# Measuring biomechanical loads in team sports – from lab to field

Jasper Verheul * [1], Niels J. Nedergaard[2], Jos Vanrenterghem[2], and Mark A. Robinson[1]

[1]Research Institute for Sport and Exercise Sciences, Liverpool John Moores University, Liverpool, United Kingdom
[2]Department of Rehabilitation Sciences, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium

January 9, 2020

(This manuscript has been peer-reviewed and published in *Science and Medicine in Football*)
https://doi.org/10.1080/24733938.2019.1709654

**Abstract**

The benefits of differentiating between the physiological and biomechanical load-response pathways in football and other (team) sports have become increasingly recognised. In contrast to physiological loads however, the biomechanical demands of training and competition are still not well understood, primarily due to the difficulty of quantifying biomechanical loads in a field environment. Although musculoskeletal adaptation and injury are known to occur at a tissue level, several biomechanical load metrics are available that quantify loads experienced by the body as a whole, its different structures and the individual tissues that are part of these structures. This paper discusses the distinct aspects and challenges that are associated with measuring biomechanical loads at these different levels in laboratory and/or field contexts. Our hope is that through this paper, sport scientists and practitioners will be able to critically consider the value and limitations of biomechanical load metrics and will keep pursuing new methods to measure these loads within and outside the lab, as a detailed load quantification is essential to better understand the biomechanical load-response pathways that occur in the field.

## 1 Introduction

Optimal sports performance with minimal injury risk is largely determined by the training an athlete has been exposed to. Whilst sufficient training loads are required to achieve beneficial physical adaptations for enhanced performance in the form of improved fitness, excessive loading can introduce fatigue and is known to increase the risk of injury [1, 2]. Training loads are, therefore, widely measured and monitored in football and other (team) sports, with the aim to better control training prescription and optimise load-response pathways. On the one hand there is a physiological load-response pathway, where the metabolic challenge to maintain powerful and prolonged skeletal muscle contractions triggers a broad range of biochemical responses in the body, primarily in the form of metabolic and cardiorespiratory adaptations [3, 4]. On the other hand, there is a biomechanical load-response pathway, where the mechanical challenges to withstand high forces repetitively applied to the musculoskeletal system triggers mechanobiological tissue responses of the muscles, tendons, ligaments, bones and articular cartilage [5, 6, 7]. There is a growing belief that monitoring the physiological and biomechanical loads separately can contribute to the holistic understanding of an athlete's adaptive mechanisms that ultimately determine their physical fitness and performance outcomes [8]. However, in contrast to a considerable understanding of the physiological branch, the extent to which (team) sports imposes loads on the musculoskeletal system and triggers mechanobiological responses that make the tissues stronger or weaker are relatively under-investigated and not well understood.

A major issue that limits the progress in understanding biomechanical load-response pathways, is that measuring in vivo biomechanical loads to the musculoskeletal system as a whole, to the various structures within it, and to the tissues making up those structures, remains very difficult or even impossible with the current technologies, especially in a field-based context. Our aim was therefore 1) to provide an overview of biomechanical load metrics at different levels, 2) to discuss current methods and challenges for measuring in vivo biomechanical loads, and 3) suggest future considerations and avenues to be explored to enhance field-based biomechanical load monitoring.

*Corresponding Author: Jasper Verheul (J.P.Verheul@ljmu.ac.uk)
This manuscript has been peer-reviewed and published in *Science and Medicine in Football*
Authors Jasper Verheul (`@jasper_verheul`), Niels J. Nedergaard (`@NJ_Nedergaard`), Jos Vanrenterghem (`@ScienceJos`) and Mark A. Robinson (`@mrobbo18`) can be reached on Twitter.
This work can be cited as: Verheul, J., Nedergaard, N.J., Vanrenterghem, J., Robinson, M.A. (2020). Measuring biomechanical loads in team sports – from lab to field. *Science and Medicine in Football.* doi:10.1080/24733938.2019.1709654




Figure 1: Schematic overview of currently available biomechanical load metrics. The feasibility of measuring these metrics, ranging from strictly limited to the laboratory to viable in field environments, is indicated along the y-axis. The level at which loads act on the musculoskeletal system is indicated along the x-axis. The different hard- and soft-tissues affected by each load metric are shown in red (muscles), green (tendons and ligaments) and/or blue (bones and cartilage). Metrics to assess tissue- or structure-specific loads that are viable to be measured in the field are still lacking.

## 2 Tissue Loads

During training and match-play in football and other (team) sports, the different hard- and soft-tissues of the body are exposed to an array of forces. These forces cause mechanical tension within the tissues in the form of stresses and strains that, together with exercise-induced microdamage and metabolic stress, trigger remodelling and repair responses. Examples of such adaptations include alterations in muscle architecture [9, 10], changes in tendon stiffness and structure [11, 12, 13, 14], and increased bone mass and mineral density [15, 16], which are generally considered desirable characteristics for enhanced performance (e.g. higher force production, increased storage and return of elastic energy). Excessive exposure to stresses and strains on the other hand, can outpace repair mechanisms and cause an accumulation of micro-damage that weakens the tissues over time. This progressive weakening can ultimately lead to mechanical fatigue and tissue failure, such as muscle tears, tendon rupture or bone fractures [17, 18]. The optimal loading thresholds of individual tissues depend on many factors, including tissue properties and loading history. In an ideal world one would thus want to quantify and monitor the accumulation of tissue-specific stresses and strains over time.

