Optimized scoring tool to quantify the functional performance during the sit-to-stand transition with a magneto-inertial measurement unit

Kevin Lepetit, Khalil Ben Mansour, Adrien Letocart, Sofiane Boudaoud, Kiyoka Kinugawa, Jean-François Grosset, Frédéric Marin

► To cite this version:

Kevin Lepetit, Khalil Ben Mansour, Adrien Letocart, Sofiane Boudaoud, Kiyoka Kinugawa, et al.. Optimized scoring tool to quantify the functional performance during the sit-to-stand transition with a magneto-inertial measurement unit. *Clinical Biomechanics*, 2019, 69, pp.109-114. 10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2019.07.012 . hal-02406859

HAL Id: hal-02406859

<https://hal.utc.fr/hal-02406859>

Submitted on 12 Dec 2019

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Optimized scoring tool to quantify the functional performance during the sit-to-stand transition with a magneto-inertial measurement unit

Type of manuscript: Original paper

Authors' names and affiliations:

Kevin Lepetit⁽¹⁾, Khalil Ben Mansour⁽¹⁾, Adrien Letocart⁽¹⁾, Sofiane Boudaoud⁽¹⁾, ,
Kiyoka Kinugawa⁽²⁾, Jean-François Grosset^(1,3), Frédéric Marin⁽¹⁾

⁽¹⁾ Université de technologie de Compiègne ,UMR CNRS 7338 Biomécanique and Bioingénierie, , Alliance Sorbonne
University, Dr Schweitzer Street, 60200 Compiègne, France

⁽²⁾ Pitié-Salpêtrière Hospital – Charles Foix Hospital (AP-HP), Avenue de la République, 94200 Ivry-sur-Seine, France

⁽³⁾ Université Paris 13, Sorbonne Paris Cité, UFR Santé Médecine et Biologie Humaine, 93017 Bobigny, France

Corresponding author:

E-mail address: frederic.marin@utc.fr

Phone number: +33 3 44 23 44 23

17 *Abstract: 243 words*

18 *Main text: 2830 words*

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

ABSTRACT

Background: Sit-to-stand is used as a qualitative test to evaluate functional performance, especially to detect fall risks and frail individuals. The use of various quantitative criteria would enable a better understanding of musculoskeletal deficits and movement strategy modifications. This quantification was proven possible with a magneto-inertial unit which provides a compatible wearable device for clinical routine motion analysis.

Methods: Sit-to-stand movements were recorded using a single magneto-inertial measurement unit fixed on the chest for 74 subjects in three groups healthy young, healthy senior and frail. MIMU data was used to compute 15 spatiotemporal, kinematic and energetic parameters. Nonparametric statistical test showed a significant influence of age and frailness. After reducing the number of parameters by a principal component analysis, an AgingScore and a FrailtyScore were computed.

Findings: The fraction of variance explained by the first principal component was $77.48 \pm 2.80\%$ for principal component analysis with healthy young and healthy senior groups, and $74.94 \pm 2.24\%$ with healthy and frail senior groups. By receiver operating characteristic curve analysis of this score, we were able to refine the analysis to differentiate between healthy young and healthy senior subjects as well as healthy senior and frail subjects. By radar plot of the most discriminate parameters, the motion's strategy could be characterized and be used to detect premature functional deficit or frail subjects.

Interpretation: Sit-to-stand measured by a single magneto-inertial unit and dedicated post processing is able to quantify subject's musculoskeletal performance and will allow longitudinal investigation of aging population.

Keywords: sit-to-stand; magneto-inertial measurement unit; frailty; age; biomechanics

1. INTRODUCTION

The sit-to-stand (STS) movement is one of the most commonly performed daily tasks (Nuzik et al., 1986). This postural transition requires coordination, balance, strength and muscle power (Millor et al., 2014) which become difficult with age (Alexander et al., 1991). Mobility is reduced with age due to illness, trauma, or progressive deconditioning i.e. sarcopenia, osteoporosis (Millor et al., 2014). The STS transition is often used to monitor the seniors and evaluate physical performance (Mijnarends et al., 2013). In practice, the clinical evaluation of the STS is based on motion description to investigate motor strategy modification (Millington et al., 1992). As quantification, the task duration is classically used as a descriptor of the STS transition performance (Beauchet et al., 2011; Millor et al., 2014). However this parameter is global, and not specific enough to quantify deficit in seniors (Lepetit et al. 2018).

