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Abstract—Inertial measurement unit (IMU)-based 3-DoF angle estimation methods for lower limb joints have been studied for decades, however the calibration motions and/or careful sensor placement are still necessary due to challenges of real-time application. This study proposes a novel sensor-movement-robust 3-DoF method for lower-limb joint angle estimation without calibration. A realtime optimization process, which is based on a feedback iteration progress to identify three joint axes of a 3-DoF joint, has been presented with a reference frame calibration algorithm, and a safe-guarded strategy is proposed to detect and compensate for the errors caused by sensor movements. The experimental results obtained from a 3-DoF gimbal and ten healthy subjects demonstrate a promising performance on 3-DoF angle estimation. Specially, the experiments on ten subjects are performed with three gait modes and a 2-min level walking. The root mean square error is below 2 deg for level walking and 5 deg for other two gait modes. The result of 2-min level walking shows our algorithms stability under long run. The robustness against sensor movement are demonstrated through data from multiple sets of IMUs. In addition, results from the 3-DoF gimbal indicate that the accuracy of 3-DoF angle estimation could be improved by 84.9% with our reference frame calibration algorithm. In conclusion, our study proposes and validates a sensor-movement-robust 3-DoF angle estimation for lower-limb joints based on IMU. To the best of our knowledge, our approach is the first experimental implementation of IMU-based 3-DoF angle estimation for lower-limb joints without calibration.

Index Terms—Analytical-based Calibration, Absolute Orientation Estimation Error, Biomedical measurement, Error compensation, Inertial Measure Unit (IMU), Lower-Limb Joint Angle Estimation, Root Mean Square (RMS), Self-aligned, Sensor-Movement-Robust, Three Degree Of Freedom (3-DOF), 3-DOF Gimbal.

I. INTRODUCTION

The need for real-time human motion measuring in pathological human movement analysis [1], stability evaluation of locomotion [2], virtual reality systems [3], and human-robot interaction [4] has driven researchers to develop novel tracking techniques. Indoor motion capture systems (e.g. optical motion capture systems [5] and magnetic resonance systems based on imaging methods [6], [7]), which utilize image processing techniques, are accurate enough to be a gold standard. However, it requires controlled laboratory settings, trained staff and costly facilities, such fatal flaws limit their use in real-time application scenarios.

For real-time application, inertial measurement units (IMU) with multi-axis gyroscopes, accelerometers and magnetometers were widely used to estimate hip, knee and ankle angles [8], [9] and [10]. To estimate 3-Degree-of-Freedom (3-DoF) angles for lower-limb joints, the IMU-based angle estimation algorithm can be decoupled to two steps. The first step is to estimate the absolute orientation of IMUs. The data measured by an IMU are described as local vectors in a sensor-fixed frame, \( \mathbf{s}_i \). Herein, orientation tracking techniques were developed to transform the vectors from \( \mathbf{s}_i \) to the earth frame in order to describe all the measurements in the same coordinate frame. Having obtained the absolute orientations of the IMUs placed on two adjacent segments, the second step is to infer joint angles by developing body-fixed frames using biomechanical constraints.

In this research, in order to develop a novel sensor-movement-robust based 3-DoF method for lower limb joint angle estimation without calibration, challenges in both steps need to be solved. Firstly, due to the diverse characteristics of measurements from each IMU, the absolute orientations of IMUs estimated by orientation tracking techniques are actually described in different reference frames [11], [12], rather than in the earth frame. This will definitely lead to a large error in the resulted angle estimation. Currently used methods for calibrating reference frames suffer from either a linear approximation of "the time-varying deviation" between reference frames [11] or a rough calibration metrics [12]. Thus, a calibration method, which is able of providing a more accurate compensation for the reference frame deviation needs to be developed with comprehensive metrics. In addition, most works of the sensor-to-body alignment for 3-DoF lower-limb joints depend on functional calibration postures. Other than being cumbersome, such postures could result in additional errors if subjects cannot perform the postures accurately. Thus, it is necessary to develop a method for estimating 3-DoF joint angles without using functional calibration postures. Moreover, when muscles, on which the IMUs are mounted, oscillate severely, or even when sensors are moved with respect to their mounted segments, how to detect the movements and re-align IMUs is still a...
challenge under real-application scenarios. Online detection and safeguarded strategy against sensor movements should be included in the algorithm.

Aiming at solving the problems above, we developed a sensor-movement-robust algorithm for estimating 3-DoF angles lower-limb joints without using calibration postures. The main contributions of this paper are summarized as follow:

- To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to realize a realtime detection and correction for sensor movements during the progress of estimating lower limb joint angles.
- A novel 3-DoF geometric constraint of lower-limb joints was proposed, with which joint axes can be further estimated without employing functional calibration postures.
- A pointwise calibration method, which utilized the fused calibrations of magnetic field and gravity vectors, was proposed to effectively overcome the problem of time-varying deviation between reference frames and ensure the accuracy of the whole algorithm.

This paper has been organized as follow: Related works are presented in Section II. Section III details the methodology and experiments have been explained in Section IV. Results and discussions of the entire research work have been given in Section V. Section VI concludes the whole study.

II. RELATED WORK

Although the IMU-based angle estimation technique has been studied for decades, there are still severe challenges for estimating 3-DoF lower-limb joint angles for real-time application. One challenge is that the second step of currently used techniques, developing body-fixed frames, still suffer from either a set of cumbersome predefined functional calibration procedures or carefully aligned body-to-sensor relationship usually associated with body landmarks defined by the International Society of Biomechanics (ISB) recommendations [13]. In [8] and [9], the coordinate axes of sensor-fixed frames were assumed to be collinear with joint axes, such an assumption makes the accuracy heavily depend on IMUs alignment. Picerno et al. [10] proposed an analytical-based calibration method using a calibration device to distinguish body landmarks. Similarly, several calibration procedures were proposed to transform sensors measurement into orientations of bone-embedded anatomical frames [14–17]. However, it was reported that the repeatability of analytical-based calibration methods was obviously worse than functional calibration [18–19].

