [9] that showed that various components of the ground reaction force become less
164 symmetrical with increases in LLI. However, the present data differ from the results of another
165 study concerning the relationship between LLI and symmetry for quadriceps and plantarflexor
166 muscle electromyographic (EMG) activity [10]. It was reported that quadriceps and plantarflexor
167 EMG activity are symmetrical in subjects with a LLI up to 3 cm [10]. This difference in results
168 may be partially explained by the different variables considered. EMG data tend to be more
169 variable than joint kinetics and kinematics, which would make asymmetry more difficult to
170 identify.

171 The present study was the first to quantify LLI and gait asymmetries, using radiography
172 and high-speed videography respectively, in an attempt to better understand the relationship
173 between LLI and able-bodied gait symmetry. An important strength of this study is the use of
174 radiography to determine LLI. Previous evaluations of the relationship between LLI and gait
175 symmetry used less accurate methods for quantifying LLI, including the tape measure [9] and a
176 wooden block [26] method. When considering LLI that is relatively small in magnitude, it is
177 especially important to use radiography [27], as other methods may be unreliable [8] and lack the
178 precision necessary to accurately detect small LLI. One limitation of the present study is the
179 exclusion of the foot in the consideration of limb length. Unlike the femur and tibia, it is difficult
180 to accurately assess the contribution of the foot to limb length using DXA, and it has generally

181 been excluded from such measures [19, 27]. In principle, a gross foot deformity could result in a
182 LLI that would not be captured using the current approach. Therefore, we screened prospective
183 subjects to minimize the risk of this potential confound.

184 The present data indicate that reasonable kinematic symmetry can be maintained by
185 young asymptomatic individuals, despite varying degrees of LLI. Several of our subjects
186 exhibited LLI that were greater than thresholds that have been deemed pathologic by some
187 researchers [11, 28], yet our subjects were all healthy and asymptomatic. This supports the
188 conclusions of Gurney [27] and Reid and Smith [29], which stated that it is difficult to identify a
189 single LLI threshold as generally pathologic and necessitating intervention. The threshold of LLI
190 that may cause asymmetry or even impairment likely varies between individuals and depends
191 upon various factors including anthropometrics, age, and activity level [27, 29]. Also, as walking
192 is a relatively benign activity, it may be important to consider the relationship between LLI and
193 between-leg symmetry during more dynamic activities that involve greater ground reaction
194 forces, like running or landing. LLI may be more strongly related to between-limb symmetry
195 during these more dynamic activities.

196 In summary, the key findings of this study were that the degree of symmetry for knee and
197 ankle joint kinetics were significantly related to LLI in able-bodied gait. Although all of our
198 subjects had LLI that were relatively mild (< 3 cm), knee and ankle joint moments and powers
199 were less symmetrical for the subjects with relatively larger LLI. This primary finding was
200 substantiated through two approaches. First, moderate negative relationships were observed
201 between LLI and the symmetry coefficient for knee and ankle moment and power. Second,
202 subjects with relatively large LLI ($1 \text{ cm} \leq \text{LLI} < 2.3 \text{ cm}$) exhibited significantly less gait
203 symmetry for knee and ankle joint moment and power than subjects with relatively small LLI

204 (LLI < 1 cm). The results for hip joint kinetics were similar to the knee and ankle, but failed to
205 reach statistical significance. No similar relationships were found between joint angles and LLI,
206 as the joint angles were highly symmetrical across subjects. This knowledge of the relationship
207 between LLI and gait asymmetry for joint kinetics increases our understanding of able-bodied
208 gait mechanics and may lead to better rehabilitation protocols for gait pathologies that are related
209 to LLI.