The recent development of wearable magneto-inertial measurement unit (MIMU) has led to new opportunities for clinical assessment of STS performance (Howcroft et al., 2013; Lepetit et al., 2018; Millor et al., 2013; Sun & Sosnoff, 2018) with the advantage to be intended for clinical routine use

(Marin et al. 2015) . For instance, STS metrics deduced from MIMU data were already investigated to diagnostic frailty (Mugueta-Aguinaga & Garcia-Zapirain, 2017) or estimate fall risks (Howcroft et al., 2013; Sun & Sosnoff, 2018). However, these studies focused on populations with diagnosed pathologies. In aging populations with risk for sarcopenia, the loss of tonicity or sedentariness should be monitored early to detect the firsts signs indicating a significant weakness of the subject (Cruz-Jentoft et al. 2019).

The use of a MIMU during the STS has be demonstrated to be relevant (Millor et al., 2014) and results showed an increase of task duration and a decrease of flexion angular velocity and coefficient of variations (i.e. ratio between standard deviation and mean durations) with age (R. C. Van Lummel et al., 2013). However, few parameters take into account the subject's morphology in the STS performance (Ganea et al., 2011; Zijlstra et al., 2010). In addition, it may be relevant to combine significant parameters in order to create a score that classifies individuals according to their mobility health status (Millor et al., 2014).

The aim of this study is to design a diagnostic tool to detect functional deficit based on a single MIMU during the STS. Investigations will focus on age and frailty effects on kinematic and kinetic parameters extracted from data of a MIMU fixed on the chest during the STS postural transition to deduce a functional score which enable to differentiate frail from healthy senior individuals and healthy senior from young subjects.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1. Subjects

Seventy-four subjects were enrolled in this study (table 1). They were divided into three groups: healthy young (HY), healthy senior (HS) and frail senior (FS). To be eligible, healthy young subjects had to be asymptomatic between 18 and 30 years old. Healthy senior subjects had to be over 65 years old and asymptomatic after examination by a medical doctor. The study also included 11 frail senior subjects after examination of a geriatrician. Geriatricians define frailty as a biologic syndrome of decreased reserve and resistance to stressors, resulting from cumulative declines across multiple physiologic systems, and causing vulnerability to adverse outcomes (Fried et al., 2001). Frail subjects had to be over 65 years old and have a degree of frailty greater than 5 according to Rockwood index (Rockwood et al., 2005).

Insert table 1

All the volunteers gave their free and written consent for these experiments. The protocol was approved by the ethical committee of Nord-Ouest II number 2016-A00534-47 and ethical committee of Ile-de-France VI in 2016.

2.2. Instrumentation

Participants were instrumented with a MIMU (APDM, Opal, Portland, USA) fixed, with an elastic strap, on their chest at approximately two thirds of the breastbone. The MIMU was composed of a 3D

108 gyroscope, a 3D accelerometer and a 3D magnetometer. The height of the chair used for this study
109 was standard (45cm). The signals of the MIMU data were sampled at 128Hz.

110 2.3. Data collection

111 After a static sitting pose, the subjects were asked to stand up at self-pace without assistance and
112 without using their hands. Each participant performed three to five STS transitions according to their
113 physical conditions. Each transition was recorded separately. A 1-minute rest period was done
114 between each test.

115 After the session, the weight and height of each subject were measured using a weighing scale and a
116 measuring stick.

117 2.4. Sit-to-Stand (STS) parameters

118 Based on fusion algorithm, MIMU provided in the MIMU local frame ($\mathcal{M}$), at each time t , the
119 acceleration, the angular velocity and the orientation relative to the earth reference frame ($\mathcal{E}$) (north,
120 west, up) (Sabatini, 2011). The STS movement beginning (t_b) and the STS movement ending (t_f) were
121 assessed by a motion detection algorithm and defined the STS time window (Lepetit et al., 2018). The
122 acceleration in the earth frame $\mathcal{E}$ is: $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{E},t} = [a_t^n \quad a_t^w \quad a_t^u]$.

