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Abstract

Ankle sprains and instability are major public health concerns. Up to 70% of individuals do not fully recover from single ankle sprains and eventually develop chronic ankle instability (CAI). The diagnosis of CAI has been mainly based on self-report rather than objective biomechanical measures. The goal of this study is to quantitatively recognize the motion patterns of a multi-joint coordinate system using gait data of bilateral hip, knee, and ankle joints, and further distinguish CAI from control cohorts. We propose an analytic framework, where subspace clustering methods are developed to characterize the dynamic gait patterns in a lower dimensional subspace from an inter-dependent network of multiply joints. A support vector machine model is built to validate the learned measures compared to traditional statistical measures in a leave-one-subject-out cross validation. The experimental results showed >70% classification accuracy on average for the dataset of 47 subjects (24 with CAI and 23 controls) recruited to examine in our designed experiment. It is found that CAI can be observed from other joints (e.g., hips) significantly, which reflects the fact that there exists inter-dependency in the multi-joint coordinate system. The developed method presents a potential to support clinical decisions using quantitative measures during diagnosis, treatment, rehabilitation of gait abnormality caused by physical injuries (e.g., ankle sprains in this study) or even central nervous system disorders.
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1 Introduction

Ankle injuries are lateral ankle sprains where individuals roll the foot inward and damage the lateral ankle structures (Garrick, 1977). It is reported that up to 70% of individuals may eventually develop chronic ankle instability (CAI) following a significant ankle sprain (Anandacoomarasamy & Barnsley, 2005). CAI is characterized by persistent pain and swelling, episodes of ankle giving way, and recurrent ankle sprains (Hertel, 2002). Individuals with CAI have been reported to have diminished physical activity (Hubbard-Turner & Turner, 2015) and lower quality of life (Houston et al., 2015). More problematically, emerging evidence has linked CAI to future development of irreversible, posttraumatic ankle osteoarthritis (Golditz et al., 2014). The high prevalence and associated medical costs make CAI a significant health concern (Soboroff et al., 1984).

Despite the clinical significance of CAI, the etiology of this medical problem remains unclear. It has been hypothesized that CAI may be caused by peripheral issues such as reduced ankle proprioception (Garn & Newton, 1988; Forkin et al., 1996) and weak peroneal muscles (Bosien et al., 1955; Tropp, 1986). However, some counter-evidence has shown that individuals with CAI do not necessarily have reduced proprioception (Refshauge et al., 2000) and ankle strength deficits are not highly correlated with chronic ankle instability (Kaminski & Hartsell, 2002). More recently, researchers started questioning if central control issues also contribute to CAI (Hass et al., 2010). A main reason was that individuals with CAI often show deviations in walking and running gaits (Monaghan et al., 2006; Delahunt et al., 2006).

Human locomotion requires the control from the central level. Theories such as the central pattern generator have been proposed to explain how the central nervous system controls gait (Duysens & Van de Crommert, 1998; Dimitrijevic et al., 1998). Previous studies have found increased ankle inversion (Monaghan et al., 2006; Delahunt et al., 2006), increased ankle plantarflexion (Chinn et al., 2013; Drewes, McKeon, Kerrigan, & Hertel, 2009), and altered spatial and temporal parameters (Gigi et al., 2015) during walking and/or running in individuals with CAI. These findings suggest that the central control of gait is altered in these patients, and support that CAI is not only a peripheral issue but also a central issue.

Gait represents a complex control problem in which redundant degrees of freedom must be constrained and coordinated to create a smooth pattern (Van Emmerik et al., 2005). Thus, examining inter-joint or inter-segment coordination may be able to generate further insight into the central control issue in individuals with CAI. A review of literature revealed that most gait studies on CAI focused on examining individual joints rather than coordination (Moisan et al., 2017). Few studies examined if CAI is associated with coordination change during gait, but they only looked at coordination between two segments (Herb et al., 2014; Drewes, McKeon, Paolini, et al., 2009) or two joints (Yen et al., 2017), e.g., ankle-ankle or hip-ankle. A possible reason may be that the current measurements for coordination, such as vector coding and continuous relative phase, can only quantify the coordination between two body components.
Owing to significant advancements of sensor technology, recent studies paid more attentions to modeling and analysis of high-volume, high-resolution functional data in various applied domains of medical diagnosis, engineered system monitoring, security (Gowsikhaa et al., 2014). In medical diagnosis application, gait data analysis is focused on pattern recognition of gait abnormality caused by physical injuries like ankle sprains (Punt et al., 2015) or central nervous system disorders like Parkinson’s disease (PD) (Pirker & Katzenschlager, 2017; Tucker et al., 2015; Duhamel et al., 2006) and Stroke (Marrocco et al., 2016). Their essential idea attempts to extract statistical measures from motion time series, examine the significance of extracted features using statistic tests (e.g., t-test or ANOVA) or supervised learning methods, and consequently, improve diagnosis results. However, it has shown evidently inter-dependent coordination among joints during motion. A current challenging task is to find significant or dominating inter-dependent network patterns from a multi-variate, high-dimensional gait data space. It is worth noting that most researches investigated new quantitative methods for gait pattern recognition of central nervous system disorders, but not disabilities caused by physical injuries.