From a mechanical perspective stress and strain can be defined as the force acting per unit surface area and the resulting relative tissue deformation, respectively. This direct relationship between force, stress and strain allows for in vitro experiments to be performed to investigate tissue adaptative or failure responses to predefined biomechanical loads [19, 20]. Such experiments can provide a detailed insight into tissue behaviour under specific loading conditions, but require highly controlled laboratory setups, homogeneous tissue specimens and strictly constant or repetitive loading patterns. As an alternative, advanced computational modelling approaches (e.g. finite element analysis) can be used to accurately predict stress and strain distributions throughout tissues in silico, and investigate their response mechanisms under different mechanical and biological conditions [21, 22]. However, there is extensive physiological, structural and morphological variability within musculoskeletal structures, and during sports movements tissues are exposed to highly varying non-uniform tensile, compressive and shear forces. This makes it difficult to translate findings from controlled in vitro and/or in silico studies to the field, beyond understanding the expected stress-related deformations and stress tolerances of individual tissues. Although biomechanical responses to training loads are thus known to take place at a tissue level, the quantification of tissue-specific loads is primarily restricted to laboratory environments only (Figure 1).

# 3 Structural Loads

Much research has investigated loads experienced by the musculoskeletal system at a structural level. Individual organs (e.g. muscles, tendons, ligaments, bones) or a combination thereof (e.g. joints, segments, limbs) form structures on which forces and moments act. These structural loads thus describe the combination of stresses and strains working on the individual tissues comprised by the structure. Net moments about the knee joint structure for example, can be used as an indicator of loading magnitude and injury risk of the anterior cruciate ligament [23, 24]. Likewise, measures of joint or leg stiffness, which is the resistance of a structure to withstand the forces acting on it, have been demonstrated to be sensitive to training status [25], running speed [26] and exercise-induced fatigue [27, 28] (see [29] for an extensive discussion of the use of stiffness measures in sports). Quantifying structure-specific loading parameters can thus be informative for evaluating the risk of injury or biomechanical adaptations to training.

To indirectly estimate the in vivo loads acting on individual structures, including bone and muscle-tendon forces, and joint moments, reaction forces and stiffness parameters, musculoskeletal modelling techniques can be used [30, 31]. Although such approaches are traditionally laborious and time consuming, recent advancements have shown the potential for real-time analysis of joint forces and moments, as well as muscle-tendon forces [32, 33, 34, 35]. The downside of these methods however, is that they are strongly dependent on kinematic (motion-capture systems), kinetic (force platforms) and/or neuromuscular (electromyography) input, the combination of which is yet largely restricted to laboratories. Several studies have, therefore, aimed to directly measure the in vivo structure-specific loads. Surgically implanted force transducers or strain gauges may, for example, be used to measure muscle-tendon forces [36, 37, 38] or bone strains [39] for walking, running and jumping activities, but their invasive and temporary nature makes the use of implants unsuitable for large-scale human experiments, let alone day-to-day load monitoring in the field. Very recently, a wearable tensiometer device has shown promising results for non-invasively assessing mechanical properties and loading of superficial tendons [40], and could be a first step towards the direct and field-based measurement of structure-specific loads.The difficulty of directly measuring structural forces has also led to the exploration of various indicators (or surrogate measures) of structural load. Tibial accelerations measured from shank-mounted accelerometers for example, have been suggested to provide a valid, reliable and simple field-based indicator of tibial loading [41, 42, 43], but it remains uncertain if tibial accelerations are related to the actual forces, stresses and strains experienced by the bone [44]. In short therefore, despite the availability of several techniques to quantify structural loads directly or indirectly, their application is still primarily bound to a lab context (Figure 1).

# 4 Whole-Body Loads

Besides internal stresses and strains that are experienced by specific tissues and/or structures, the body as a whole is exposed to external forces. These external loads are primarily caused by interactions with other athletes (e.g. during tackling), equipment (e.g. kicking or hitting a ball) or the ground. Ground reaction forces (GRFs) following from foot-ground interactions especially, both drive and are affected by muscular actions, and contribute to impact forces experienced by individual structures. GRFs thus describe the biomechanical loading experienced by the musculoskeletal system as a whole and have been investigated extensively for their potential association with running performance features [45, 46, 47] or specific overuse related pathologies [48, 49, 50]. Such relationships remain ambiguous though [48, 50] and GRF may even be a poor predictor of the loads experienced at a structural level [49, 20].