Other works [20–22] proposed various functional calibration procedures, in which subjects were asked to perform a set of pre-determined tasks to define each orientation of biological axes with respect to sensor-fixed frames. Functional calibration presented robustness towards the execution of calibration movements [15] and the load applied to the joint [19–23]. A functional calibration with passive movements was introduced by Favre et al. [24] in order to improve robustness. Recently, Valencia et al. [25] proposed an IMU-to-body alignment method where an initial upright posture needs to be performed by subjects to align a coordinate axis with gravity. But some additional strategies, such as accurate sensor placement or standing along the direction of geomagnetic field, still need to be adopted to align other two coordinate axes.

In order to avoid the need for such calibration procedures for 3-DoF joint angle estimation, some related work in estimating angles of joints with fewer DoFs does give encouragement. Seel et al. [26] proposed a 1-DoF joint angle estimation method for knee and ankle, which fused the integration of angular rate along joint axis and the inclination of acceleration based on exploring the kinematic constraints of a hinge joint. In [27], Muller et al. extended Seel’s work towards 2-DoF joints, in which the absolute orientations of IMUs were required.

It should be noted that among all the previous work in estimating joint angles for lower-limb joints, none of the published work was proven to be robust against the sensor movements after calibration procedures. Although Muller and Seel’s work were reported to be robust against skin artificial movements, no published work have experimentally validated how to detect and compensate for large sensor movements.

Another challenge is that the accuracy of estimating IMUs’ absolute orientation has huge effect to the performance of angle estimation. The error of estimating IMUs’ absolute orientations with motion tracking algorithms will make the vectors described in sensor-fixed frames into reference frames rather than the earth frame. The reference frames of IMUs mounted on different segments vary due to IMUs’ individual signal corruptions. Brennan et al. [11] validated to what extent the absolute orientation estimation error could lead to the accuracy reduction when estimating 3-DoF angle. Therefore, in our research work, in order to reduce the error caused by the deviation between the two reference frames, a reference frame calibration algorithm should be included in 3-DoF joint angle estimation. Favre et al. [28] defined gravity as the Z axis of each reference frame. The deviation between two reference frames was calibrated by uniforming the projected angular rates of each IMU in the horizontal plane while the subjects were to perform a hip abduction and adduction. However, due to the changing of magnetic distortion and movement-caused acceleration, the deviation between two reference frames is time-varying. The calibration in this work cannot be updated over time because of the calibration posture. Based on Favre’s single calibration method, Brennan et al. [11] performed the calibration procedure before and after data collection in order to linearly interpolate the calibration angle by time. The accuracy represented by the root mean square errors indicated relatively large errors of such approximation. Vitali et al. [12] proposed a calibration algorithm
for estimating 3-DoF knee angle to dynamically calculate a “correction” direction cosine matrix, which assumes that the flexion/extension axis estimated by Seel’s 1-DoF joint angle estimation method [26] should be the same in reference frames. Although Vatali’s work provides some encouragement, the 1-DoF joint axis estimated by [25] is based on the hinge-joint approximation, which is not accurate enough on 3-DoF lower-limb joints. Thus, a comprehensive metrics of deviation between the reference frames should be given.

Motivated by the challenges from the literature review, we presented how accurately 3-DoF angle of lower-limb joints can be estimated without performing pre-defined postures or careful alignment. A novel numerical optimization-based estimation strategy has been proposed where an algorithm was embedded to detect sensor movements and compensate the consequent errors. In our experiments, IMU signals recorded from ten healthy subjects and a 3-DoF gimbal were used to respectively evaluate the potential of the designed 3-DoF angle estimation algorithm and the errors from each step of our algorithm have been analyzed separately. The promising results of this study will aid the future development of IMU-based motion measuring for gait-related application.

III. Methodology

In this research, a sensor-movement-free estimation of the orientation relationship between two segments beside a 3-DoF joint without introducing calibration movements has been proposed. More specifically, a point-wise reference frame calibration combining with an orientation tracking algorithm is firstly used to estimate IMUs’ absolute orientations in the same reference frame. Then the biological axes of lower-limb joints are estimated through geometric constraints of each joint to develop alignment between body-fixed frames and sensor-fixed frames. In this section, the principle of our algorithm is presented separately in III-A and III-B. The implementation is concretely described in III-C.

A. Calibration for Two Reference Frames

Firstly, the absolute orientation of each IMU is calculated by an improved complementary filter proposed in our previous work [29] to dynamically fuse readings from gyroscope, accelerometer and magnetometer.

As stated above, due to the different data characteristics of signals of the two IMUs mounted on each segment, the absolute orientations of both IMUs are described in two different reference frames $[g_1]$ and $[g_2]$, which can be represented by quaternions $q_{g_1}^{g_1}, q_{g_2}^{g_1}$. To compensate for errors caused by the difference between two reference frames, a common reference frame should be employed, which is namely to estimate a correction quaternion from $[g_2]$ to $[g_1]$.

Without including movement-caused acceleration, the acceleration vectors, $a_1$ and $a_2$, should be identical in the common reference frame, which contributes to the construction of the correction quaternion, given by:

$$q_{acc} = \cos(\theta_{acc}/2) \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + \sin(\theta_{acc}/2) \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ W_{acc} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$W_{acc} = (q_{g_1}^{g_1} \otimes a_1) \times (q_{g_2}^{g_2} \otimes a_2)$$ (1)

$$\theta_{acc} = \frac{q_{g_1}^{g_1} \otimes a_1 \times q_{g_2}^{g_2} \otimes a_2}{\| (q_{g_1}^{g_1} \otimes a_1) \times (q_{g_2}^{g_2} \otimes a_2) \|}$$