210

- 212 1. Herzog W, Nigg BM, Read LJ, Olsson E. Asymmetries in ground reaction force patterns
213 in normal human gait. *Med Sci Sport Exer* 1989; 21(1): 110-114.
- 214 2. Sadeghi H, Allard P, Prince F, Labelle H. Symmetry and limb dominance in able-bodied
215 gait: a review. *Gait Posture* 2000; 12(1): 34-45.
- 216 3. Allard P, Lachance R, Aissaoui R, Duhaime M. Simultaneous bilateral 3-D able-bodied
217 gait. *Hum Movement Sci* 1996; 15: 327-346.
- 218 4. Maupas E, Paysant J, Datie AM, Martinet N, Andre JM. Functional asymmetries of the
219 lower limbs. A comparison between clinical assessment of laterality, isokinetic
220 evaluation and electrogoniometric monitoring of knees during walking. *Gait Posture*
221 2002; 16(3): 304-12.
- 222 5. Sadeghi H, Allard P, Duhaime M. Functional gait asymmetry in able-bodied subjects.
223 *Hum Movement Sci* 1997; 16: 243-258.
- 224 6. Arsenault AB, Winter DA, Marteniuk RG. Bilateralism of EMG profiles in human
225 locomotion. *Amer J Physical Med* 1986; 65(1): 1-16.
- 226 7. Ounpuu S, Winter DA. Bilateral electromyographical analysis of the lower limbs during
227 walking in normal adults. *Electroen Clin Neuro* 1989; 72(5): 429-38.
- 228 8. McCaw S, Bates BT. Biomechanical implications of mild leg length inequality. *Brit J*
229 *Sport Med* 1991; 25(1): 10-13.
- 230 9. White S, Gilchrist L, Wilk B. Asymmetric limb loading with true or simulated leg-length
231 differences. *Clin Orthop Relat R* 2004; 421:287-292.
- 232 10. Gurney B, Mermier C, Robergs R, Gibson A, Rivero D. Effects of limb-length
233 discrepancy on gait economy and lower-extremity muscle activity in older adults. *J Bone*
234 *Joint Surg Am* 2001; 83(6): 907-915.
- 235 11. Subotnick S. Limb length discrepancies of the lower extremity (the short leg syndrome).
236 *J Orthop Sport Phys* 1981; 3(1): 11-16.
- 237 12. Perttunen JR, Anttila E, Sodergard J, Merikanto J, Komi PV. Gait asymmetry in patients
238 with limb length discrepancy. *Scand J Med Sci Spor* 2004; 14(1): 49-56.
- 239 13. Kaufman KR, Miller LS, Sutherland DH. Gait asymmetry in patients with limb-length
240 inequality. *J Pediatr Orthoped* 1996; 16(2): 144-150.
- 241 14. Du Chatinier K, Rozendal R. Temporal symmetry gait of selected normal subjects.
242 *Anatomy* 1970; 73: 353-361.
- 243 15. Goel A, Loudon J, Nazare A, Rondinelli R, Hassanein K. Joint moments in minor limb-
244 length discrepancy: a pilot study. *Amer J Orthoped*, 1997; 26(12): 852-856.
- 245 16. Cathie A. The influence of the lower extremities upon the structural integrity of the body.
246 *J Am Osteopath Assoc* 1950; 49: 443-446.
- 247 17. Gross R. Leg length discrepancy in marathon runners. *Am J Sport Med* 1983; 11: 121-
248 124.
- 249 18. Siffert R. Current concepts review: lower limb-length discrepancy. *J Bone Joint Surg*
250 *AM* 1987; 69:1100-1105.
- 251 19. Ganley K, Powers C. Determination of lower extremity anthropometric parameters using
252 dual energy X-ray absorptiometry: the influence on net joint moments during gait. *Clin*
253 *Biomech* 2004; 19(1): 50-56.
- 254 20. Winter D. *Biomechanics and motor control of human movement*. 2005; John Wiley &
255 Sons, New York, New York, USA.

256 21. Pierotti SE, Brand RA, Gabel RH, Pederson DR, Clarke WR. Are leg electromyogram
257 profiles symmetrical? *J Orthopaed Res* 1991; 9(5): 720-729.

258 22. Maupas E, Paysant J, Martinet N, Andre J. Asymmetric leg activity in healthy subjects
259 during walking, detected by electrogoniometry. *Clin Biomech* 1999; 14(6): 403-11.

260 23. Seeley M, Umberger B, Shapiro R. A test of the functional asymmetry hypothesis in
261 walking. *Gait Posture* 2008; 28(1): 24-28.

262 24. Borghese N, Bianchi L, Lacquaniti F. Kinematic determinants of human locomotion. *J*
263 *Physiol* 1996; 494:863-879.

264 25. Selles R, Bussmann J, Klip L, Speet B, Van Soest A, Stam H. Adaptations to mass
265 perturbations in transtibial amputees: kinetic or kinematic invariance? *Arch Phys Med*
266 *Rehab* 2004; 85: 2046-2052.

267 26. Woerman A, Binder-MacLeod S. Leg length discrepancy assessment: accuracy and
268 precision in five clinical methods of evaluation. *J Orthop Sport Phys* 1984; 5: 230-238.