Whilst GRF alone unlikely suffices as a source of information for the prevention or treatment of particular tissue- or structure-specific pathologies, GRF can still provide a generic indicator of cumulative loading of the musculoskeletal system as a whole. In contrast to tissue- and structure-specific loads, GRFs can be measured relatively easily and non-invasively from force platforms. Unfortunately, force platforms are not suitable for sport-specific training and competition environments, and different approaches have been explored to estimate GRF from wearable devices in the field. Probably the most intuitive method is by using instrumented insoles, which are typically worn in or under the shoe and provide a summed measure of the pressure that the foot exerts on the ground [51]. Although pressure insoles can estimate GRF for running and jumping fairly well [52, 53, 54, 55, 56], their compromised accuracy for high-intensity movements [52, 54, 55, 56] and practical limitations (e.g. movement restrictions, added mass in the shoe, discomfort) [52], leaves the feasibility of using insoles for monitoring GRF on a large-scale in the field currently still questionable.

Based on the relationship between force and acceleration according to Newton's second law (F=m·a), segmental movements may be used to indirectly estimate GRF [57, 58, 59]. Currently popular body-worn accelerometers have, therefore, received special attention for their potential to measure GRF in this manner [41, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65]. Several studies have, however, demonstrated that either whole GRF waveforms [60, 61, 62], or even specific GRF features [41, 61, 63], cannot be estimated well from individual trunk-, pelvis- or shank-mounted accelerometers. In fact, the majority of segmental accelerations are likely required to accurately estimate GRF [57, 58], making the use of one or even a combination of several accelerometer units to predict GRF probably insufficient.

Besides GRF, other accelerometry-based metrics have been suggested to assess whole-body loading, including vertical stiffness [66, 67, 68] and cumulative acceleration metrics [69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74]. Vertical stiffness is assumed to represent the whole-body response to the dynamic external forces and may be used to assess neuromuscular fatigue and performance after different types of training [67, 68]. Likewise, cumulative acceleration metrics (e.g. PlayerLoadTM, New Body Load, Dynamic Stress Load, Force Load [69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74]) are thought to provide an indication of the accumulated external impacts the body is exposed to. However, the premise underpinning these metrics that accelerations of individual segments appropriately represent the whole-body acceleration is probably not valid [60], while evidence for a relationship with loads acting on a structural or tissue level is yet lacking. As such, if associations between any of these metrics and performance improvements or increased injury risk are observed, this does not provide an explanation for the underlying mechanisms of such associations. In other words, although GRF, stiffness or accelerometry-derived metrics offer field-based methods to quantify whole-body loading (Figure 1), their relevance and intrinsic value for assessing load-response pathways at a structural or tissue level remains to be determined.

# 5 From Lab to Field

A big hurdle for translating research into the biomechanical load-response pathways from the lab to the field is the difficulty of quantifying biomechanical loads. This is primarily due to the lack of means to accurately measure biomechanical information in an athlete's natural training and/or competition environment (e.g. a football pitch). Recent developments have, however, demonstrated that such information might become more easily available in applied sport settings in the near future. For example, full-body wireless inertial sensor suits have been shown to be a reliable and valid method to simultaneously measure kinematic information of all body segments outside the laboratory (e.g. Xsens MVN [75]), and can already provide GRF and joint moment estimates during stereotypical activities such as walking [76, 77]. To overcome discomfort and movement restriction issues associated with the use of multiple body-worn devices, markerless motion capture techniques are a non-invasive method for measuring different biomechanical variables in various sport environments [78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83]. These techniques may in the future allow for load metrics to be estimated at different levels. If for example, information from body-worn sensors or markerless motion capture can be used to accurately estimate GRF [58, 84], the combination of kinematics and GRF may eventually be used to estimate structure-specific loading and thus open the door to field-based measurements and monitoring of internal biomechanical loads.

Given the often-limited availability of information in day-to-day football environments (as well as other applied sports settings), estimating biomechanical loads using conventional mechanical methods that attempt to directly measure load is not always possible. An imminent area in sports biomechanics that overcomes this issue is the use of advanced machine learning approaches to identify and/or predict biomechanical variables of interest [85]. For example, neural network methods have been used to predict GRF and moments [86, 87] and joint forces [88] from body-worn inertial sensors for different running tasks. Although these studies show promising results, interpreting the underlying biomechanical mechanisms of the predicted variable can be difficult [85, 89], which could limit their application for e.g. explaining adaptation criteria or injury mechanisms. If similar techniques can be used to accurately predict tissue- or structure-specific forces however, this may enable large-scale and non-invasive internal load monitoring in the field.

To effectively investigate and describe biomechanical load-response pathways in the field, the relevance of metrics used to quantify loads acting on the musculoskeletal system, as well as the outcome measures against which these loads are validated, should be considered. Popular body-worn sensor technologies especially, have opened the door for relatively easy measurements of several indicators of whole-body loading, but the applied researcher or practitioner should be reminded that their relationship with established tissue or structural load metrics, or their relevance in the context of the adaptive or injury mechanisms, has not been validated. For example, changes observed at a whole-body level (e.g. technique changes in a fatigued state) can be insightful when assessing generic whole-body adaptations to training but as yet, cannot be used to directly infer on load-response pathways experienced by individual tissues or structures. Therefore, careful validation is required for such field-based metrics against measures of tissue and/or structural responses (e.g. from tissue biopsies or ultrasound scanning) to establish the relationships between available biomechanical load metrics and the adaptive or injury mechanisms occurring at internal levels.