In this study, the overarching goal is to characterize critical information (measurements) that can summarize and/or represent the motion behaviors of individuals with CAI using gait kinematic data for a multi-joint coordinate system of bilateral hip, knee, and ankle joints. During our designed running experiments, biosensors were placed to record the locomotions of sagittal, frontal, and transverse planes. We present the multi-joint coordinate system as an inter-connected network as it is hypothesized that there exists inter-dependency between hip, knee, and ankle joints. We then propose an analytic framework that first extracts the network patterns of subspaces learned from multi-variate kinematic data during running, and then develop a decision model using support vector machine (SVM) to validate and distinguish individuals with CAI from a control subjects.

The organization of this paper is as follows. In Section 2, we review relevant research for clinical ankle sprains diagnosis and assessment, followed by a review of quantitative methods for functional data analysis. In Section 3, we describe data acquisition of our designed experiment and then present the proposed analytic framework that involves both unsupervised learning and supervised learning of multi-variate gait data. In Section 4, computational results are demonstrated and compared between conventional data extraction and our method. Finally, the conclusion and future work are addressed in Section 5.
2 Related Work

2.1 Clinical Diagnosis and Assessment of Ankle Sprains

Traditional clinical assessment for CAI is mainly based on self report. For example, Hiller et al. developed Cumberland Ankle Instability Tool (CAIT) to assess subjective symptoms of CAI (Hiller et al., 2006). Martin et al. developed a self-report survey called The Foot and Ankle Ability Measure (FAAM) that has been widely used in CAI assessment (Martin et al., 2005). Another self-report assessment for CAI is the Ankle Instability Instrument developed by Docherty et al. (Docherty et al., 2006). These tools have been recommended by the International Ankle Consortium to determine if an individual has CAI (Gribble et al., 2014). However, self-report answers may be subject to a number of biases (e.g., social desirability bias) that could affect the reliability and accuracy of the measures. To address this problem, these self-reported tools should be used in conjunction with objective measures.

Previous studies have used lab tools to objectively measure ankle proprioception, balance control, ankle muscle strength, and the reaction time to ankle inversion perturbation in individuals with CAI, but the results were often inconsistent (Holmes & Delahunt, 2009; Gutierrez et al., 2009). For example, some studies reported that individuals with CAI have delayed reaction time to inversion perturbation (Konradsen & Ravn, 1990; Karlsson & Andreasson, 1992), but others did not find similar results (Ebig et al., 1997). Recently, more studies have examined walking and/or running patterns in individuals with CAI, and the results have suggested that CAI may be associated with deviations in these patterns (Monaghan et al., 2006; Delahunt et al., 2006; Chinn et al., 2013; Drewes, McKeon, Kerrigan, & Hertel, 2009; Gigi et al., 2015; Yen et al., 2017). Walking and/or running could be used as a motor task to objectively differentiate control subjects and those with CAI.

Existing gait research on individuals with CAI often focus on examining the ankle kinematics (Monaghan et al., 2006; Delahunt et al., 2006; Chinn et al., 2013). However, gait is a complex motor task that involves all leg joints. Inter-joint coordination could be a parameter used to determine if an individuals with CAI. For example, Yen et al. used a vector coding method to examine hip-ankle coupling during walking, and found that the coupling pattern was different between control subjects and those with CAI (Yen et al., 2017). A weakness of this study was that the coordination measure was limited to hip-ankle coupling in the affected side in the frontal plane, and deviations may exist in other couplings that were not measured. This weakness was due to limitation in current methods to quantify a coordination pattern. Predominate methods such as vector coding and continuous relative phase can only quantify the coupling between two kinematic trajectories (Hamill et al., 2000).
2.2 Pattern Recognition and Analysis of Human Motion Data

Pattern recognition and analysis of human kinematic data is aimed to discover the insight into gaits through statistical and machine learning methods. Traditionally, statistical methods were used to test the coupling and grouping information of kinematic data (Park et al., 2017). For PD diagnosis research, a study investigated the co-activity between muscle and brain functions of kinematic data and functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) data using statistical analysis methods (t-test and ANOVA) (van der Stouwe et al., 2015). They found that PD patients have significant difficulty to perform complex movements compared to control subjects. Another research studied the motion behaviors of PD patients using gait sensor data in various supervised learning methods, including Naive Bayes, SVM, Decision Tree, Random Forest, and IBK (Tucker et al., 2015).