Where $W_{acc}$ is the rotation axis, $\theta_{acc}$ is the rotation angle and $q_{acc}$ is the correction quaternion calculated from gravity. Similarly, the identical magnetic field vectors $m_1$ and $m_2$ without magnetic distortion could contribute to another correction quaternion, given by:

$$q_{mag} = \cos(\theta_{mag}/2) \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + \sin(\theta_{mag}/2) \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ W_{mag} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$W_{mag} = (q_{g_1}^{g_1} \otimes m_1) \times (q_{g_2}^{g_2} \otimes m_2)$$ (2)

$$\theta_{mag} = \frac{q_{g_1}^{g_1} \otimes m_1 \times q_{g_2}^{g_2} \otimes m_2}{\| (q_{g_1}^{g_1} \otimes m_1) \times (q_{g_2}^{g_2} \otimes m_2) \|}$$

However, due to the corruption of acceleration and magnetometer readings, neither of the correction quaternions calculated above are accurate enough to represent the rotational relationship between $[g_1]$ and $[g_2]$. Herein, a weighted sum of these two correction quaternions is used to make a fusion.

$$q_{corr} = k_{mag} \cdot q_{mag} + k_{acc} \cdot q_{acc}$$ (3)

To calculate the angle of a 3-DoF joint, the detailed description of geometric constraint will be presented, which will start from the 1-DoF joint and then extending to 3-DoF joint.

B. Sensor-to-Body Alignment Based on Geometric Constraints

1) Geometric Constraints of a 1-DoF Joint: For lower-limb joints, there is always a main axis around which the joint rotates the most time during gait cycles. The main axis usually corresponds to flexion/extension for hip and knee, and dorsiflexion/plantarflexion for ankle. Simplifying a lower-limb joint as a hinge joint, the main axis could be estimated through its geometric constraint based on the method introduced by Seel et al. [26], which is given by:

$$\| \omega_1 \times j_1^{2D} \| - \| \omega_2 \times j_2^{2D} \| = 0$$ (4)

Where $\omega_1, \omega_2$ are angular rate vectors of each segment with respect to the sensor-fixed frames $[s_1]$ and $[s_2]$ respectively, and $j_1^{2D}, j_2^{2D}$ are the same unit joint axis but described in $[s_1]$ and $[s_2]$ respectively.
According to [20], the geometric constraint of joint position vectors can be exploited as:

\[
\|a_1 - \omega_1 \times a_1 - \omega_1 \times (\omega_1 \times a_1)\| \\
- \|a_2 - \omega_2 \times a_2 - \omega_2 \times (\omega_2 \times a_2)\| = 0
\]  
(5)

Where \(a_1\) , \(a_2\) and \(\omega_1\) , \(\omega_2\) are readings of accelerometers and gyroscopes mounted on each segment, respectively. \(a_1\) and \(a_2\) are vectors from the origin of each sensor frame to the rotating center.

According to the construction of rotation matrix, \(R_{b_i}^{s_i}\), that represents the rotation matrix between body-fixed frame \([b_i]\) and sensor-fixed frame \([s_i]\) is defined by the \(a_{b_i}^{s_i}\) coincident with the joint axis, which is assumed to be vertical to the sagittal plane.

\[x_{s_i}^{b_i} = j_i^{2D}, i = 1, 2\]  
(6)

\[z_{s_i}^{b_i} = \frac{x_{s_i}^{b_i} \times a_i}{\|x_{s_i}^{b_i} \times a_i\|} \text{, } y_{s_i}^{b_i} = z_{s_i}^{b_i} \times x_{s_i}^{b_i}\]  
(7)

\[P_{s_i}^{b_i} = [x_{s_i}^{b_i}, y_{s_i}^{b_i}, z_{s_i}^{b_i}]\]  
(8)

2) Geometric Constraints of a 3-DoF Joint: Estimating the main axis through the method presented above, although straightforward, suffers from the perturbation caused by rotation around other axes, which will consequently lead to relatively large errors and even divergence. Besides, angles of other DoFs are also of importance for gait-related researches. Herein, a general condition is considered to develop geometric constraints of a 3-DoF joint as an extension of the abovementioned method. Considering two segments connected by a 3-DoF joint, the rotation of a segment relative to the other one can be decoupled into three segment rotations around three axes. As shown in Fig. S1, \(j_1^{3D}\) and \(j_2^{3D}\) denote the axes fixed on each segment respectively, while \(j_3^{3D}\) denotes the main axis. In order to obtain a further relaxed constraint on 3-DoF lower-limb joint, the assumptions are organized as follow:

- The main axis, \(j_3^{3D}\), is perpendicular to the other two axes, which meets the definition of ISB [13].
- As adopted by [22], either of the other two axes \(j_1^{3D}\) and \(j_2^{3D}\) possesses a fixed relative orientation with its corresponded segment (i.e. \(j_1^{3D}\) - segment 1, \(j_2^{3D}\) - segment 2). If sensor movements are not considered, the coordinates of \(j_1^{3D}\) and \(j_2^{3D}\) are fixed in \([s_1]\) and \([s_2]\) respectively (i.e. \(j_1^{3D}\) - \([s_1]\), \(j_2^{3D}\) - \([s_2]\)).

To unify the description of these axes, a transitional coordinate frame, the reference frame \([g]\), should be introduced to describe all the data from both IMUs mounted on both segments. The relationship between angular rates of two segments is given by:

\[\omega_2|g| - \omega_1|g| = \omega_{j_1}|j_1^{3D}| |g| + \omega_{j_2}|j_2^{3D}| |g| + \omega_{j_3}|j_3^{3D}| |g|\]  
(9)

1It should be noted that all the figures and tables named as Si are presented in the Supplementary information.