123 A technical calibration as proposed by (Bouvier et al., 2015) was performed to register the local frame
124 of the MIMU ($\mathcal{M}$) with the anatomical axes of the trunk (i.e. proximal-distal (PD) , medio-lateral (ML),
125 antero-posterior (AP) axes). Thus, the linear acceleration was deduced in the trunk reference frame

126 ($\mathcal{T}$) as $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{T},t} = [a_t^{PD} \ a_t^{ML} \ a_t^{AP}]$. By the same procedure, the angular velocity of the trunk was
 127 deduced in the torso frame as $\boldsymbol{\omega}_{\mathcal{T},t} = [\omega_t^{PD} \ \omega_t^{ML} \ \omega_t^{AP}]$.

128 The inclination angle of the torso θ_t was computed as the angle between the axis of the torso and the
 129 vertical axis. Then, the STS beginning time t_b , the STS end time t_f , the velocity of the torso center of
 130 mass ($\mathbf{VG}_{\mathcal{T},t}$) and the kinetic energy ($\mathbf{EK}_t$) of the torso were computed (Lepetit et al., 2018).

131 In the STS time window, for each subject, 15 parameters were computed as the average value of all
 132 trials as follows:

- 133 - TD: the STS task duration such as $TD = t_f - t_b$;
- 134 - mAcc and maxAcc: the mean and maximal values of the norm of $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{E},t}$;
- 135 - mAz and maxAz: the mean and maximal values of the absolute value of $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{E},t}$ along the vertical
 136 axis $|a_t^u|$;
- 137 - mAxy and maxAxy: the mean and maximal values of the norm of $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{E},t}$ in the horizontal plane
 138 $\sqrt{a_t^{n^2} + a_t^{w^2}}$;
- 139 - AUCml: the area under the curve of the medio-lateral acceleration a_t^{ML} as a quantification of
 140 lateral sway (W. Janssen et al., 2008) ($AUCml = \int_{t_b}^{t_f} |a_t^{ML}| dt$);
- 141 - mVG and maxVG: the mean and maximal values of the norm of the torso COM velocity $\mathbf{VG}_{\mathcal{T},t}$;
- 142 - mEK and maxEK: the mean and maximal values of the norm of the torso kinetic energy $\mathbf{EK}_t$;
- 143 - mOmega and maxOmega: the mean and maximal values of the norm of the trunk angular
 144 velocity $\boldsymbol{\omega}_{\mathcal{T},t}$;

- Incl: the maximal inclination angle of the torso as the maximal absolute value of θ_t ($Incl = \max(|\theta_t|)$).

To investigate the age effect on each parameter, a Mann-Whitney U-test was realized between the parameters of HY and HS groups. Likewise, the influence of frailty was analyzed with a Mann-Whitney U-test realized between HS and frail groups. The significance level was set to 0.01 for all comparisons.

2.3. Scores computation and statistical analysis

Each subject of each group (HS, HY, and FS) was characterized with a k -length vector with $k=15$.

i. Aging score (*AgingScore*) computation

To assess the discrimination performance of each parameter between HY and HS, the area under the curve (AUC) of a receiver operating characteristic (ROC) was computed (Zweig & Campbell, 1993).

The aim of the *AgingScore* is to reduce the k -length vector to a scalar based on an iterative principal component analysis (PCA) procedure as follows. First, from the k -length vectors of the HS and HY subjects, an a -length sub-vectors of the a most discriminative parameters according to the PCA ($1 \leq a \leq k$) were extracted (Jackson, 1991). At this stage, each subject is now characterized by an a -length vector. Secondly, the a -length vectors of HY and HS subjects were randomly divided into equal training (t) and test (s) subgroups as HY_t, HY_s, HS_t and HS_s, respectively. Then, a PCA with standardized correlation matrix was performed with the a -length vectors of the training data (HY_t and HS_t)

(Jolliffe, 2002). The first principal component PC1, which maximizes the variance in one dimension and has the highest potential in terms of classification accuracy (Nikas & Low, 2011), was computed for HY_s and HS_s subjects and was defined as the temporary aging score named *AgingScore-tmp*. At this stage, each subject in the test group is now characterized by a single parameter. The classification performance according to the *AgingScore-tmp* was evaluated with the AUC of a ROC curve, denoted by *AUC-tmp*. This randomization process (i.e. division between equal training and test subgroups to *AUC-tmp* computation) was performed 1000 times. The mean value of *AUC-tmp* was considered and defined as *AUC-a*.