For other gait data analysis work, a research modeled the motion patterns for 33 human activities using kinematic data, and used classification algorithms, including SVM and Neural Network, on signal segments directly instead of focusing on detecting the discriminating patterns in locomotion, (Janidarmian et al., 2015). Another study developed a dynamic time warping (DTW) based k-nearest neighbors (KNN) algorithm to classify kinematic data directly, and showed their method outperforms other statistic-based models (Derlatka & Bogdan, 2015). In parallel to statistical learning methods, some researches focused on dynamic modeling of multi-variate kinematic data. A research group used a hidden Markov model (HMM) to describe the transition of the system in different states for gait phase detection and walking/jogging discrimination and recognized the significant discriminative patterns between walking and jogging with 99% accuracy (Mannini & Sabatini, 2012).

More recent researches were focused on dimensionality reduction in order to extract more representative information from complex data (Deluzio & Astephen, 2007; Xu et al., 2007). It is assumed that multi-variate data in the original data space can be transformed into multiple low-dimensional subspaces associated with different classes or functions (Bahadori et al., 2015). Machine learning based methods were developed to find the latent structure, e.g., quantitative trait locus mapping based on nonparametric regression (Xiang et al., 2013), LASSO (Z. Li et al., 2017; Rida et al., 2016) and linear manifold modeling method (Chiou & Muller, 2014). Other methods, such as functional principal component analysis (FPCA), Bayesian network, and subspace learning (Kadkhodaeian & Hossein-Zadeh, 2012; Coffey et al., 2011; Moon & Pavlovic, 2008), were developed to describe the correlation structure of high dimensional signals in a lower dimensional space. In particular, subspace learning is more advantageous to data transformation while reducing the effect of noise (Wang & Xu, 2016). In addition, sparse subspace clustering was developed for detecting both affinity and segmentation from data (C.-G. Li et al., 2017), which makes similar algorithms widely used for various types of multi-variate functional data, for instance, learning dynamic and functional brain connectivity using fMRI data (Y. Zhang et al., 2015; Ng & Abagherieh, 2011). For methodology development based on self-expressive assumption, an efficient
sparse subspace clustering method was proposed to group data samples in multiple independent clusters with the application of motion segmentation in videos (Elhamifar & Vidal, 2013). The other research group developed a sparse self-expressive decomposition to perform sparse matrix factorization and iteratively selected representative vectors in coefficient matrix to form independent subspaces (Dyer et al., 2015). A more recent study developed a data modeling method with additional constraint to prevent large fluctuation over time and applied to detect and classify different gestures of multi-variate gait time series (C. Zhang et al., 2018).

3 Materials and Methods

3.1 Data Acquisition and Processing

In this study, we acquired human motion data in running mode from 47 subjects in total, among which 24 subjects with CAI and 23 control subjects. There are 36 females (18 subjects with CAI and 18 controls) and 11 males (6 subjects with CAI and 5 controls). Subjects were recruited from the Northeastern University community. Screening exams were conducted for all potential subjects to determine their suitability for the study based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria. We followed the selection standards endorsed by the International Ankle Consortium to set the inclusion criteria for CAI (Gribble et al., 2014). All subjects with CAI had a significant ankle sprain at least one year before being enrolled in this study. In addition, they scored 24 or lower in CAIT and had more than one episode of ankle giving ways in the past 6 months.

All qualified subjects were asked to participate in a single session, in which they were asked to run on a treadmill for one minute. Their running performances and behaviors were captured by a 7-camera 3D motion capture system (Qualisys AB, Sweden). Reflective markers were placed on the major bony landmarks of the pelvis and left and right legs in order to create biomechanical models of bilateral hip, knee, and ankle. The recorded marker data were then analyzed using Visual3D (C-Motion, MD). The resultant variables are bilateral hip, knee, and ankle position changes in each of the sagittal, frontal, and transverse planes over time. Each joint trajectory was segmented into cycles (defined as the interval between two consecutive initial contacts of the same foot) for further analysis. On average, each session contains around forty cycles varied by subject’s running posture. Figure 1 shows the kinematic data collected from the motion capture system for both CAI and control subjects. For each joint, there are three motion time series in x-axis, y-axis, and z-axis presenting sagittal, frontal, and transverse planes. There are eighteen channels in each motion dataset. We define channels 1-3 representing the sagittal, frontal, and transverse planes on right hip, channels 4-6 representing the sagittal, frontal, and transverse planes for left hip, and so on. Since the total number of time points in running cycles varies in different subjects, we first applied an interpolation method to realign all cycles length to 84 time points, which
is the longest running cycle in the dataset. Then, motion time series data were detrended and z-scored to avoid variability between subject postures and potential human errors during data collection. As a result, for a subject, there are \( \sim 40 \) matrices, denoted by \( y_i(t) \) where \( i = 1, \ldots, 18 \) and \( t = 1, \ldots, 84 \).