Where \(\omega_1\), \(\omega_2\) represent two vectors of angular rate described in local sensor-fixed frames, \(\omega_{j_1}\), \(\omega_{j_2}\) and \(\omega_{j_3}\) represent scalar angular rates of each joint axis, \(j_1^{3D}\), \(j_2^{3D}\) and \(j_3^{3D}\) represent three unit joint axes described in sensor-fixed frames, \(\begin{bmatrix} \omega \end{bmatrix}_g\) denotes the description of a vector in the reference frame. Multiplying \(\begin{bmatrix} j_1^{3D}\end{bmatrix}_g\) and \(\begin{bmatrix} j_2^{3D}\end{bmatrix}_g\) on both sides of the equation, equation (9) could be transformed into:

\[f(j_1^{3D}, j_2^{3D}) = ([\omega_2]_g - [\omega_1]_g) \cdot ([j_1^{3D}]_g \times [j_2^{3D}]_g)\]  
(10)

One of the joint axes \(j_2^{3D}\) is known as the same vector as the main axis, \(j_1^{2D}\) and \(j_2^{2D}\) . Given that \(j_3^{3D}\) is perpendicular to the other two axes, the scalar angular rate \(\omega_{j_3}\) is equal to the projection of \([\omega_2]_g - [\omega_1]_g\) on this axis, which is:

\[\omega_{j_3} = ([\omega_2]_g - [\omega_1]_g) \cdot [j_3^{3D}]_g\]  
(11)

It could be seen that estimating \(j_1^{3D}\), \(j_2^{3D}\) and \(j_3^{3D}\) has no need for a specific placement, which can be very useful when orientations of IMUs towards segments are unknown. After obtaining the coordinates of \(j_1^{3D}\) and \(j_2^{3D}\) in sensor-fixed frames, a sensor-to-body alignment could be achieved by determining the orientation of body-fixed frames.

\[\begin{align*}
\theta_{s_1}^{b_1} &= \arccos([1 0 0]^T, j_1^{3D}) \\
q_{s_1}^{b_1} &= \begin{bmatrix} \cos(\theta_{s_1}^{b_1}/2) \\ \sin(\theta_{s_1}^{b_1}/2) \cdot [1 0 0]^T, j_1^{3D} \end{bmatrix} \\
\theta_{s_2}^{b_2} &= \arccos([0 0 1]^T, j_2^{3D}) \\
q_{s_1}^{b_2} &= \begin{bmatrix} \cos(\theta_{s_2}^{b_2}/2) \\ \sin(\theta_{s_2}^{b_2}/2) \cdot [0 0 1]^T, j_2^{3D} \end{bmatrix}
\end{align*}\]  
(12)

C. Algorithm Implementation

Based on the product of the rotation matrixes and quaternions calculated above, the orientation relationship between two body-fixed frames can be estimated. As shown in Fig. S2, some details still need to be implemented in order to complete the whole algorithm. In this section, details will be discussed by explaining each part of the proposed algorithm.

1) The Feedback-based Iteration Progress of Calculating 3-DoF Joint Axes: Considering the existence of main rotation in each lower-limb joint, the accuracy of 3-DoF angle estimation can be improved by applying geometric constraints of 1 DoF joint and 3-DoF joint iteratively. A complete iteration is presented in Fig. 1. The main axis described in each sensor-fixed frame, simplifying a 3-DoF joint as a hinge joint, is estimated using 1-DoF joint geometric constraints. Then, plugging the estimated main axis as the known third axis into equation (10) and (11), the geometric constraint of a 3-DoF joint, the other two axes described in each sensor-fixed frame, \(j_1^{3D}\) and \(j_2^{3D}\), can be calculated to represent the rotation axes of abduction and inner rotation.
It is shown in Fig. 1 that angular rates, $\omega_{up}$ and $\omega_{lo}$, measured by each IMU beside the joint are subtracted by their projection on each axis respectively to reduce the errors of the main axis estimation caused by additional rotations, given by:

$$
\omega_{up} = \omega_{up} - (\omega_{up} \cdot j_{1D}^2) \cdot \omega_{up} \\
\omega_{lo} = \omega_{lo} - (\omega_{lo} \cdot j_{2D}^3) \cdot \omega_{lo}
$$

The updating of angular rates constructs a feedback, which contributes to an iteration progress. With the increasing iteration times, the accuracy of estimation could be consequently improved, however, with the price of increasing computing time. Given that the tradeoff between computing efficiency and accuracy, the number of iteration is limited to 6 in order to maintain an acceptable accuracy.

2) Numerical Optimization Methods: As stated in section II-B, the geometric constraints of anatomical axes are described as a problem of minimizing cost functions. Utilizing the Gauss-Newton method as presented in [26], the coordinates of $j_{1D}^2$ and $j_{2D}^3$, $a_1$ and $a_2$ could be obtained within several iterations. Regarding $j_{3D}$ as the same vector as $j_{1D}^2$ or $j_{2D}^3$, equation (10), working as the cost function, could be used to calculate the coordinates of other two axes $j_{3D}^1$ and $j_{3D}^2$. However, unlike the calculation of $j_{1D}^2$ and $j_{2D}^3$, Jacobian of derivative-based methods is not straightforward enough to be constructed because $j_{1D}^2$ and $j_{2D}^3$ can also be treated as a function of $j_{3D}^1$ and $j_{3D}^2$. To this end, a secant version of the Levenberg-Marquardt method is applied in this scenario [30]. Following this secant version, the coordinates of $j_{3D}^1$ and $j_{3D}^2$ could be calculated by minimizing cost function $f(j_{3D}^1, j_{3D}^2)$.

In addition to joint axis calculation, a calibration of two reference frames, combined with $q_{s1}^{g1}$ and $q_{s2}^{g2}$ estimation, is also embedded in the iteration progress shown in Fig. 1. The performance of $q_{corr}$ is determined by its two fusion coefficients $k_{mag}$ and $k_{acc}$. For quantification purposes, the deviation of $[j_{1D}^2]_{g1}$ and $[j_{2D}^3]_{g1}$ is introduced here to evaluate to what extent coordinates in $[g2]$ is rotated by $q_{corr}$

$$
[j_{1D}^2]_{g1} = q_{s1}^{g1} \otimes j_{1D}^2 \\
[j_{2D}^3]_{g1} = q_{s2}^{g2} \otimes q_{corr} \otimes j_{2D}^3
$$

Regarding $f_i(k_{mag}, k_{acc}) = \| [j_{1D}^2]_{g1} - [j_{2D}^3]_{g1} \|$ as the cost function, fusion coefficients, $k_{mag}$ and $k_{acc}$, can be estimated through the secant version of L-M method. Hence, the calibration of reference frames synthesizes the information from local magnetic field, gravity and the main axis of the 3-DoF joint, which results in a comprehensive measuring.