Finally, the value *a* was chosen in order to maximize the classification performance *AUC-a*. In addition, the *a*-length vector associated to the *AgingScore* identified the parameters related with age.

ii. Frailty score (*FrailtyScore*) computation

The same procedure was implemented to assess the *FrailtyScore* based on the *f*-length vectors with $1 \leq f \leq k$ of the FS and HS subjects. Finally, the parameters of the *f*-length vectors associated to the *FrailtyScore* identified the parameters related to frailty.

iii. Sit-to-Stand strategy plot

The STS strategy was also investigated on the base of the two previous computations. Parameters of the *a*-length vectors from the *AgingScore* and *f*-length vectors from the *FrailtyScore* were kept to

deduce a s -length vector with $\max(a, f) \leq s \leq a + f$. The vector of the s unique parameters was normalized by the mean values of the HY group. For each group, the mean and standard deviation values of each parameter were displayed in a radar plot. For each subject, the STS strategy was quantified by computing the circularity ratio ($\frac{perimeter^2}{4\pi \cdot area}$) of the polygon in the radar plot. The significance of the evolution of the circularity ratio between groups was quantified with a Mann-Whitney U-test. Data are presented as mean and standard deviation. The significance level was set to 0.01.

3. RESULTS

The mean and standard deviation for each of the 15 parameters for each group are presented in table 2. The p-values of Mann-Whitney U-tests are also given. A significant difference between HY and HS subjects has been found for maxVG, maxOmega, maxAcc, maxAz, while between HS and FS subjects, significant differences were highlighted for maxAxy, mVG, mOmega, TD, Incl, mAcc, mAxy, mAz, AUCml, mEK and maxEK.

By the value of AUC of the ROC analysis, it was demonstrated that maxAcc was the most discriminative for HY and HS groups (AUC=0.763), and mVG was the most discriminative for HS and FS groups (AUC=0.972).

The a -vector of parameters which maximized the AgingScore discrimination performance was [maxAcc, maxAz, maxAxy, maxVG, maxOmega] with $a=5$. For the FrailtyScore, the f -vector of

parameters which maximized the discrimination performance was [mVG, mEK, TD, mAz, maxEK, mAcc, AUCml] ($f=7$) (table 2).

Insert table 2

The fraction of variance explained by the first principal component was $77.48 \pm 2.80\%$ for PCA with HY and HS groups and $74.94 \pm 2.24\%$ for PCA with HS and FS groups. The average ROC curve and AUC for both classifications with *AgingScore* and *FrailtyScore* are displayed in figure 1.

Insert figure 1

The STS strategies displayed in a radar plot are presented in figure 2. Only the 12 different parameters which were retained in both score computations are displayed. The circularity ratio for each group is summarized in boxplots in figure 3. According to the Mann-Whitney U-tests, the evolution was significative only for FS subjects.

Insert figure 2

Insert figure 3

4. DISCUSSION

The quantification of the STS postural transition with a single MIMU fixed on the trunk enabled the classification of the subjects according to two different scores. Moreover, the present study has evidenced that the analysis based on 12 parameters was able to quantify the strategy of the STS

219 motion. The influence of age and frailty on the STS movement through several parameters was
220 demonstrated. The results also validated that the STS motion strategy was significantly modified for
221 few frail subjects.

222 Classically, the task duration (TD) is the only parameter analysed during single STS transition. The mean
223 TD values for healthy subjects were between 1.57s and 2.42s (Cerrito et al., 2015; Galli et al., 2008;
224 Grimm & Bolink, 2016; Moufawad el Achkar et al., 2018; R. C. Van Lummel et al., 2013). Several studies
225 showed that TD increases with frailty (Ganea et al., 2011; Millor et al., 2013; R. C. Van Lummel et al.,
226 2013). However, there is no consensus for the influence of age. Studies showed that the subject's age
227 may influence (R. C. Van Lummel et al., 2013) or not (Hurley, 2013) this parameter during the STS
228 motion. This could be explained by the different methodological approaches used to determinate t_b
229 and t_f . Hurley used a marker-based motion capture device in his study which is known to be more
230 reliable than magneto-inertial units used by (R. C. Van Lummel et al., 2013).