# 6 Conclusion

Biomechanical load-response pathways can be explained at different levels of the musculoskeletal system. Due to the currently limited availability of field-based biomechanical load metrics, enhancing our understanding of what biomechanical load metrics can and cannot be used for is essential. Our hope is that through this paper, sport scientists and practitioners alike will revisit their views on the value and limitations of biomechanical load metrics at different levels. Nevertheless, we would like to encourage sport scientists and biomechanics researchers to keep pursuing ways to overcome the challenges of measuring these loads within and outside the lab, as the detailed quantification of biomechanical loads experienced during sport activities is essential to further understand the in vivo biomechanical load-response pathways and ultimately monitor them in the field.

# References

[1] T. G. Eckard, D. A. Padua, D. W. Hearn, B. S. Pexa, and B. S. Frank, *The Relationship Between Training Load and Injury in Athletes: A Systematic Review*, vol. 48. Springer International Publishing, 2018.

[2] M. K. Drew and C. F. Finch, "The Relationship Between Training Load and Injury, Illness and Soreness: A Systematic and Literature Review," *Sports Medicine*, 2016.

[3] F. M. Impellizzeri, E. Rampinini, and S. M. Marcora, "Physiological assessment of aerobic training in soccer," *Journal of Sports Sciences*, vol. 23, no. 6, pp. 583–92, 2005.

[4] M. J. MacInnis and M. J. Gibala, "Physiological adaptations to interval training and the role of exercise intensity," *Journal of Physiology*, vol. 595, no. 9, pp. 2915–2930, 2017.

[5] N. Rosa, R. Simoes, F. D. Magalhães, and A. T. Marques, "From mechanical stimulus to bone formation: A review," *Medical Engineering and Physics*, vol. 37, no. 8, pp. 719–728, 2015.

[6] S. Bohm, F. Mersmann, and A. Arampatzis, "Human tendon adaptation in response to mechanical loading: a systematic review and meta-analysis of exercise intervention studies on healthy adults," *Sports Medicine - Open*, vol. 1, no. 1, p. 7, 2015.

[7] K. M. Wisdom, S. L. Delp, and E. Kuhl, "Use it or lose it: multiscale skeletal muscle adaptation to mechanical stimuli," *Biomechanics and Modeling in Mechanobiology*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 195–215, 2015.

[8] J. Vanrenterghem, N. J. Nedergaard, M. A. Robinson, and B. Drust, "Training Load Monitoring in Team Sports: A Novel Framework Separating Physiological and Biomechanical Load-Adaptation Pathways," *Sports Medicine*, 2017.

[9] S. Nimphius, M. R. McGuigan, and R. U. Newton, "Changes in Muscle Architecture and Performance During a Competitive Season in Female Softball Players," *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, vol. 26, no. 10, pp. 2655–2666, 2012.

[10] J. L. Secomb, O. R. Farley, S. Nimphius, L. Lundgren, T. T. Tran, and J. M. Sheppard, "The training-specific adaptations resulting from resistance training, gymnastics and plyometric training, and non-training in adolescent athletes," *Sports Science & Coaching*, vol. 12, no. 6, pp. 762–773, 2017.

[11] C. Couppe, M. Kongsgaard, P. Aagaard, P. Hansen, J. Bojsen-Moller, M. Kjaer, and S. P. Magnusson, "Habitual loading results in tendon hypertrophy and increased stiffness of the human patellar tendon," *Journal of Applied Physiology*, vol. 105, no. 3, pp. 805–810, 2008.

[12] F. Mersmann, S. Bohm, A. Schroll, H. Boeth, G. Duda, and A. Arampatzis, "Muscle and tendon adaptation in adolescent athletes: A longitudinal study," *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports*, vol. 27, pp. 75–82, 2017.

[13] A. Esmaeili, A. M. Stewart, W. G. Hopkins, G. P. Elias, and R. J. Aughey, "Effects of Training Load and Leg Dominance on Achilles and Patellar Tendon Structure," *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance*, vol. 12, pp. S2–122–S2–126, 2017.

[14] L. M. Rabello, J. Zwerver, R. E. Stewart, I. van den Akker-Scheek, and M. S. Brink, "Patellar tendon structure responds to load over a 7 - week preseason in elite male volleyball players," *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports*, pp. 1–8, 2019.

[15] M. Fredericson, K. Chew, J. Ngo, T. Cleek, J. Kiratli, and K. Cobb, "Regional bone mineral density in male athletes: a comparison of soccer players, runners and controls," *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, vol. 41, pp. 664–668, 2007.

[16] E. Helge, T. Andersen, J. Schmidt, N. Jørgensen, T. Hornstrup, P. Krustrup, and J. Bangsbo, "Recreational football improves bone mineral density and bone turnover marker profile in elderly men," *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 98–104, 2014.