For the sake of real-time calculation, a sliding window ($W_n$) is chosen to segment the measurements from each sensor such that the axes’ coordinates could be estimated for the last $N$ measurements. As shown in Fig. 2, two sliding windows are separated by an interval ($I_n$) within which the coordinates of joint axes estimated in the last sliding window are used to calculate joint angles.

3) Detection and Safeguarded Strategy against Sensor Movement: No published work presented how to detect and re-align IMUs (sensor-fixed frames) to body-fixed frames when IMUs are moved with respect to the segments they are mounted on. Traditionally, the only solution to sensor movements is to terminate the data collection and perform calibration procedures again. Seel and Muller’s algorithms, developed for estimating 1-DoF angle and 2-DoF angle respectively, could gradually update the coordinates of anatomical axes based on sliding windows. However, the measurements before sensor movements could no longer be used to estimate axes and angles. So a gradual update is not practical enough especially when the estimated angles are used as input to other applications.

In order to solve this problem, a comparison between outputs of each iteration is presented to ensure the variety of $j_{1D}^2$, $j_{2D}^3$ and $j_{3D}^3$ is under a boundary. A metric of such variety is given by:

$$
V = \sum_{i=1}^{3} v_i \| (j_{i}^{3D})_{iter} - (j_{i}^{3D})_{det} \|
$$

Where $(j_{i}^{3D})_{iter}$ denotes the coordinates of each axis output by the iteration progress. $(j_{i}^{3D})_{det}$ denotes the axes estimated for detection, $v_i$ is the weight for the $i$th axis. Because the main axis varies slowly under normal conditions, its...
weight $v_3$ is set to 0.2 while $v_1$ and $v_2$ are set to 0.4 respectively. The thresholds for judging sensor movements are 1.5 for hip and knee, 2.0 for ankle. During an interval $I_n$, estimation algorithm still works for estimating $(j_3^{3D})_{det}$ with 50 measurements. When $V$ is detected to be larger than a threshold, the calculation during this interval will be terminated. And a new sliding window will then be initiated to update estimates of axes, during which the axes $(j_3^{3D})_{det}$ are used to estimate angles.

Thus, according to equation [12], the angles around $j_1^{3D}$ and $j_2^{3D}$ could be estimated by decoupling $q_{b1}^{b2}$ into a sequential rotation of $X$ and $Z$ axes.

**Algorithm 1 3-DoF angle estimation for lower-limb joints**

**Input:** $\omega_1, \omega_2, a_1, a_2, m_1, m_2$

**Output:** $\angle_{j_1}, \angle_{j_2}, \angle_{j_3}, j_1^{3D}, j_2^{3D}, j_3^{3D}, o_1, o_2$

1. initialize $j_1^{3D}, j_2^{3D}, j_3^{3D}, o_1, o_2$

2. while sliding windows do

   3. for $i = 0 \rightarrow 6$

      4. subtracting angular rates using Eq. (13)

      5. estimating the main axis using Eq. (14)

      6. calibrating reference frames using Eq. (2), (3), (4). 

   7. obtaining $\omega_{j3}$ using Eq. (11) and $[j_3^{3D}]_g = [j_1^{3D}]_g$

28. estimating 3-DoF joint axes using Eq. (10)

9. end for

10. return $[j_1^{3D}]_{g1}, [j_2^{3D}]_{g1}$ and $[j_3^{3D}]_{g1}$

11. end while

12. while intervals do

13. result and $[j_1^{3D}]_{det} \leftarrow$ SENSE($\omega_{up}, \omega_{lo}$)

14. if result == 1 then

15. STOP intervals

16. do step 2 – 11

17. do step 16 – 23 using $[j_1^{3D}]_{det}$

18. else

19. estimating joint position vectors using Eq. (5)

20. calculating $R_{b1}^{b2}$ using Eq. (6) - (8) and (16)

21. inferring $q_{j3}$ using Eq. (17) and (18)

22. inferring $q_{b1}^{b2}$ using Eq. (19)

23. decoupling XYZ Euler angles of $q_{b1}^{b2}$:

24. $\angle_{j1} \leftarrow \theta_X$,

25. $\angle_{j2} \leftarrow \theta_Z$

26. end if

27. function SENSE($\omega_{up}, \omega_{lo}$)

28. result $\leftarrow 0$

29. $[j_1^{3D}]_{det} \leftarrow$ do 2-8 in detection windows

30. calculating $V$ using Eq. (15)

31. if $V < threshold$ then

32. result $\leftarrow 0$

33. else

34. result $\leftarrow 1$

35. end if

36. return result and $[j_1^{3D}]_{det}$

37. end function

IV. EXPERIMENT

A. Validation Protocol

1) 3-DoF Gimbal: To validate the effectiveness of reference frame calibration separately, a gimbal consists of two segments and three rotating axes intersecting at the same point was designed to mimic a 3-DoF lower-limb...
joint. As shown in Fig. 4, angles directly measured by Hall sensors attached to each axis by couplings, were used as reference to quantify our algorithm’s performance. Four IMUs were attached to each segment of the gimbal. IMU2 and IMU3 were attached to the segments beside a 1-DoF joint whose axis was set as the main axis, while IMU1 and IMU4 were placed beside the 3-DoF joint. Due to its flat mounting surface, IMUs can be mounted with known orientation relative to body-fixed frames, which provided a reference for the estimation of axes. The gimbal was activated manually, while the largest motion was guaranteed to be around the main axis.