![Figure 1: A representation of kinematic data collection from a 7-camera 3D motion capture system. The upper panel presents eighteen time series from bilateral hip, knee, and ankle joints of a subject with CAI and the lower panel presents eighteen time series from the same joints of a control subject.](image)

### 3.2 Proposed Method

In this section, we describe our proposed analytic framework composed of two phases to recognize the dynamic motion patterns across channels in the multi-joint coordinate system for discriminating and predicting subjects with CAI from a control cohort. Note that in this study, we use a term ‘channel’ to express sagittal, frontal, or transverse plane of a joint. Figure 2 illustrates the concept of our proposed method. In the first phase, we learn and extract significant clustering (or inter-connection) patterns of segmented motion signals. For each running cycle of individual subjects, motion signals undergo the detrending and z-scoring pre-processing steps. Then, a sparse subspace clustering is developed to obtain clustering coefficients (CCs) to represent the dynamical inter-relationships among channels. In the second phase, we consider a linear SVM-based classification model using the estimated CCs as input features for performing a binary classification task between CAI and control cohorts. Both channel-based and network-based modeling strategies are proposed. First, for a channel, we use its clustering coefficients (i.e., a column vector in the CC matrix) as input features, which present the correlation of other channels to it due to the self-expression assumption. Second, we compute a symmetric CC matrix.
Then a clustering analysis is further applied to find a more representative network, and use all CCs (in the triangular CC matrix) as input features. The detailed methodology is presented as follows.

**Phase 1: Subspace (Clustering) Learning**

![Phase 1 Diagram]

**Phase 2: SVM-based Classification**

![Phase 2 Diagram]

Figure 2: An illustration of our proposed analytic framework. In Phase 1, dynamic motion patterns (i.e., clustering coefficients) are recognized by sparse subspace clustering to represent the motion behaviors of the multi-joint coordinate system. In Phase 2, a linear SVM-based classification model is trained with clustering coefficients for binary classification tasks between CAI and control cohorts.

### 3.2.1 Self-Expressive Sparse Subspace Learning

Let us consider a set of multi-variate motion time series \( Y(t) = \{y_1(t), y_2(t), ..., y_n(t)\} \), where \( n = 18 \), in a multi-joint coordinate system. It is considered as a dynamic system of multiple units where each unit linearly or nonlinearly interact with each other at different connectivity degree and can be presented in certain subspaces \( g_m \in G \), where \( m \) is the number of subspaces. In this study, it is assumed that each motion time series is self-expressive and presented by a linear combination of some other motion time series and they share the same subspace. In other words, each motion time series can be represented by the basis functions in a subspace shared with other motion time series, which are highly correlated with each other while those in different subspaces have no or weak correlations. Note that the number of subspaces \( (m) \) need not to be pre-determined and will be determined by solving a self-expressive sparse subspace clustering problem.
The mathematical formulation of self-expressive model is presented as follows:

\[ y_i = Yc_i \quad 1^Tc_i = 1, \quad c_{ii} = 0, \quad \forall \ i = 1, \ldots, n, \quad (1) \]

where \( Y \) is the original time series in \( n \) channels and \( c_i = [c_{i1}, c_{i2}, \ldots, c_{in}] \) is a coefficient vector. In this model, \( c_{ii} \) is set to zero to avoid a trivial solution. To find a lower-dimensional subspace shared by original channels, we aim to minimize the coefficient values. The optimization problem for sparse subspace clustering (SSC) is then formulated as follows:

\[ \min_{c_i} \| c_i \| \quad s.t. \quad y_i = Yc_i; \quad c_{ii} = 0. \quad (2) \]

After solving this minimization problem, a sparse solution of \( c_i \) is obtained, where the non-zero elements \( c_{ij} \neq 0 \) express the coefficients of channel \( j \) to channel \( i \). Furthermore, we extend to solve the whole system by introducing a coefficient matrix \( C = [c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_n] \). The extended optimization problem can be written as

\[ \min_{C} \| C \| \quad s.t. \quad Y = YC; \quad \text{diag}(C) = 0. \quad (3) \]

Since noises usually appear in real data, we assume \( Y_i(t) = X_i(t) + e_i(t) \), where \( X_i(t) \) represents the real signals and \( e_i \) is independent and identically distributed noise with zero mean. We rewrite the model in Equation (3) as follows:

\[ \min_{C, E} \| C \| + \lambda \| E \| \quad s.t. \quad Y = YC + E; \quad \text{diag}(C) = 0. \quad (4) \]

In the objective function, we still minimize the coefficients and add a penalty term to minimize the fitting errors, where \( \lambda \) is the penalty parameter, subject to the same constraints. By solving the model Equation (4), we reveal corresponding subspaces and obtain a sparse representation of CC matrix \( C \), in which the nonzero elements represent the channels from the same subspace. Ideally, if both coefficients \( c_{ij} \) and \( c_{ji} \) are nonzero, then we consider channel \( i \) and \( j \) share the same subspace.