[17] W. B. Edwards, "Modeling Overuse Injuries in Sport as a Mechanical Fatigue Phenomenon," *Exercise and Sport Sciences Reviews*, vol. 46, no. 4, pp. 224–231, 2018.

[18] M. Bertelsen, A. Hulme, J. Petersen, R. Brund, H. Sørensen, C. Finch, E. Parner, and R. Nielsen, "A framework for the etiology of running-related injuries," *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports*, vol. 27, pp. 1170–1180, 2017.

[19] T. Wang, Z. Lin, R. E. Day, B. Gardiner, E. Landao-Bassonga, J. Rubenson, T. B. Kirk, D. W. Smith, D. G. Lloyd, G. Hardisty, A. Wang, Q. Zheng, and M. H. Zheng, "Programmable mechanical stimulation influences tendon homeostasis in a bioreactor system," *Biotechnology and Bioengineering*, vol. 110, no. 5, pp. 1495–1507, 2013.

[20] L. L. Loundagin, T. A. Schmidt, and W. B. Edwards, “Mechanical Fatigue of Bovine Cortical Bone Using Ground Reaction Force Waveforms in Running,” *Journal of Biomechanical Engineering*, vol. 140, pp. 031003–1–031003–5, jan 2018.

[21] F. Amirouche and A. Bobko, “Bone Remodeling and Biomechanical Processes- A Multiphysics Approach,” *Austin Journal of Biotechnology & Bioengineering*, vol. 2, no. 2, p. id1041, 2015.

[22] D. W. Smith, J. Rubenson, D. Lloyd, M. Zheng, J. Fernandez, T. Besier, J. Xu, and B. S. Gardiner, “A conceptual framework for computational models of Achilles tendon homeostasis,” *WIREs Systems Biology and Medicine*, vol. 5, no. October, pp. 523–538, 2013.

[23] T. E. Hewett, G. D. Myer, K. R. Ford, R. S. Heidt, A. J. Colosimo, S. G. McLean, A. J. Van den Bogert, M. V. Paterno, and P. Succop, “Biomechanical Measures of Neuromuscular Control and Valgus Loading of the Knee Predict Anterior Cruciate Ligament Injury Risk in Female Athletes: A Prospective Study,” *American Journal of Sports Medicine*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 492–501, 2005.

[24] C.-f. Lin, H. Liu, M. T. Gros, P. Weinhold, W. E. Garrett, and B. Yu, “Biomechanical risk factors of non-contact ACL injuries: A stochastic biomechanical modeling study,” *Journal of Sport and Health Science*, vol. 1, pp. 36–42, 2012.

[25] J. Verheul, A. C. Clansey, and M. J. Lake, “Adjustments with running speed reveal neuromuscular adaptations during landing associated with high mileage running training,” *Journal of Applied Physiology*, vol. 122, pp. 653–665, 2017.

[26] A. Arampatzis, G.-P. Brüggemann, and V. Metzler, “The effect of speed on leg stiffness and joint kinetics in human running,” *Journal of Biomechanics*, vol. 32, pp. 1349–1353, 1999.

[27] J. B. Morin, P. Samozino, and G. Y. Millet, “Changes in running kinematics, kinetics, and spring-mass behavior over a 24-h run,” *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, vol. 43, no. 5, pp. 829–836, 2011.

[28] J. L. Oliver, M. B. De Ste, R. S. Lloyd, and C. A. Williams, “Altered neuromuscular control of leg stiffness following soccer-specific exercise,” *European Journal of Applied Physiology*, vol. 114, pp. 2241–2249, 2014.

[29] S. J. Maloney and I. M. Fletcher, “Lower limb stiffness testing in athletic performance: a critical review,” *Sports Biomechanics*, vol. 3141, no. May, pp. 1–22, 2018.

[30] A. Seth, J. L. Hicks, T. K. Uchida, A. Habib, C. L. Dembia, J. J. Dunne, C. F. Ong, M. S. DeMers, A. Rajagopal, M. Millard, S. R. Hamner, E. M. Arnold, J. R. Yong, S. K. Lakshmikanth, M. A. Sherman, J. P. Ku, and S. L. Delp, “OpenSim: Simulating musculoskeletal dynamics and neuromuscular control to study human and animal movement,” *PLoS Computational Biology*, vol. 14, no. 7, p. e1006223, 2018.

[31] S. H. Scott and D. A. Winter, “Internal forces at chronic running injury sites,” *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 357–369, 1990.

[32] C. Pizzolato, D. J. Saxby, E. Ceseracciu, L. Modenese, and D. G. Lloyd, “Biofeedback for gait retraining based on real-time estimation of tibiofemoral joint contact forces,” *Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, vol. 25, no. 9, pp. 1612–1621, 2017.

[33] C. Pizzolato, M. Reggiani, L. Modenese, and D. G. Lloyd, “Real-time inverse kinematics and inverse dynamics for lower limb applications using OpenSim,” *Computer Methods in Biomechanics and Biomedical Engineering*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 436–445, 2017.