![The 3-DoF gimbal](image)

(a) The 3-DoF gimbal

![The IMU attachment on human subjects](image)

(b) The IMU attachment on human subjects

Fig. 4. Experimental setup

2) **Human subject**: For the purpose of validation on human subjects, ten healthy subjects (23±3 years old, 175±5cm, 65±8.3kg) were enrolled in this study. To test the robustness against sensors’ small oscillations caused by muscle activation, the IMUs were visually placed on major muscles of pelvis and right leg (thigh, shank, foot) with arbitrary orientations. The IMUs used in this paper were numbered as Fig. 4. The subjects were asked to perform three gait modes: stair ascent, squat and level walking. Subjects were asked to firstly take four steps on level ground, ascend four steps of stair and squat three times. The sequence of these gait modes was fixed for each subject. After the multi-mode locomotion, subjects were asked to walk for 2 minutes on a treadmill after a 3-minute rest between tests to avoid the gait deviation caused by fatigue. Optical motion capture system, Vicon, was used as gold standard for comparison purpose.

B. **Data Analysis**

Prior to data processing, the raw data from IMUs were filtered by a low pass filtering method, and then method proposed by Feliz et al [31] had been adopted to reset the angular rate to zero when the angular rate was under 1 rad/s. The bias of accelerometer and magnetometer readings were evaluated by the algorithm proposed in [20] and subtracted from the data.

During the iteration of the whole algorithm, a relatively large error might come from 1) the estimation of axes using geometric constraints, 2) the calibration of reference frames. To distinguish the sources of errors, experiments were performed on the gimbal, with IMUs being placed with proper orientations relative to gimbal axes. Hence, relative errors caused by misestimation of joint geometric constraints can be completely avoided by proper alignment. Data from human subjects were collected and processed for validating the whole algorithm’s performance on lower-limb joints, and the robustness towards different sensor placement and sensor movements.

1) **Effectiveness of the reference frame calibration**: To simply analyze the effectiveness of reference frame calibration, error of estimating joint axes and position vectors should be eliminated. To do this, Z axis of IMU2 and X axis of IMU3 were placed in the direction of axis $j_1^{3D}$. In addition, structural parameters of the gimbal were used to calculate reference coordinates of joint position vectors. Thus, error caused by the deviation of reference frames can be seen as the only reason that contributes to the deviation between measured and estimated angle. The root mean square error (RMSE) between the measured 1-DoF joint angle($\theta_{measured}$) and estimated angle with ($\theta^+_j$ known) and without ($\theta^-_j$ known) calibrating reference frames was used to quantify the effectiveness of the reference frame calibration.

$$error_{RFC}^{1DoF}(i) = \theta_{measured}(i) - \theta^{+_j}_j(i)$$

$$RMSE_{RFC}^{1DoF} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (error_{RFC}^{1DoF}(i))^2}$$

(20)

2) **Validity of axis estimation**: To validate the effectiveness of axis estimation for 3-DoF joints, an accuracy comparison needs to be made in 1-DoF axis estimation and the feedback-based iteration for estimating 3-DoF axes. Using data collected from IMU2 and IMU3, the main axis $j_1^{2D}$, $j_2^{2D}$, and joint position $o_1$, $o_2$ of the 1-DoF joint can be estimated assuming that the alignment of sensors is unknown. Then, RMSE is used to measure the performance of the algorithm, which combines estimating $j_1^{2D}$, $j_2^{2D}$, $o_1$, $o_2$ and calibrating reference frames. To present how estimates of such axes drift, the deviation between the estimated coordinates of $j_1^{2D}$, $j_2^{2D}$, $o_1$, $o_2$ and their reference coordinates known by IMUs’ determined placement is used as another metric.

$$error_{GAE}^{1DoF}(i) = \theta_{measured}(i) - \theta_{estimated}(i)$$

$$error_{GAE}^{1DoF}(i) = \theta^+_j(i) - \theta^-_j(i)$$


\[
RMSE_{GAE}^{1\text{DoF}}(\theta^\pm) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (\text{error}_{GAE}^{1\text{DoF}}(i))^2}
\]  
(21)

\[
\text{error}(j_{i}^{2\text{D}})^\pm = \| [j_{i}^{\text{ref}}] - (j_{i}^{2\text{D}})^\pm \|, i = 1, 2
\]

\[
\text{error}(o_{i})^\pm = \| [o_{i}] - (o_{i})^\pm \|, i = 1, 2
\]  
(22)

Where \([j_{i}^{\text{ref}}], [o_{i}]\) are the reference coordinates of the main axis and sensor position described in the coordinate frame of the \(i\)-th IMU, \(\pm\) denotes the estimates with and without reference frame calibration respectively.

Similarly, as a performance indicator of 3-DoF angle estimation, RMSE could also be a metric of the feedback-based iteration algorithm, which can be identified as follow:

\[
RMSE_{GAE}^{3\text{D}}((j_{i}^{3\text{D}})^\pm) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mu^2}
\]

\[\mu = \theta_{\text{measured}}^{3\text{D}}(i) - \theta_{\text{estimated}}^{3\text{D}}(i)^\pm, i = 1, 2, 3\]  
(23)

Reference coordinates of the three axes, known by the placement of IMU1 and IMU4, can also provide a measurement for the estimates of such axes, given by:

\[
\text{error}(j_{i}^{3\text{D}})^\pm = \| [j_{i}^{\text{ref}}] - (j_{i}^{3\text{D}})^\pm \|, i = 1, 2, 3; j = 3, 4
\]  
(24)

Due to the varying coordinates of \(j_{3}^{3\text{D}}\) relative to IMU1 and IMU2, \(\text{error}(j_{3}^{3\text{D}})^\pm\) is computed at the end of each sliding window.