231 In our study, we noticed that other parameters, which quantified the STS performance, showed
232 heterogeneities according to age and frailty. For instance, the maximal value of the trunk CoM velocity
233 (maxVG) was the only parameter which was significantly influenced by age and frailty. The inclination
234 angle (Incl) did not evolve significantly with the age but raised with frailty. Although the mean value
235 increased for FS subjects, the range of values was wider (standard deviation=20.70°). However, the
236 inclination angle was similar between HY and HS subjects and in agreement with a previous study
237 (Hurley, 2013). Also, AUCml which is linked to the acceleration and TD did not evolve between HY and
238 HS subjects but increased significantly for FS persons. Our study confirmed that the quantification of

the STS performance evaluate by single parameter would not enough be accurate ,and consequently, the use of a composite parameter, i.e. a score, as an image of multidimensional parameters, is more relevant (W. G. M. Janssen et al., 2008).

In the present study, a multifactorial analyze of several parameters was reduced into a unique quantitative score using the first principal component of a PCA. The classification performance of these scores were quantified with a ROC analysis. In both cases, the AUC which represents the classification performance of the scores was better than with any other single parameter (figure 1 and table 2). The *FrailtyScore* enabled a reliable classification (meanAUC>0.98, figure 1). This result was improved in comparison to previous studies which generally used only one parameter such as TD (Millor et al., 2014). The *AgingScore* enabled to classify HS and HY subjects (meanAUC>0.77, figure 1). Van Lummel (R. Van Lummel, 2017) proposed a score to evaluate the 5 times repeated STS. Their method was based on an exploratory factor analysis of 24 parameters of three different types: durations, kinematics and coefficients of variation. However, the discrimination power between young and old individuals was not documented because they did not include young subjects in their study.

The age is known to influence the STS motion performance (Cruz-Jentoft et al. 2019). The results showed that except for maxEK, all the maximal values of the other parameters decreased significantly with age. These results could be explained by a reduction of muscles and tendons capacities. Indeed, the relationship between muscle strength and STS performance was already demonstrated (Bohannon et al., 2010). On other hand, the circularity ratio analysis demonstrated that the STS strategy is not significantly influenced with age (p-value=0.221) for the healthy subjects. This result agreed with a

previous study which highlighted quantitative reduction but similar qualitative kinematic and kinetic parameters between HY and HS subjects (Hurley, 2013; Marin et al., 1999; Steffen et al., 2013). On the contrary, frailty influences significantly the STS strategy (p -value <0.01). We found that all the mean-based parameters (mVG, mAcc, mAz, mAxy, mEK), max EK and maxVG decreased significantly for FS subjects as compared with HS and HY groups. These observations could be a marker of frailness for further longitudinal investigation.

However, this study also has some limitations. First, frail subjects were older than healthy seniors. Secondly, with our methodology, the computed variables often required the determination of t_b and t_f . In the literature, numerous methods to detect movement are proposed with MIMU data without consensus (Cerrito et al., 2015; Millor et al., 2013). In this study, the motion detection algorithm was based on a threshold of the orientation quaternions and the vertical acceleration (Lepetit et al., 2018). Moreover, the parameters based on maximum values were often more dispersed than those based on mean value (table 2). Indeed, they focused on only one specific moment and consequently, they were more subject to sensor errors. Finally, the muscle strength and activation were not evaluated, and it may be useful to add this information.

To conclude, our study proposed two quantitative scores (*AgingScore* and *FrailtyScore*) to evaluate premature functional deficit with a single MIMU during the STS transition. This setup is appropriate for clinical routines and may help clinicians to detect subject with abnormal functional capacities and monitor rehabilitation enhancements.

279 CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

280 The authors have no conflicts of interest to report related to this study.

281

282 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

283 The research leading to these results has received funding from “Agence National de la Recherche”

284 ANR-11-IDEX-0004-02 under Idex “Sorbonne Universités” and PhD funding of ENS Cachan.

285

286 REFERENCES

287 Alexander, N. B., Schultz, A. B., & Warwick, D. N. , 1991. Rising From a Chair: Effects of Age and
288 Functional Ability on Performance Biomechanics. *Journal of Gerontology: MEDICAL SCIENCES*,
289 46(3), 91–98.