[34] A. J. van den Bogert, T. Geijtenbeek, O. Even-Zohar, F. Steenbrink, and E. C. Hardin, “A real-time system for biomechanical analysis of human movement and muscle function,” *Medical and Biological Engineering and Computing*, vol. 51, pp. 1069–1077, 2013.

[35] K. Manal, K. Gravare-Silbernagel, and T. S. Buchanan, “A real-time EMG-driven musculoskeletal model of the ankle,” *Multibody System Dynamics*, vol. 28, pp. 169–180, 2012.

[36] S. Fukashiro, P. V. Komi, M. Järvinen, and M. Miyashita, “In vivo achilles tendon loading’ during jumping in humans,” *European Journal of Applied Physiology and Occupational Physiology*, vol. 71, no. 5, pp. 453–458, 1995.

[37] P. V. Komi, M. Salonen, M. Järvinen, and O. Kokko, “In Vivo Registration of Achilles Tendon Forces in Man. I. Methodological Development,” *Internation Journal of Sports Medicine*, vol. 8, pp. 3–8, 1987.

[38] P. V. Komi, “Relevance of in vivo force measurements to human biomechanics,” *Journal of Biomechanics*, vol. 23, no. Suppl. 1, pp. 23–34, 1990.

[39] D. B. Burr, C. Milgrom, D. Fyhrie, M. Forwood, M. Nyska, A. Finestone, S. Hoshaw, E. Saiag, and A. Simkin, “In Vivo Measurement of Human Tibial Strains During Vigorous Activity,” *Bone*, vol. 18, no. 5, pp. 405–410, 1996.

[40] J. A. Martin, S. C. Brandon, E. M. Keuler, J. R. Hermus, A. C. Ehlers, D. J. Segalman, M. S. Allen, and D. G. Thelen, “Gauging force by tapping tendons,”

*Nature Communications*, vol. 9, no. 1592, pp. 1–9, 2018.

[41] D. P. Raper, J. Witchalls, E. J. Philips, E. Knight, M. K. Drew, and G. Waddington, "Use of a tibial accelerometer to measure ground reaction force in running: A reliability and validity comparison with force plates," *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 84–88, 2018.

[42] C. E. Milner, R. Ferber, C. D. Pollard, J. Hamill, and I. S. Davis, "Biomechanical factors associated with tibial stress fracture in female runners," *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 323–328, 2006.

[43] E. M. Hennig and M. A. Lafortune, "Relationships between ground reaction force and tibial bone acceleration parameters," *Internation Journal of Sport Biomechanics*, vol. 7, pp. 303–309, 1991.

[44] K. R. Sheerin, D. Reid, and T. F. Besier, "The measurement of tibial acceleration in runners. A review of the factors that can affect tibial acceleration during running and evidence based guidelines for its use," *Gait & Posture*, vol. 67, pp. 12–24, 2019.

[45] R. Nagahara, M. Mizutani, A. Matsuo, H. Kanehisa, and T. Fukunaga, "Association of sprint performance with ground reaction forces during acceleration and maximal speed phases in a single sprint," *Journal of Applied Biomechanics*, pp. 1–20, 2017.

[46] N. E. Bezodis, J. S. North, and J. L. Razavet, "Alterations to the orientation of the ground reaction force vector affect sprint acceleration performance in team sports athletes," *Journal of Sports Sciences*, vol. 35, no. 18, pp. 1817–1824, 2017.

[47] G. Rabita, S. Dorel, J. Slawinski, E. Sàez-de Villarreal, A. Couturier, P. Samozino, and J. B. Morin, "Sprint mechanics in world-class athletes: A new insight into the limits of human locomotion," *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports*, vol. 25, no. 5, pp. 583–594, 2015.

[48] A. A. Zadpoor and A. A. Nikooyan, "The relationship between lower-extremity stress fractures and the ground reaction force: A systematic review," *Clinical Biomechanics*, vol. 26, pp. 23–28, 2011.

[49] E. S. Matijevich, L. M. Branscombe, L. R. Scott, and K. E. Zelik, "Ground reaction force metrics are not strongly correlated with tibial bone load when running across speeds and slopes: Implications for science, sport and wearable tech," *Plos One*, vol. 14, no. 1, p. e0210000, 2019.

[50] H. van der Worp, J. W. Vrielink, and S. W. Bredeweg, "Do runners who suffer injuries have higher vertical ground reaction forces than those who remain injury-free? A systematic review and meta-analysis.," *British journal of sports medicine*, vol. 50, no. 8, pp. 450–7, 2016.

[51] J. A. Ramirez-Bautista, J. A. Huerta-Ruelas, S. L. Chaparro-Cárdenas, and A. Hernández-Zavala, "A Review in Detection and Monitoring Gait Disorders Using In-Shoe Plantar Measurement Systems," *IEEE Reviews in Biomedical Engineering*, vol. 10, pp. 299–309, 2017.