269 27. Gurney B. Leg length discrepancy. *Gait Posture* 2002, 15: 195-206.

270 28. Friberg O. Leg length asymmetry in stress fractures: a clinical and radiological study. *J*
271 *Sport Med Phys Fit* 1982; 22:485-488.

272 29. Reid D, Smith B. Leg length inequality: a review of etiology and management.
273 *Physiotherapy Can* 1984; 36: 177-182.

274
275
276

277 **Table 1.** Means and standard deviations for the symmetry coefficients that were used to quantify
278 the degree of between-limb gait symmetry for sagittal-plane joint angle, moment, and power at
279 the hip, knee, and ankle (n = 26). Lower coefficient values indicate less symmetrical gait. Joint
280 moments and powers were generally less symmetrical than joint angles.

281
282 **Table 2.** Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients (r) that were used to quantify the
283 relationship between leg-length inequality and degree of gait symmetry for a sample of healthy
284 subjects (n = 26). Degree of symmetry for sagittal-plane knee and ankle joint moment and power
285 were moderately and negatively related to leg-length inequality, indicating that as leg-length
286 inequality increased, gait symmetry for knee and ankle joint moment and power decreased.

287
288 **Table 3.** Means and standard deviations for degree of gait symmetry, quantified via the
289 symmetry coefficient, for two groups of subjects: 1) leg-length inequality less than 1 cm (n =
290 19), and 2) leg-length inequality equal to or greater than 1 cm (n = 7). Lower symmetry
291 coefficients indicate less gait symmetry. The degree of gait symmetry was significantly less for
292 sagittal-plane knee and ankle joint moment and power for subjects with a leg-length inequality
293 that was greater than or equal to 1 cm.

294
295 **Figure 1.** Means and standard deviations (shaded area) for sagittal plane hip joint angle (A) and
296 power (B) over the full gait cycle (n = 26). To increase clarity of the figure, only standard
297 deviations for the left leg are shown, as standard deviations were bilaterally similar. The mean
298 symmetry coefficient was higher for hip joint angle than for hip joint power, indicating that hip
299 joint angle was generally more symmetrical than hip joint power.

300
301 **Figure 2.** Scatter plots (n = 26) that depict the linear relationship (r) between leg-length
302 inequality and degree of between-limb gait symmetry, quantified via the symmetry coefficient,
303 for sagittal-plane knee joint angle (A) and power (B). Greater symmetry coefficients indicate
304 more gait symmetry. The negative relationship between leg-length inequality and gait symmetry
305 for knee power was statistically significant, indicating that gait was less symmetrical for knee
306 joint power decreased for subjects with relatively larger leg-length inequality. There was also
307 more between-subject variability with larger leg-length inequality.

308
309
310

Mean Symmetry

Joint	Measure	Coefficient
Hip	Angle	0.99 ± 0.02
	Moment	0.87 ± 0.23
	Power	0.71 ± 0.34
Knee	Angle	0.99 ± 0.04
	Moment	0.77 ± 0.26
	Power	0.75 ± 0.25
Ankle	Angle	0.94 ± 0.12
	Moment	0.95 ± 0.09
	Power	0.87 ± 0.19


311
312
313
314
315

Joint	Measure	r value	p value
Hip	Angle	-0.30	0.135
	Moment	-0.38	0.053
	Power	-0.36	0.072
Knee	Angle	-0.29	0.155
	Moment	-0.48	0.013
	Power	-0.51	0.008
Ankle	Angle	-0.34	0.094
	Moment	-0.41	0.035
	Power	-0.42	0.032

316
317
318
319
320

Joint	Measure	LLI < 1 cm	LLI ≥ 1 cm	p value
Hip	Angle	0.99 ± 0.01	0.98 ± 0.04	0.285
	Moment	0.94 ± 0.06	0.66 ± 0.37	0.174
	Power	0.81 ± 0.14	0.41 ± 0.52	0.069
Knee	Angle	0.99 ± 0.01	0.96 ± 0.08	0.418
	Moment	0.85 ± 0.11	0.55 ± 0.41	0.040
	Power	0.85 ± 0.07	0.50 ± 0.38	0.035
Ankle	Angle	0.97 ± 0.02	0.87 ± 0.22	0.064
	Moment	0.98 ± 0.02	0.86 ± 0.15	0.040
	Power	0.94 ± 0.04	0.69 ± 0.31	0.022

321
322
323
324



325
326