3) Accuracy and Agreement of human lower-limb joint angle estimation: To access the accuracy of the angles estimated by our algorithm, RMSE is calculated among all the lower-limb joints using estimated angles and reference angles measured by optical motion capture.

\[
RMSE_{i}^{j} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} (\theta_{i}^{j}(k) - \hat{\theta}_{i}^{j})^2}
\]

\[i = FE, AB, IR; j = \text{ankle, knee, hip}\]  
(25)

4) Repeatability of human lower-limb joint angle estimation: To evaluate the robustness of our algorithm against sensor placement, the repeatability is estimated by comparing RMSEs of estimated angles between different sensor placements. To do so, multiple IMUs were placed on the thigh and shank and data from different sets of IMUs were used to construct a comparative trial i.e. IMU1-IMU2, IMU1-IMU3, IMU2-IMU4, IMU3-IMU5, IMU4-IMU6, IMU5-IMU6. Then repeatability could be estimated by Bland-Altman method, which provides an interval where the errors fall with a 95% probability [22].

5) Influence caused by different lengths of sliding windows and intervals: To test the influence caused by different lengths of sliding window and interval, the RMSE and iteration duration were calculated with 5 sets of sliding windows and 6 sets of intervals to present their effect on accuracy and computational efficiency.

6) Robustness against sensor movements: An extreme condition was constructed to validate the effectiveness of sensor movement detection and safeguarded strategy. Data from IMUs besides hip joint during stair ascent were used as an example in this test. When data from IMU1 and IMU2 were used for estimating 3-DoF hip angles during upstairs, a piece of data from IMU3 was injected into data flow to replace data measured by IMU2 in the same duration. RMS errors were calculated separately to present the accuracy before detection, during detection and after detection. The algorithm in [25], which is proposed recently for estimating 3-D lower-limb joint angles, was employed to make a comparison with our algorithm.

7) Accuracy under a 2-min test: In order to demonstrate our algorithm’s performance over long runs, data from the 2-min test on level walking were processed. Under this test, no sensor movement was involved. RMS errors, which quantified the accuracy, were averaged among subjects.

V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Error Sources of 3-DoF Angle Estimation

As shown in Fig. 5, the curves of 1-DoF joint angle are calculated through known versus estimated (denoted by \(\theta_{\text{known}}\) and \(\theta_{\text{estimated}}\), respectively) coordinates of \(j_{1}^{3\text{D}}, j_{2}^{3\text{D}}, o_{1}, o_{2}\), and with versus without (denoted by + and −, respectively) calibrating reference frames. The root mean square errors, \(RMSE_{1\text{DoF}}^{RFC}\), are 0.32 deg (+) and 3.24 deg (−), while \(RMSE_{3\text{D}}^{1\text{DoF}}\) are 2.06 deg (+) and 4.17 deg (−). The \(RMSE_{1\text{DoF}}^{RFC}\) without calibration meets the error reported in [29].

![Fig. 5. Estimated 1-DoF angles around the axis \(j^{2\text{D}}\)](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>(\text{error}(j_{1}^{2\text{D}}))</th>
<th>(\text{error}(j_{2}^{2\text{D}}))</th>
<th>(\text{error}(o_{1}))</th>
<th>(\text{error}(o_{2}))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>−</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using data from IMU 1 and IMU 4 in the same experiment, the 3-DoF joint angle estimated by the feedback-based
Calibrating reference frames could make a large improvement (90% and 50%, respectively) on accuracy. TABLE II presents the comparison of estimating 3-DoF angles with (+) versus without (−) pointwise reference frame calibration, which demonstrates calibrating reference frames can greatly improve the estimation accuracy of 3-DoF joints. It should be noted that the performance presented TABLE II deteriorates drastically when cancelling reference frame calibration, which gives a proof that the cancelling of reference frame calibration could lead to an accumulation of data errors during the whole iteration process, even resulting in a wrong descending direction in LM method.

**TABLE II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Angle</th>
<th>$(\theta_{1D}^{*})_{3D/+}$</th>
<th>$(\theta_{2D}^{3D/-})$</th>
<th>$(\theta_{3D}^{1D/-})$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RMSE(deg)</td>
<td>18.88/2.49</td>
<td>29.18/1.69</td>
<td>9.90/2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSE(%)</td>
<td>95.1/12.54</td>
<td>34.95/2.03</td>
<td>76.1/22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE III**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>error($j_1^{1D}$)</th>
<th>error($j_2^{3D}$)</th>
<th>error($j_3^{3D}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>0.0517</td>
<td>0.0434</td>
<td>0.0089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>−</td>
<td>0.4981</td>
<td>0.3702</td>
<td>0.5596</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) **Validity of axis estimation:** For 1-DoF joint angle estimation, $RMSE_{1DoF}^{GAE}$ is larger than $RMSE_{1DoF}^{RFC}$, no matter reference frame calibrated or not, which gives an indication of to what content the 1-DoF joint axis estimation could contribute to the performance. The same data were used to analyze our algorithm’s performance on the main axis $j_3^{3D}$ of the 3-DoF joint, while the data collected simultaneously on $j_1^{3D}$ and $j_2^{3D}$ were added into analysis. It can be seen from TABLE II that $RMSE$ of $(\theta_{3D}^{3D/+})$ is smaller than $RMSE_{1DoF}^{GAE}$ with calibrating reference frames (2.06 deg), which indicates that our algorithm could improve the estimation accuracy of angles around the main axis and demonstrates the validity of decoupling a 3-DoF rotation with a main axis into rotations of three axes.

**B. Validation on human subjects**

1) **Accuracy and agreement:** In human lower-limb joint angle estimating tests, the 3-DoF angles of hip, knee and ankle were estimated, the result of which was depicted in Fig.3. Both lengths of sliding window ($W_n$) and interval $I_n$ were 300 sample points for ascending and level walking while 500 sample points for squatting. The resulting RMS errors and correlation coefficients were presented in TABLE IV and TABLE S1.

In addition to testing our algorithm’s performance on level walking, we constructed the validation on much worse conditions with larger acceleration and more severe skin artificial movements, which were stair ascending and squatting.
During such tasks, we can still obtain better accuracy in angle around the main axis compared with another self-alignment method reported in [25] during level walking, while angles in the other two directions were estimated simultaneously with relatively good accuracy.