In real-life cases, however, inter-dependency and/or interactions are not usually linear explicitly. We herein introduce a kernel trick, a commonly used technique in pattern recognition, to map the original motion time series in a non-linear dimensional space, where subspace can be linearly expressed. Then, we can rewrite the optimization problem for kernel sparse subspace clustering (KSSC) as follows (Patel & Vidal, 2014):

\[ \min_{C} \| C \| + \lambda \| \psi(Y) - \psi(Y)C \|^2 \quad s.t. \quad \text{diag}(C) = 0; \quad C^T1 = 1, \quad (5) \]

where \( \psi(\cdot) \) is a mapping function and \( \psi(\cdot) = \{\psi(y_1), \psi(y_2), \ldots, \psi(y_n)\} \). A positive semi-definite kernel
matrix is defined as $\kappa(Y,Y)_{ij} = \langle \psi(Y_i), \psi(Y_j) \rangle$ and Gaussian kernel is used in our study. It is noted that the inter-dependency/interactions are still linear in the mapped subspace.

3.2.2 ADMM Solution Approach

To solve both SSC and KSSC optimization problems, we adopt a well-developed alternating direction method of multipliers (ADMM) algorithm. We present the solution process for KSSC optimization problem and it can be done for SSC optimization problem in a similar way. We first rewrite the model in Equation (5) by introducing an auxiliary matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ to avoid the trivial solution ($c_{ii} = 0$) as follows (Elhamifar & Vidal, 2013):

$$\min_{A, C} ||C|| + \lambda ||\psi(Y) - \psi(Y)A||^2$$

s.t. $A = C - \text{diag}(C), \quad A^T 1 = 1.$

(6)

Then, we add two penalty terms to make the problem convex in terms of variables $C$ and $A$, where $\frac{\rho}{2}$ is the trade-off parameters for the two terms. The convex optimization problem is expressed as follows:

$$\min_{A, C} ||C|| + \lambda ||\psi(Y) - \psi(Y)A||^2 + \frac{\rho}{2} ||A - C + \text{diag}(C)||^2 + \frac{\rho}{2} ||A^T 1 - 1||^2$$

s.t. $A = C - \text{diag}(C), \quad A^T 1 = 1.$

(7)

Note that the models in Equation (6) and Equation (7) share the same solution since all feasible solutions that satisfy all the constraints ensure two penalty terms equal to zero. Furthermore, we derive a new formulation for KSSC optimization problem by applying Lagrange multipliers a vector $\delta \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and a matrix $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ as follows:

$$\min_{A, C} ||C|| + \lambda ||\psi(Y) - \psi(Y)A||^2 + \frac{\rho}{2} ||A - C + \text{diag}(C)||^2 + \frac{\rho}{2} ||A^T 1 - 1||^2 +$$

$$\delta^T (A^T * 1 - 1) + tr(\Delta^T (A - C + \text{diag}(C)))$$

(8)

The ADMM is aimed to blend the decomposability and solving this convex optimization problem by decomposing it into small sub-problems in sequence and solving individual variables one at a time (Boyd et al., 2011). The problem is solved iteratively until solution is converged within an acceptable error or the maximum iteration is reached. For iteration $k$:

1. Update $A^{k+1}$ by optimizing Equation (8) with respect to $A$ with fixed $C^k$, $\delta^k$ and $\Delta^k$. We obtain $A^{k+1}$ by calculating the following.

$$(\lambda_z K_{YY} + \rho I + \rho 11^T) A^{k+1} = \lambda_z K_{YY} + \rho (11^T + C^k) - 1\delta^T - \Delta^k$$
2. Update $C^{k+1}$ by optimizing Equation (8) with respect to $C$ with updated $A^{k+1}$ and fixed $\delta^k$ and $\Delta^k$. We obtain

$$C^{k+1} = D - \text{diag}(D), \quad D = T_{1/\rho}(A^{k+1} + \Delta^k/\rho),$$

Note that $T_\eta(\cdot)$ is the shrinkage-thresholding operator applied on each element in matrix and is defined as $T_\eta(\nu) = (|\nu|)_+ \text{sgn} (\nu)$. Operator $(\cdot)_+$ returns its argument if non-negative, and returns zero otherwise.

3. Update $E^{k+1}$ by optimizing Equation (8) with respect to $E$ with updated $C^{k+1}$ and $A^{k+1}$, and fixed $\delta^k$ and $\Delta^k$.

$$E^{k+1} = T_{\lambda E/\lambda Z}(Y - Y A^{k+1})$$

4. Updating $\delta^{k+1}$ and $\Delta^{k+1}$ with updated $C^{k+1}, A^{k+1}$.

$$\Delta^{k+1} = \Delta^k + \rho(A^{k+1} - C^{k+1})$$
$$\delta^{k+1} = \delta^k + \rho(A^{k+1}^T 1 - 1)$$

The pseudo-code is summarized in Algorithm 1.

