



This is a peer-reviewed, post-print (final draft post-refereeing) version of the following published document and is licensed under Creative Commons: Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0 license:

Matikainen-Tervola, Emmi, Cronin, Neil ORCID logoORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5332-1188>, Aartolahti, Eeva, Sihvonen, Sanna, Sansgiri, Sailee, Finni, Taija, Mattila, Olli-Pekka and Rantakokko, Merja (2024) Validity of IMU sensors for assessing features of walking in laboratory and outdoor environments among older adults. *Gait & Posture*, 114. pp. 277-283. doi:10.1016/j.gaitpost.2024.10.013

Official URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2024.10.013>

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2024.10.013>

EPrint URI: <https://eprints.glos.ac.uk/id/eprint/14955>

Disclaimer

The University of Gloucestershire has obtained warranties from all depositors as to their title in the material deposited and as to their right to deposit such material.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation or warranties of commercial utility, title, or fitness for a particular purpose or any other warranty, express or implied in respect of any material deposited.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation that the use of the materials will not infringe any patent, copyright, trademark or other property or proprietary rights.

The University of Gloucestershire accepts no liability for any infringement of intellectual property rights in any material deposited but will remove such material from public view pending investigation in the event of an allegation of any such infringement.

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR TEXT.

- 1 **Walking parameters of older adults on hilly and level**
- 2 **terrain outdoors**

Abstract

Background/Objective: To understand how older adults adapt their walking to various environments, it is important to study walking outdoors, including in hilly terrains. This cross-sectional study aimed to validate inertial measurement units (IMUs) for detecting older adults' walking parameters on uphill and downhill terrains and to compare these parameters between level and hilly terrains.

Methods: A sample of older adults (N=35, mean age 76 years (SD 5), 71% women) walked on a level, uphill and downhill route outdoors at self-selected speeds. Three IMUs were used to estimate walking parameters (step, stride, swing and stance durations, cadence, step length, and walking speed). IMUs were validated against high-speed video camera data from six participants. After validation, differences in walking parameters between the three terrains were assessed with repeated measures ANOVA, and variability of the parameters (SD/M*100%) with Friedman's test.

Results: IMUs showed mainly good to excellent validity for temporal, but not spatial walking parameters in hilly outdoor environments. Older adults exhibited longer step, stride and swing durations and lower cadence on level and uphill versus downhill. On level terrain, cadence was higher and step, stride, and stance durations shorter than uphill. Variability of temporal parameters was greatest uphill.

Conclusion: IMUs demonstrated potential to measure walking parameters of older adults in hilly terrains. The results suggest that older adults' outdoor walking parameters differ between level and hilly terrains.

1 **Significance/Implications:** These results can inform the design of outdoor walking
2 interventions for older adults by considering the usability of IMUs and the changes in
3 walking parameters due to environment.

4

5 *Keywords:* gait analysis, validation, IMU, uphill, downhill

Walking is a complex movement that requires co-operation between the central and peripheral nervous systems, including feedback from muscles, joints and other receptors (Vaughan et al., 1992, p. 2). Aging has widespread effects on the human musculoskeletal, nervous, respiratory, and circulatory systems (Komulainen & Vuori, 2015), and causes motor (McGibbon, 2003) and sensory deficits (Seidler et al., 2010). Aging also influences spatiotemporal walking parameters such as step/stride duration, swing/stance duration, step length, cadence, and step velocity (Dewolf et al., 2021; Hong et al., 2015; Kuntapun et al., 2020; Thomson et al., 2019). For example, it seems that older adults walk slower (Hollander et al., 2022; Hong et al., 2015; Schmitt et al., 2021), take shorter strides than younger adults at a given speed (Dewolf et al., 2021; Hollander et al., 2022; Kuntapun et al., 2020), and show increased variability in stride (Bock & Beurskens, 2010; Hausdorff et al., 2001) and step duration and cadence (Gamwell et al., 2022). Variability of swing duration also seems to increase with age (Shafizadeh et al., 2023).

Environment is another factor that influences walking, as reflected by changes in walking parameters (Ferraro et al., 2013; Lindemann et al., 2017; Hong et al., 2015; Thomson et al., 2019; Scaglioni-Solano & Aragón-Vargas, 2015). Walking on hilly terrain is more physically demanding than on level terrain (Scaglioni-Solano & Aragón-Vargas, 2015) and imposes unique mechanical demands on the neuromuscular system (Lay et al., 2006). During downhill walking there is a greater risk of falling because the increased acceleration may disturb gaze and posture (Scaglioni-Solano & Aragón-Vargas, 2015). When older adults walk indoors on an uphill slope with different gradients, they walk with a lower cadence and a longer double stance duration as the steepness of the slope increases (Hong et al., 2015), whereas during pronounced outdoor downhill walking, they walk slower, with shorter steps and higher cadence than on level terrain or on a moderate downhill (Scaglioni-Solano & Aragón-Vargas, 2015). During indoor and outdoor uphill walking, older adults walk slower

1 with shorter strides and lower cadence compared to level walking (Ferraro et al., 2013;
2 Lindemann et al., 2017; Thomson et al., 2019). However, only a few studies have compared
3 spatiotemporal parameters of older adults walking outdoors on level terrain with both uphill
4 and downhill (Scaglioni-Solano & Aragón-Vargas, 2015; Thomson et al. 2019). Thus, it
5 remains unclear how walking parameters are modified when older adults walk on different
6 terrain outdoors.