2) Repeatability: Fig. S4 clearly presents the repeatability toward different placement of sensors using the statistics method proposed in [32]. As shown in Fig. S4, over 95% difference between two IMU sets fell in the interval of mean±SD for all the subfigures. Through the result we have obtained, we can conclude that our algorithm is sensor-placement free during the axes’ estimation, in other words, the progress of sensor self-alignment.

3) Influence caused by different lengths of sliding windows and intervals: The overall effect resulted from different lengths of sliding window and interval has been verified by an error metric, given by:

\[
    f_n(W_n, I_n) = \sum_j b_j \frac{\mu_j}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3}, \quad j = \text{hip, knee, ankle}
\]

\[
    \mu = \frac{\alpha_1}{\mu_{FE}^2} \text{RMSE}_{FE}^j + \frac{\alpha_2}{\mu_{AB}^2} \text{RMSE}_{AB}^j + \frac{\alpha_3}{\mu_{IR}^2} \text{RMSE}_{IR}^j
\]

(26)

Where \( f_n(W_n, I_n) \) denoted a weighted sum of RMS errors of every joint and every direction, \( \mu_j^i \) (\( i = FE, AB, IR \)) was the correlation coefficients of sensors and joint. Due to the same importance of each joint, \( b_j \) was set to 1. We set \( \alpha_1 = 2 \) and \( \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = 1 \), considering that more attention was paid to Flexion/Extension during most gait research. For each \( W_n \) and \( I_n \), Fig. S5 was presented to show the variety of performance. For the sake of real time application, the sliding window should be greater than or equal to the interval \( I_n \).

It can be indicated from Fig. S5 that the metric calculated by equation (25) gently varies with the changing lengths of sliding window and interval. Neither smaller nor greater sliding window length were included in this validation because algorithm with a smaller sliding window, although convergent, converges to a saddle point which was far away from the optimal solution. This could be given a side proof, shown in TABLE VI by the RMSE of sensor movement during \( I_n^{det} \), in which \( \hat{f}^{3D}_{\text{det}} \) were estimated by just 50 measurements. These RMS errors were obviously larger than those in TABLE S1. And the main axis didn’t stay still relative to IMUs. In contrast, its coordinates in sensor-fixed frames were slowly varying, the speed of which depended on the sort of moving tasks and the locomotion features of subjects. So a greater sliding window cannot improve the accuracy either. Selection of interval length (\( I_n \)) was related to the length of sliding window (\( W_n \)). During every interval \( I_n \), angles were computed according to the axes estimated in last sliding window. \( I_n \) should be equal or greater than \( W_n \), while a too great \( I_n \) would reduce the accuracy. So an interval \([W_n, 800]\) was considered by compromising the real time application and accuracy requirements.

![Fig. 7. The boxplot of computing time versus sliding window.](image)

Fig. 7 presented the computing time of 6 iterations with different lengths of sliding window. It is shown that the computing time was increasing with the lengthening sliding window.

4) Accuracy under the 2-min test: As shown in TABLE V and Fig. S6, the RMSE were presented after the five subjects performed the 2-minute test. Compared with the performance of the short-run test (shown in TABLE S1), our algorithm on the 2-min test presented a similar mean and a slightly larger standard deviation among subjects. This performance can demonstrate our algorithm’s stability under a long-run test.

### TABLE V

**RMSE of the 2-Min Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joint</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Fle/Ext</th>
<th>Abd/Add</th>
<th>InR/ExR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hip</td>
<td>1.69 ± 0.90</td>
<td>0.52 ± 0.33</td>
<td>0.79 ± 0.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knee</td>
<td>1.74 ± 0.77</td>
<td>1.77 ± 0.83</td>
<td>0.83 ± 0.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankle</td>
<td>1.25 ± 0.90</td>
<td>0.39 ± 0.71</td>
<td>0.73 ± 0.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. The robustness towards sensor movement

The robustness towards sensor movements was validated in Fig. 8. The RMS errors before sensor movement, during abnormal period, during \( I_n^{det} \) and during \( I_n \) were presented in TABLE VI.

It is shown in Fig. 8 and TABLE VI during abnormal period after sensor movement, a large deviation was induced.
by replacing IMUs. After the variation metrics $V$ was detected to exceed the threshold we set, the normal interval $I_n$ was interrupted (denoted by the vertical red line). During the temporal interval $I^\text{det}_n$, the estimates in detection widow (denoted by the red area) were used to calculate 3-DoF angles. As we can see in TABLE VI, the RMSE in this duration reduced a lot but were still larger than RMSE in next normal interval $I_{n+1}$. Comparing the results estimated by our algorithm and the algorithm in [25], it is indicated that our algorithm presented strong robustness towards sensor movement, although suffered from a slightly lower accuracy during BMS.

### VI. Conclusion

This study demonstrates an initial attempt to develop and evaluate a sensor-movement-free 3-DoF joint angle estimation algorithm for lower-limb joints. A pointwise reference frame calibration method and a feedback-based iteration progress are presented. In the experiments with the 3-DoF gimbal, errors of sensor-to-body alignment and reference frame calibration have been estimated separately. On human subjects, the robustness against sensor placement and sensor movement are validated respectively by the repeatability of different sets of IMUs and a set of RMSE during detecting and compensating sensor movement. The results of this pilot study have shown that the feedback-based iteration design is visible for estimating 3-DoF joint axes and the novel reference frame calibration algorithm is able to improve accuracy and promote the convergence of the whole estimation algorithm. Robustness against sensor placement and movement has been demonstrated and real-time application has been guaranteed by validating the computing time. However, continuing efforts are still required to further improve the robustness towards various lengths of sliding window and interval, and a more computing efficient algorithm need to be adopted if the algorithm is applied for the estimation of 3-DoF joint angle without main axis.
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