---

**Algorithm 1 ADMM**

**Data:** $K_{YY}$, hyper-parameters: penalties, Max-Iter, Threshold

**Result:** Sparse subspace matrix $C$

**Initialization:** $A$, $C$, $E$, $\Delta$ and $\delta = 0$

while $\text{errors} \leq \text{threshold}$ or reach Max-Iter do

1. Solve following equation for $A^{k+1}$:

$$\left(\lambda Y Y + \rho I + \rho 11^T\right) A^{k+1} = \lambda Y Y + \rho (11^T + C^i) - 1\delta^i - \Delta^i$$

2. Update $C$ by:

$$C^{k+1} = D - \text{diag}(D), \quad \text{where} \quad D = T_{1/\rho}(A^{k+1} + \Delta^k/\rho)$$

3. Update $E$ by:

$$E^{k+1} = T_{\lambda E/\lambda Z}(Y - Y A^{k+1})$$

4. Update $\Delta$ by:

$$\Delta^{k+1} = \Delta^k + \rho(A^{k+1} - C^{k+1})$$
$$\delta^{k+1} = \delta^k + \rho(A^{k+1}^T 1 - 1)$$

5. $k = k + 1$

end

For optimizing hyper-parameters $\lambda$ and $\rho$, we used grid search method to find the best settings in terms of the highest cross-validation accuracy: $\lambda = 0.015$ and $\rho = 800$ for SSC problem, and $\lambda = 60$ and $\rho = 2500$ for KSSC problem.

### 3.2.3 Feature Extraction and Representation

For input features used in a pattern classification task in the next section, we propose two strategies such that motion patterns are recognized and distinguished in the learnt subspace. First, to examine the
discriminative power, we consider individual channel-based vector \( \mathbf{c}_i \) in the clustering coefficient matrix \( \mathbf{C} \) (see CM1 in Figure 2). Each channel-based vector \( i \) contains a set of non-zero coefficients of other channels \( i' \in I \setminus i \) correlating to channel \( i \) in the same subspace. Channel-based vectors from all cycles of all subjects are aggregated to form an input feature set. There are \(|I|\) sets of input features to be performed in the classification task separately.

Second, we calculate an affinity symmetric matrix \( \mathbf{C}_s = |\mathbf{C}| + |\mathbf{C}|^T \) to present the network (or connectivity) patterns across all channels (see CM2 in Figure 2), we employ a state-of-the-art clustering technique, called density-based spatial clustering of applications with noise (DBSCAN) (Ester et al., 1996), to find clustering subspaces \( G = \{g_1, g_2, ..., g_m\} \), in which each cluster is formed by channels that interact with each other closely and dynamically; that is, connectivities in between are strong. The DBSCAN’s goal is to discover clusters of input channels based on two parameters. The first parameter \( \rho \) is a distance threshold to determine the closeness for the neighborhood of a given sample and the second parameter \( \phi \) is a threshold to limit the number of samples to form a neighborhood. In this study, we set the thresholds \( \rho \) equal to the median distance and \( \phi = 4 \). DBSCAN starts with an arbitrary channel and includes all other channels that are directly density-reachable as neighborhood if satisfied with the two parameter thresholds. This process iterates until no new channels being added to this neighborhood. Note that this is computationally fast since it is a network of only 18 channels. After determining the major cluster \( g^* \) that dominates the network, we perform sparse subspace learning, mentioned in Section 3.2.1, again on the channels included in \( g^* \) and obtain an updated clustering matrix \( \mathbf{C}_s^* \) of this major cluster \( g^* \) (see FR2 in Figure 2). Then, the elements in the upper-triangle part in \( \mathbf{C}_s^* \) are the network coefficients in the new subspace.

### 3.2.4 Pattern Classification

With the learned sparse clustering matrices \( \mathbf{C} \) and \( \mathbf{C}_s \) in Section 3.2.2, we propose to train a SVM-based classification model for performing binary classification tasks between CAI and control cohorts. The objective is to validate the effectiveness of the learned motion patterns for distinguishing CAI subjects from control subjects. SVM is considered as one of robust supervised learning methods in various applied problems of high-dimensional data (Hearst et al., 1998). The idea of SVM is to find a hyperplane with a maximum margin that allows to separate the samples in two classes (i.e., CAI versus control). Let us have training data \( \mathbf{x} = \{x_{lk}\} \) as samples \( l \in L \) presented by feature set \( k \in K \) and binary class \( y_l = \{-1, 1\} \) associated with the samples. A hyperplane is defined as

\[
h(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x} + b, \tag{9}\]
where $w^T$ is a weight vector and $b$ is a scalar. A sample is decided to belong to class $y = +1$ if $h(x) > 0$; otherwise, it belongs to class $y = -1$ if $h(x) < 0$. To find an optimal hyperplane $h^*(x) = \arg \max_{w,b} \{ \frac{1}{||w||} \}$, one can solve a constrained optimization problem to optimize the in-between margin, shown as follows:

$$\min_{w} \frac{||w||^2}{2} + \gamma \sum_{l \in L} \xi_l, \quad \text{s.t.} \quad y_l(w^T x_l + b) \geq 1 - \xi_l \forall l \in L; \quad w, b \in \mathbb{R}, \xi_l \geq 0, \forall l \in L.$$  \hspace{1cm} (10)

We solve this classification problem using a widely used library LIBSVM (Chang & Lin, 2011) with the default settings. For the sake of interpretation, a linear kernel is used throughout the computational experiments in this study. The optimized weights tell the features importance; the larger positive or negative value is, the more discriminative the feature is. See the resultant example in Figure 6. The detail will be discussed in the latter section.