7 Walking outdoors in a free-living environment differs from walking in a
8 laboratory (Brodie et al., 2016; Hillel et al., 2019; Schmitt et al., 2021) due to variation in
9 environmental conditions such as light, sound and ground surface. Despite that, walking has
10 mainly been assessed indoors and on level terrain in the past. Instrumented gait analysis can
11 reveal subtle changes in gait which cannot be detected in clinical assessment or based only on
12 walking speed (Zhang et al., 2021), and laboratory measurements such as three-dimensional
13 motion capture and electronic walkways have been used to assess walking parameters. Inertial
14 measurement units (IMUs; with three-dimensional accelerometer, three-dimensional
15 gyroscope and three-dimensional magnetometer) and custom algorithms have recently been
16 used to estimate spatiotemporal walking parameters, enabling walking to be assessed outdoors
17 in more natural environments (Schmitt et al., 2021; Thomson et al., 2019). IMUs have been
18 shown to be valid measurement tools to assess spatiotemporal walking parameters in older
19 adults indoors (O'Brien et al., 2019; Rantalainen et al., 2019; Werner et al., 2020), and good
20 validity of temporal walking parameters has been reported outdoors [*blinded for review*].
21 However, very few studies have used IMUs to examine spatiotemporal walking parameters of
22 older adults on different terrains outdoors. Moreover, to our knowledge, the validity of IMUs
23 to assess spatiotemporal walking parameters outdoors on hilly terrain has not yet been studied
24 in older individuals.

The aims of this cross-sectional study were: 1) to demonstrate the validity of IMUs for estimating spatiotemporal walking parameters in outdoor hilly terrain, and 2) to assess how walking parameters change when older adults walk outdoors on level, uphill and downhill terrain. Based on our previous studies on validity of IMU's on level environment [blinded for review], we hypothesize that IMU's are valid to detect walking parameters also on uphill and downhill walking. We also anticipate finding differences in walking parameters between level, uphill and downhill walking.

Methods

Study type and participants

This study is part of a larger experimental cross-sectional research project [blinded for review]. Full details of the project and methodology have been reported previously [blinded for review].

Briefly, 40 community-dwelling older adults aged 70 and older, without severe sensory deficits, memory impairment, or neurological condition, and able to walk at least 1 km without assistive devices, took part in the study. From six of these participants, valid IMU data were obtained from five uphill and five downhill trials and used in a validation sub study. To compare walking parameters in different terrains, 35 out of 40 participants from whom data were obtained on level, uphill and downhill outdoor terrains were included in this study. The study followed the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki and was approved by the ethics committee of [blinded for review]. All participants gave their written informed consent prior to any measurements, and they could withdraw at any time during the study.

Procedure

Data collection included two visits: anthropometry (height and body mass) was assessed in the first visit and outdoor walking measurements were performed in the second visit, which was approximately seven days later (range 2-20). Outdoor measurements were conducted only on summer and autumn days without rain.

In the level outdoor walking test, participants walked on a public sport track along a 70-meter route (2x29 m straight path and turns) for six minutes. In uphill and downhill walking tests, participants walked five times along a 20-meter-long straight asphalt route on a five-degree hill (8.7%), alternating between downhill and uphill. All tests were conducted at self-selected, normal walking speeds.

Participants wore three IMU sensors (NGIMU, x-ion, UK) which contained a three-dimensional accelerometer (range 16 g), three-dimensional gyroscope (range 2000°/s) and three-dimensional magnetometer (range 13000 μ T). Sensors were attached with Velcro tape to the lower back, middle of the spine at the level of L3-L4 and laterally midway along each shank. The lower back IMU was attached to a small wooden plate to avoid unnecessary tilting and rotation of the sensor caused by the shape of the lower back during walking.

Walking was filmed with a high-speed camera (GoPro9 HERO, GoPro Inc., LA, United States) from the side of the participant at a distance of 3.46 m during the level test and 4.25 m during uphill and downhill tests. Sampling frequency was 120 fps. The camera was attached to a three-wheeled trolley which was moved by a researcher alongside the participant as they walked.