[52] K. E. Renner, D. B. Williams, and R. M. Queen, "The Reliability and Validity of the Loadsol® under Various Walking and Running Conditions," *Sensors*, vol. 19, no. 265, pp. 1–14, 2019.

[53] G. T. Burns, J. D. Zendler, and R. F. Zernicke, "Validation of a wireless shoe insole for ground reaction force measurement," *Journal of Sports Sciences*, pp. 1–10, 2018.

[54] W. Seiberl, E. Jensen, J. Merker, M. Leitel, and A. Schwirtz, "Accuracy and precision of loadsol® insole force- sensors for the quantification of ground reaction force-based biomechanical running parameters parameters," *European Journal of Sport Science*, vol. 18, no. 8, pp. 1100–1109, 2018.

[55] J. Park, Y. Na, G. Gu, and J. Kim, "Flexible insole ground reaction force measurement shoes for jumping and running," *Proceedings of the IEEE RAS and EMBS International Conference on Biomedical Robotics and Biomechatronics*, vol. 2016-July, pp. 1062–1067, 2016.

[56] A. T. Peebles, L. A. Maguire, K. E. Renner, and R. M. Queen, "Validity and Repeatability of Single-Sensor Loadsol Insoles during Landing," *Sensors*, vol. 18, no. 4082, pp. 1–10, 2018.

[57] G. Pavei, E. Seminati, D. Cazzola, and A. E. Minetti, "On the estimation accuracy of the 3D body center of mass trajectory during human locomotion: Inverse vs. forward dynamics," *Frontiers in Physiology*, vol. 8, no. MAR, pp. 1–13, 2017.

[58] J. Verheul, J. Warmenhoven, P. J. Lisboa, W. Gregson, J. Vanrenterghem, and M. A. Robinson, "Identifying generalised segmental acceleration patterns that contribute to ground reaction force features across different running tasks," *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, 2019.

[59] M. F. Bobbert, H. C. Schamhardt, and B. M. Nigg, "Calculation of Vertical Ground Reaction," *Journal of biomechanics*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 1095–1105, 1991.

[60] N. J. Nedergaard, M. A. Robinson, E. Eusterwiemann, B. Drust, P. J. Lisboa, and J. Vanrenterghem, "The Relationship Between Whole-Body External Loading and Body-Worn Accelerometry During Team-Sport Movements," *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 18–26, 2017.

[61] S. Edwards, S. White, S. Humphreys, R. Robergs, and N. O'Dwyer, "Caution using data from triaxial accelerometers housed in player tracking units during running," *Journal of Sports Sciences*, vol. 37, no. 7, pp. 810–818, 2019.

[62] N. J. Nedergaard, J. Verheul, B. Drust, T. Etchells, P. J. Lisboa, M. A. Robinson, and J. Vanrenterghem, "The feasibility of predicting ground reaction forces during running from a trunk accelerometry driven mass-spring-damper model," *PeerJ*, vol. 6, p. e6105, 2018.

[63] D. W. Wundersitz, K. J. Netto, B. Aisbett, and P. B. Gastin, "Validity of an upper-body-mounted accelerometer to measure peak vertical and resultant force during running and change-of-direction tasks," *Sports Biomechanics*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 403–412, 2013.

[64] R. D. Gurchiek, R. S. McGinnis, A. R. Needle, J. M. McBride, and H. van Werkhoven, "The use of a single inertial sensor to estimate 3-dimensional ground reaction force during accelerative running tasks," *Journal of Biomechanics*, vol. 61, pp. 263–268, 2017.

[65] J. M. Neugebauer, K. H. Collins, and D. A. Hawkins, "Ground reaction force estimates from ActiGraph GT3X+ hip accelerations," *PLoS ONE*, vol. 9, no. 6, p. e99023, 2014.

[66] P. Gaudino, C. Gaudino, G. Alberti, and A. E. Minetti, "Biomechanics and predicted energetics of sprinting on sand: Hints for soccer training," *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, vol. 16, pp. 271–275, 2013.

[67] M. Buchheit, A. Gray, and J.-B. Morin, "Assessing stride variables and vertical stiffness with GPS-embedded accelerometers: preliminary insights for the monitoring of neuromuscular fatigue on the field," *Journal of Sports Science and Medicine*, no. 14, pp. 698–701, 2015.

[68] M. Buchheit, M. Lacome, Y. Cholley, and B. M. Simpson, "Neuromuscular Responses to Conditioned Soccer Sessions Assessed via GPS-Embedded Accelerometers: Insights Into Tactical Periodization," *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance*, vol. 13, pp. 577–583, 2018.

[69] R. M. Page, K. Marrin, C. M. Brogden, and M. Greig, "Biomechanical and physiological response to a contemporary soccer match-play simulation," *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, vol. 29, no. 10, pp. 2860–2866, 2015.

[70] M. J. Colby, B. Dawson, J. Heasman, B. Rogalski, and T. J. Gabbett, "Accelerometer and GPS-Derived Running Loads and Injury Risk in Elite Australian Footballers," *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, vol. 28, no. 8, pp. 2244–2252, 2014.