290 Beauchet, O., Fantino, B., Allali, G., Muir, S. W., Montero-Odasso, M., & Annweiler, C. , 2011. Timed
291 Up and Go test and risk of falls in older adults: a systematic review. *The Journal of Nutrition*,
292 *Health & Aging*, 15(10), 933–8.

293 Bohannon, R. W., Bubela, D. J., Magasi, S. R., Wang, Y.-C., & Gershon, R. C. , 2010. Sit-to-stand test:
294 Performance and determinants across the age-span. *Isokinetics and Exercise Science*, 18(4), 235–
295 240.

296 Bouvier, B., Duprey, S., Claudon, L., Dumas, R., & Savescu, A. , 2015. Upper Limb Kinematics Using
297 Inertial and Magnetic Sensors: Comparison of Sensor-to-Segment Calibrations. *Sensors*, 15(8),
298 18813–18833.

299 Cerrito, A., Bichsel, L., Radlinger, L., & Schmid, S. , 2015. Reliability and validity of a smartphone-based
300 application for the quantification of the sit-to-stand movement in healthy seniors. *Gait & Posture*,
301 41(2), 409–413.

302 Edward Jackson, J. , 1991. *A user’s guide to principal components*. Wiley-Interscience Paperback Series.

303 Fried, L. P., Tangen, C. M., Walston, J., Newman, A. B., Hirsch, C., Gottdiener, J., ... McBurnie, M. A. ,
304 2001. Frailty in Older Adults: Evidence for a Phenotype. *The Journals of Gerontology Series A:*
305 *Biological Sciences and Medical Sciences*, 56(3), M146–M157.

306 Galli, M., Cimolin, V., Crivellini, M., & Campanini, I. , 2008. Quantitative analysis of sit to stand
307 movement: Experimental set-up definition and application to healthy and hemiplegic adults. *Gait*

308 & *Posture*, 28(1), 80–85.

309 Ganea, R., Paraschiv-Ionescu, A., Büla, C., Rochat, S., & Aminian, K. , 2011. Multi-parametric evaluation
310 of sit-to-stand and stand-to-sit transitions in elderly people. *Medical Engineering & Physics*, 33(9),
311 1086–93.

312 Grimm, B., & Bolink, S. , 2016. Evaluating physical function and activity in the elderly patient using
313 wearable motion sensors. *EFORT Open Reviews*, 1(5), 112–120.

314 Howcroft, J., Kofman, J., & Lemaire, E. D. , 2013. Review of fall risk assessment in geriatric populations
315 using inertial sensors. *Journal of Neuroengineering and Rehabilitation*, 10(1), 91.

316 Hurley, S. T. , 2013. *Sit-to-stand transfer mechanics: the effect of age and lifting-seat device design*.
317 Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia.

318 Jackson J. E. ,1991, A Use's Guide to Principal Components, Book Series:Wiley Series in Probability
319 and Statistics, John Wiley & Sons

320 Janssen, W. G. M., Bussmann, J. B. J., Horemans, H. L. D., & Stam, H. J. , 2008. Validity of accelerometry
321 in assessing the duration of the sit-to-stand movement. *Medical & Biological Engineering &*
322 *Computing*, 46(9), 879–887.

323 Janssen, W., Kulcu, D. G., Horemans, H., Stam, H. J., & Bussmann, J. , 2008. Sensitivity of Accelerometry
324 to Assess Balance Control During Sit-to-Stand Movement. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems*
325 *and Rehabilitation Engineering*, 16(5), 479–484.

326 Jolliffe, I. T. , 2002. *Principal Component Analysis, Second Edition*. (P. Bickel, P. Diggle, S. Fienberg, K.
327 Krickeberg, I. Olkin, N. Wermuth, & S. Zeger, Eds.). Springer.

328 Lepetit, K., Ben Mansour, K., Boudaoud, S., Kinugawa-Bourron, K., & Marin, F. , 2018. Evaluation of the
329 kinetic energy of the torso by magneto-inertial measurement unit during the sit-to-stand
330 movement. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 67, 172–176.

331 Marin, F., Allain, J., Diop, A., Maurel, N., Simondi, M., & Lavaste, F. , 1999. On the estimation of knee
332 joint kinematics. *Human Movement Science*, 18(5), 613–626.