4 Computational Results

In this section, for CAI dynamic motion pattern recognition, we perform our proposed subspace clustering (SSC and KSSC) methods compared to traditional methods including statistic features and Pearson correlation, and principal component analysis (PCA). We train a linear SVM model with these extracted features for classification in a leave-one-subject-out cross validation scheme; each subject of $\sim$40 sample cycles is left for testing iteratively.

4.1 Results for Channel-based Subspace

To examine the discriminative power of learnt motion patterns in different subspaces, we perform a classification task for individual learnt subspaces using channel-based vectors in the matrix $C$. We evaluate using two measures: (1) hit rate $HR = \frac{TP}{TT}$ for individual subjects, where true positive ($TP$) is the number of correctly classified sample cycles (matching true class) and $TT$ is the total number of sample cycles, and (2) majority voting accuracy ($MV$-Accur). Subject is correctly classified as the percentage of correctly classified sample cycles exceeds 50%. The results based on the two evaluation metrics are presented in Figures 3 and 4, respectively. In Figure 3, for both SSC and KSSC features, we see that the only subspace based on Channel 1 (sagittal plane of right hip) results in $\sim$70% testing hit rate, followed by the other subspace based on Channel 18 (transverse plane of left ankle). The rest of subspaces based on other channels results in $< 50\%$ testing hit rate. In Figure 4, with SSC features, there is the only one subspace based on Channel 1 (sagittal plane of right hip) resulting in $\sim 80\%$ testing $MV$-Accur. The subspaces based on Channels 3, 11, 13, 14, and 15 result in $< 50\%$ testing $MV$-Accur, and there exists a relatively larger gap between training and testing accuracies. With KSSC features,
Figure 3: Hit rates for individual channel-based subspace using SSC and KCCS features, respectively. 

There is only one subspace based on Channel 1 (sagittal plane of right hip) resulting in > 80% testing MV Accur and the rest of subspaces based on other channels results in < 60% testing MV Accur.

It is interesting that most CAI subjects can be distinguished from the hip position (Channel 1) rather than ankle position (Channels 13-18). The motion abnormality on knees along has little influence or impact on the running patterns of subjects. It is noted that there a big gap (around 20-40%) between testing and training accuracies except Channel 1, but is commonly seen in cross-subject validation due to high variation between samples in different subjects. Limited by the number of subjects, it is difficult to eliminate the bias between subjects with different body conditions, such as BMI, gender, dominant and affected leg. It may be nothing related to over-fitting in the classification model building.

In Figure 5, we illustrate the classification results of both SSC and KSSC methods for all subjects.
Figure 4: Majority voting accuracies for individual channel-based vectors using SSC and KSSC features, respectively.

are reported based on the best subspace of Channel 1 (sagittal plane of right hip). Correct prediction is colored in blue, wrong prediction is colored in white, and no data entry is colored in black. Subjects with CAI are framed in red and control subjects are framed in green. As observed, with SSC features, we classified running cycles correctly for most subjects except CAI Subjects 2, 4, 6, 9, 10, 11, and 16, and control Subjects 28, 29, 43, 44, and 45. With KSSC features, we classified running cycles correctly for most subjects except for CAI Subjects 2, 6, 9, 16, and 19, and control Subjects 9, 35, 43, and 44.

We further compare classification performance of our proposed SSC and KSSC methods to other statistical and PCA based extraction methods. We compute statistic features: mean and variance of motion time series. Pearson correlation is calculated to measure the linear relationships for all pairs of
two motion time series and a correlation matrix is formed. PCA, a classical dimensionality reduction
technique, is used to map a set of motion time series into a set of uncorrelated time series (called
principal components) in a new space. We consider the top three principal components that account
for 99.9 percent of variance in the original data space. Then we calculate the mean and variance of
principal components to form a feature vector. Table 1 present all experimental results and shows that
our proposed SSC and KSSC methods outperforms other methods by > 15%.

Our experiments also show that KSSC method outperforms SSC method. It means motion pat-
tterns are more discriminative on in a higher dimensional (non-linear) space, but not the original space.
However, direct inter-dependency between joints /channels in motion patterns becomes not easily inter-
pretable since all channels are tangle with each other.

4.2 Results for Network-based Subspace

Consider the multi-joint coordinate system as a network of 18 nodes (representing channels). We use the
network coefficients $C_s$, computed in Section 3.2.3, to describe the connectivity pattern among channels.