[71] S. Barrett, A. Midgley, and R. Lovell, "PlayerLoad™: Reliability, convergent validity, and influence of unit position during treadmill running," *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance*, vol. 9, no. 6, pp. 945–952, 2014.

[72] P. Gaudino, G. Alberti, and F. M. Iaia, "Estimated metabolic and mechanical demands during different small-sided games in elite soccer players," *Human Movement Science*, vol. 36, pp. 123–133, 2014.

[73] F. E. Ehrmann, C. S. Duncan, D. Sindhusake, W. N. Franzsen, and D. A. Greene, "GPS and Injury Prevention in Professional Soccer," *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 360–367, 2016.

[74] L. J. Boyd, K. Ball, and R. J. Aughey, "The reliability of minimaxX accelerometers for measuring physical activity in australian football," *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance*, vol. 6, pp. 311–321, 2011.

[75] D. Roetenberg, H. Luinge, and P. Slycke, "Xsens MVN: Full 6DOF Human Motion Tracking Using Miniature Inertial Sensors," tech. rep., Xsens Technologies, 2013.

[76] A. Karatsidis, G. Bellusci, M. H. Schepers, M. de Zee, M. S. Andersen, and P. H. Veltink, "Estimation of Ground Reaction Forces and Moments During Gait Using Only Inertial Motion Capture," *Sensors*, vol. 17, no. 75, pp. 1–22, 2017.

[77] J. Konrath, A. Karatsidis, M. H. Schepers, G. Bellusci, M. de Zee, and M. S. Andersen, "Estimation of the Knee Adduction Moment and Joint Contact Force during Daily Living Activities Using Inertial Motion Capture," *Sensors*, vol. 19, no. 1681, pp. 1–12, 2019.

[78] S. Corazza, L. Mündermann, A. M. Chaudhari, T. Demattio, C. Cobelli, and T. P. Andriacchi, "A markerless motion capture system to study musculoskeletal biomechanics: Visual hull and simulated annealing approach," *Annals of Biomedical Engineering*, vol. 34, no. 6, pp. 1019–1029, 2006.

[79] G. D. Abrams, A. H. Harris, T. P. Andriacchi, and M. R. Safran, "Biomechanical analysis of three tennis serve types using a markerless system," *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, vol. 48, no. 4, pp. 339–342, 2014.

[80] S. K. Fung, K. Sundaraj, N. U. Ahamed, L. C. Kiang, S. Nadarajah, A. Sahayadhas, A. Ali, A. Islam, and R. Palaniappan, "Hybrid markerless tracking of complex articulated motion in golf swings," *Journal of Bodywork & Movement Therapies*, vol. 18, pp. 220–227, 2014.

[81] J. Grigg, E. Haakonssen, E. Rathbone, R. Orr, and J. W. Keogh, "The validity and intra-tester reliability

of markerless motion capture to analyse kinematics of the BMX Supercross gate start," *Sports Biomechanics*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 383–401, 2018.

[82] K. Saylor, D. Nicolella, D. Chambers, and B. Swenson, "Markerless biomechanics analysis for optimization of soldier physical performance," *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, vol. 20S, p. S119, 2017.

[83] M. A. Perrott, T. Pizzari, J. Cook, and J. A. McClelland, "Comparison of lower limb and trunk kinematics between markerless and marker-based motion capture systems," *Gait and Posture*, vol. 52, pp. 57–61, 2017.

[84] S. Skals, M. K. Jung, M. Damsgaard, and M. S. Andersen, "Prediction of ground reaction forces and moments during sports-related movements," *Multibody System Dynamics*, vol. 39, pp. 175–195, 2017.

[85] E. Halilaj, A. Rajagopal, M. Fiterau, J. L. Hicks, T. J. Hastie, and S. L. Delp, "Machine Learning in Human Movement Biomechanics: Best Practices, Common Pitfalls, and New Opportunities," *Journal of Biomechanics*, 2018.

[86] F. J. Wouda, M. Giuberti, G. Bellusci, E. Maartens, J. Reenalda, B.-J. F. van Beijnum, and P. H. Veltink, "Estimation of Vertical Ground Reaction Forces and Sagittal Knee Kinematics During Running Using Three Inertial Sensors," *Frontiers in Physiology*, vol. 9, pp. 1–14, 2018.

[87] W. R. Johnson, A. Mian, M. A. Robinson, J. Verheul, D. G. Lloyd, and J. A. Alderson, "Multidimensional ground reaction forces and moments from wearable sensor accelerations via deep learning," *arXiv Preprint*, 2019.

[88] B. J. Stetter, S. Ringhof, F. C. Krafft, S. Sell, and T. Stein, "Estimation of Knee Joint Forces in Sport Movements Using Wearable Sensors and Machine Learning," *Sensors*, vol. 19, p. 3690, 2019.

[89] F. Doshi-Velez and B. Kim, "Towards A Rigorous Science of Interpretable Machine Learning," *ArXiv Preprint*, vol. 1702.08608, 2017.