333 Mijnders, D. M., Meijers, J. M. M., Halfens, R. J. G., ter Borg, S., Luiking, Y. C., Verlaan, S., ... Schols,
334 J. M. G. A. , 2013. Validity and Reliability of Tools to Measure Muscle Mass, Strength, and Physical
335 Performance in Community-Dwelling Older People: A Systematic Review. *Journal of the American*
336 *Medical Directors Association*, 14(3), 170–178.

337 Millington, P. J., Myklebust, B. M., & Shambes, G. M. , 1992. Biomechanical Analysis of the Sit-to-Stand
338 Motion in Elderly Persons. *Arch Phys Med Rehabilitation*, 73, 609–617.

339 Millor, N., Lecumberri, P., Gomez, M., Martinez-Ramirez, A., & Izquierdo, M. , 2014. Kinematic
340 Parameters to Evaluate Functional Performance of Sit-to-Stand and Stand-to-Sit Transitions Using
341 Motion Sensor Devices: A Systematic Review. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and*
342 *Rehabilitation Engineering*, 22(5), 926–936.

343 Millor, N., Lecumberri, P., Gómez, M., Martínez-Ramírez, A., & Izquierdo, M. , 2013. An evaluation of
344 the 30-s chair stand test in older adults: frailty detection based on kinematic parameters from a
345 single inertial unit. *Journal of Neuroengineering and Rehabilitation*, 10, 86.

346 Moufawad el Achkar, C., Lenbole-Hoskovec, C., Paraschiv-Ionescu, A., Major, K., Büla, C., & Aminian, K.
347 , 2018. Classification and characterization of postural transitions using instrumented shoes.
348 *Medical & Biological Engineering & Computing*, 1–10.

349 Mugueta-Aguinaga, I., & Garcia-Zapirain, B. , 2017. Is Technology Present in Frailty? Technology a Back-

350 up Tool for Dealing with Frailty in the Elderly: A Systematic Review. *Aging and Disease*, 8(2), 176–
351 195.

352 Nikas, J. B., & Low, W. C. , 2011. ROC-supervised principal component analysis in connection with the
353 diagnosis of diseases. *American Journal of Translational Research*, 3(2), 180–96.

354 Nuzik, S., Lamb, R., VanSant, A., & Hirt, S. , 1986. Sit-to-stand movement pattern. A kinematic study.
355 *Physical Therapy*, 66(11), 1708–13.

356 Rockwood, K., Song, X., MacKnight, C., Bergman, H., Hogan, D. B., McDowell, I., & Mitnitski, A. , 2005.
357 A global clinical measure of fitness and frailty in elderly people. *CMAJ: Canadian Medical*
358 *Association Journal = Journal de l'Association Medicale Canadienne*, 173(5), 489–95.

359 Sabatini, A. M. , 2011. Estimating three-dimensional orientation of human body parts by
360 inertial/magnetic sensing. *Sensors*, 11(2), 1489–1525.

361 Steffen, D., Bleser, G., Weber, M., Stricker, D., Fradet, L., & Marin, F. , 2013. A personalized exercise
362 trainer for elderly. *Journal of Ambient Intelligence and Smart Environments*, 5(6), 24–31.

363 Sun, R., & Sosnoff, J. J. , 2018. Novel sensing technology in fall risk assessment in older adults: a
364 systematic review. *BMC Geriatrics*, 18(1), 14.

365 Van Lummel, R. , 2017. *Assessing Sit-to-Stand for Clinical Use*. Retrieved from
366 <https://www.mcroberts.nl/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/complete-dissertation.pdf>

367 Van Lummel, R. C., Ainsworth, E., Lindemann, U., Zijlstra, W., Chiari, L., Van Campen, P., & Hausdorff,
368 J. M. , 2013. Automated approach for quantifying the repeated sit-to-stand using one body fixed
369 sensor in young and older adults. *Gait & Posture*, 38(1), 153–156.

370 Zijlstra, W., Bisseling, R. W., Schlumbohm, S., & Baldus, H. , 2010. A body-fixed-sensor-based analysis
371 of power during sit-to-stand movements. *Gait & Posture*, 31(2), 272–8.