Table 1: Classification performance comparison of our proposed SSC and KSSC methods with statistic-
based and PCA-based feature extraction methods. The average hit rates (upper panel) and majority
voting accuracies (lower panel) are reported, respectively, from leave-one-subject-out cross validation. Each subject contains ∼40 sample cycles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Learning</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>PCA</th>
<th>SSC</th>
<th>KSSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Testing Hit Rate</td>
<td>57.49%</td>
<td>56.72%</td>
<td>52.25%</td>
<td>68.50%</td>
<td>72.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Hit Rate</td>
<td>85.23%</td>
<td>77.73%</td>
<td>70.53%</td>
<td>76.13%</td>
<td>83.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing Voting Accuracy</td>
<td>61.70%</td>
<td>57.45%</td>
<td>51.06%</td>
<td>74.47%</td>
<td>80.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Voting Accuracy</td>
<td>91.91%</td>
<td>79.56%</td>
<td>74.42%</td>
<td>75.53%</td>
<td>86.36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By applying DBSCAN clustering analysis, our experiment shows two representative SSC-based clusters. Cluster I, resulting in higher classification accuracy, includes Channels 1, 2, 5, 7, 10, 11, 16, 17 and 18, for which Channels 1, 2 and 6 locate at hip joints, Channels 7, 10 and 11 locate at knee joints, and Channels 16, 17 and 18 locate at left ankle joint. The remaining channels are included in Cluster II. We then solve the SSC problem to obtain new network coefficients for Clusters I and II, which are used for pattern classification task. Note that we do not consider KSSC method because of burdensome interpretation of inter-dependency among channels.

Table 2 presents the results (hit rate and majority voting accuracy) for network-based subspace. We compare our method to other clustering methods based on human physical joints (hips, knees, and ankles) and Pearson correlation, as well as the baseline (including all channels in a cluster). Using the same DBSCAN setting, two Pearson correlation-based clusters are found. For all resultant clusters, we employ the SSC method for the channels in the clusters to obtain network coefficients \( C_s \). The subspace (Cluster I) learnt by our SSC method results in the highest accuracy (68%). Between two correlation-based clusters, Cluster II results in a higher accuracy (65%) and includes Channels 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 13, 15 and 16, for which most channels locate on hips and ankles. If we subjectively select the joints for testing, we find that hip joint is the best cluster compared to knees and ankles.

Table 2: A performance comparison of network-based subspaces by the SSC methods and human physical joints (hips, knees, and ankles) and Pearson correlation, as well as the baseline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Physical joints</th>
<th>Correlation based</th>
<th>SSC based</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hips</td>
<td>Knees</td>
<td>Ankles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hit rate</td>
<td>50.69%</td>
<td>60.53%</td>
<td>43.40%</td>
<td>46.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV Accur</td>
<td>55.32%</td>
<td>65.96%</td>
<td>44.68%</td>
<td>46.81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As known, in SVM, features with higher weights (regardless of sign) are more important for classification. In Figure 6, we present the weights of SVM model using all subjects as training dataset for both correlation-based Cluster II and SSC-based Cluster I. Inter-dependency corresponding to higher weights are found between channels in hip and ankle joints. In summary, recognizing motion (running) abnormality for CAI may be diagnosed with hip joints rather than ankle joints. It is suspected that subjects with CAI in our study may use muscles around hips to adjust their posture to protect their ankle from sprains.

5 Conclusion

In this work, we studied a physical injury problem caused by ankle sprains, which develops a long-term and chronic instability in human daily movements. While most of recent studies were focused on the application of traditional statistic methods to biomechanical gait data, in this research we proposed a new analytic method to quantitatively learn the functional subspace that represents the original multivariate
gait motion data acquired from the 3D motion capture system. We expected that there are joint effects as a network system, i.e., a multi-joint coordinate system of bilateral ankles, knees, and hips. Our proposed sparse subspace clustering algorithms attempted to learn significant subspaces in a lower dimensional space such that original motion dynamics can be easily characterized. A SVM classification model was trained with the extracted network-based features and validated for subjects with CAI compared to control subjects. We obtained higher classification performances by >10% compared to the statistic-based features (that resulted in 55-60% accuracy). Moreover, we found that there indeed exist joint effects among these channels from our analysis. The motion instability caused by ankle sprains are found significantly on the hip joints in the studied subjects. Subjects with CAI might use hip to stabilize and balance during movement. We have shown a potential that this proposed model can be applied to support the decisions in diagnosis, treatment, and rehabilitation. For future work, we will further investigate abnormal detection problem - when motion behaviors begin to deteriorate during movement in individual subjects with CAI. A dynamic modeling approach is suggested to obtain a functional clustering tensor. Given that our current study does not consider the geometry structure of multi-varate gait data, incorporating geometry information may improve the understanding of the motion patterns in the human body system.
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