372 Zweig, M. H., & Campbell, G. , 1993. Receiver-operating characteristic (ROC) plots: a fundamental
373 evaluation tool in clinical medicine. *Clinical Chemistry*, 39(4), 561–77. Retrieved from
374 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8472349>

375

Tables

	n♀	n♂	Age (years)	Height (cm)	Weight (kg)	BMI (kg/m ²)
HY subjects	4	20	25 (3)	178 (9.5)	72.1 (11.7)	22.8 (3.1)
HS subjects	5	34	70 (4)	174 (8.3)	79.4 (14.2)	26.1 (4.1)
FS subjects	6	5	87 (6)	161 (6.0)	61.0 (11.2)	23.6 (4.9)

Table 1: Subjects' characteristics: mean value (standard deviation)

Parameter	Healthy young subjects (HY)	Healthy seniors subjects (HS)	Frail subjects (FS)	p-value (HY,HS)	ROC AUC (HY,HS)	p-value (HS,FS)	ROC AUC (HS, FS)
mVG (m/s)	0.405 (0.065)	0.390 (0.065)	0.242 (0.049)	p = 0.457	0.557	p < 0.01	0.972
maxVG (m/s)	0.905 (0.147)	0.784 (0.137)	0.562 (0.167)	p < 0.01	0.735	p < 0.01	0.844
mOmega (rad/s)	0.670 (0.162)	0.637 (0.165)	0.433 (0.152)	p = 0.666	0.533	p < 0.01	0.825
maxOmega (rad/s)	1.70 (0.57)	1.36 (0.49)	1.41 (0.43)	p < 0.01	0.706	p = 0.590	0.555
TD (s)	1.98 (0.41)	1.92 (0.38)	4.22 (2.02)	p = 0.392	0.565	p < 0.01	0.923
Incl (°)	32.40 (9.10)	32.80 (9.87)	46.70 (18.50)	p = 0.815	0.518	p < 0.01	0.781
mAcc (m/s ²)	1.93 (0.43)	1.69 (0.41)	0.91 (0.39)	p = 0.048	0.650	p < 0.01	0.911
maxAcc (m/s ²)	6.69 (2.40)	4.73 (1.69)	3.48 (1.90)	p < 0.01	0.763	p = 0.058	0.690
mAz (m/s ²)	1.36 (0.34)	1.16 (0.33)	0.54 (0.27)	p = 0.036	0.659	p < 0.01	0.935
maxAz (m/s ²)	5.12 (1.44)	3.85 (1.10)	2.69 (1.43)	p < 0.01	0.757	p = 0.011	0.755
mAxy (m/s ²)	1.11 (0.24)	1.03 (0.23)	0.63 (0.23)	p = 0.221	0.593	p < 0.01	0.886
maxAxy (m/s ²)	4.84 (2.47)	3.29 (1.51)	2.76 (1.49)	p < 0.01	0.745	p = 0.337	0.597
AUCml (m/s)	1.20 (0.54)	1.30 (0.70)	4.14 (2.63)	p = 0.882	0.512	p < 0.01	0.895
mEK (J)	3.08 (1.22)	2.97 (1.24)	0.90 (0.51)	p = 0.656	0.534	p < 0.01	0.965
maxEK (J)	10.00 (3.77)	8.42 (3.71)	3.35 (2.13)	p = 0.086	0.630	p < 0.01	0.921

Table 2: Mean (standard deviation) for the parameters evaluating during the sit-to-stand. The Mann-Whitney p-values and ROC AUC values were assessed between healthy young subjects (HY) and healthy senior subjects (HS) and between HS subjects and frail subjects (FS).

Figure Captions

Figure 1: Average ROC curves (dark lines) and standard deviation limits (shaded areas) quantifying the classification performance of the PCA-based scores between HY and HS subjects (AgingScore, left) and between HS and FS subjects (FrailtyScore, right). The mean AUC values and their standard deviations are given for each curve.

Figure 2: Medians (dark lines), 1st and 3rd quartiles (lower and upper limits of shaded areas) of retained parameters for all groups presented in a radar plot. The data were normalized according to the median values of HY group (thus, red dark line is the unit circle).

Figure 3: The circularity ratio of each group is presented in a boxplot. The evolution between groups was investigated with Mann-Whitney U-tests. The evolution was significative between HY and FS groups and between HS and FS groups.