1 Data analysis

2 *Validity of IMU sensors*

3 Validation of IMU sensors in uphill and downhill walking was performed on six
4 participants from whom valid, synchronized IMU data were obtained from all five uphill and
5 five downhill trials. As a reference, a high-speed GoPro camera was used. The validity of IMU
6 sensors for detecting spatiotemporal walking parameters on level terrain outdoors has been
7 validated previously [*blinded for review*].

8 From IMU sensors, step events (heel strike and toe off) were detected with an
9 algorithm developed previously (Amiania et al., 2002; Bertoli et al., 2018; Renggli et al.,
10 2020; Zijlstra & Hof, 1997; 2003; Vähä-Ypyä et al., 2018). Zero-crossings of the antero-
11 posterior acceleration of the lower back IMU were used to denote heel strike (Zijlstra & Hof,
12 2003). The global minimum of the sagittal angular velocity of the shank IMUs was used to
13 represent toe off (Amiania et al., 2002; Bertoli et al., 2018; Renggli et al., 2020). Step length
14 estimation was done by assuming compass gait with an inverted pendulum and using the
15 vertical acceleration signal of the lower back IMU and heel strike events. The formula for
16 step length calculation was:

$$17 \quad \text{step length} = 2\sqrt{(2lh - h^2)}$$

18 in which l is the length of the pendulum (leg length), and h is the vertical displacement
19 (Zijlstra & Hof, 2003). Leg length was estimated as 0.53*participant's height (Winter, 1979).

20 From IMU data, step and stride durations, swing and stance durations, cadence, step length
21 and walking speed were calculated as shown in Table 1. The first and last heel strikes for each
22 trial were excluded. Other algorithm and filtering details are reported in the Supplementary
23 material (Supplement 1).

24 From the reference, high-speed video camera data, heel strikes, and toe offs
25 were identified manually. Heel strike was defined as the first contact of the shoe with the

ground and toe off as the moment just before the forefoot of the shoe left the ground. IMUs and video data were synchronized using an analog trigger device that produced a TTL pulse in the IMU analog channel and a red light visible in the camera view at the beginning of a recording. From the reference, cadence and step, stride, swing, and stance durations were calculated as from IMU data (Table 1). From the reference data, step length was calculated by dividing the length of the route (20-meters) by the number of individual steps taken during the route and walking speed was calculated as the distance walked divided by time.

Walking parameters in different terrains outdoors

In the analysis of IMU data, steps from the first and second available walking trials for each terrain were used to minimize the impact of tiredness on walking parameters. In the level test, a trial consisted of a 29-meter-long straight walking path between the turns. In the uphill and downhill tests, a trial consisted of a 20-meter-long straight walking path on a five-degree hill (8,7%). The two first and last heel strikes were excluded from each trial in the analysis. The same algorithms were used to calculate walking parameters from IMU data from level, uphill and downhill terrains as in the validation tests in this study and previously in *[blinded for review]*. If the algorithm identified the wrong peak for heel strike or toe off (based on visual inspection), the stride in question was not used in the analysis (N = 5). One participant had toe off events from uphill and downhill walking IMU data only from another leg.

Statistical analysis

Validation of IMUs in uphill and downhill outdoors

Bland-Altman plots (Bland & Altman, 1986), typical errors (standard deviation divided by $\sqrt{2}$), and root mean square errors (RMSEs) were drawn and calculated for each spatiotemporal walking parameter and for step events (heel strike and toe off). Intraclass

correlation coefficients with absolute agreement (ICC (2,1)) were calculated for each spatiotemporal walking parameter. ICC values were defined as excellent (≥ 0.75), good (0.60-0.74), fair (0.4-0.59) or poor (< 0.4) (Cicchetti et al., 1994).

Walking parameters in different terrains outdoors

Mean, standard deviation and variability (coefficient of variation $\% = \text{standard deviation} / \text{mean} * 100$) were calculated for walking parameters from all three terrains. Normality of variables was estimated with the Shapiro-Wilk test and Q-Q plots. Repeated measures ANOVA was used to test the differences between walking parameters on different terrains and Friedman's test to test the differences between variability of walking parameters on those terrains. For parametric tests, sphericity was estimated with Mauchly's W test. If the assumption of sphericity was violated, Greenhouse-Geisser correction was used. Bonferroni correction was used for post hoc analysis. Post hoc comparisons for non-parametric tests were done with Wilcoxon Signed Ranks test. Statistical tests were done with JASP 0.18.3.0 (JASP Team 2024, The Netherlands) and SPSS 29.0 (IBM SPSS Statistics Inc., Chicago, IL).

Results

Validation of IMUs in uphill and downhill outdoor walking

In the validation sub study, the mean age of the participants (N=6) was 74 (SD 3) years (range 69-77) and five out of six were female. Mean height was 164 cm (range 154-170 cm, SD 6 cm) and mean body mass 65 kg (SD 14 kg). In the analysis, 824 heel strike events and 823 toe off events from uphill walking, as well as 811 heel strike events and 809 toe off events from downhill walking were included.

When IMU values were compared to high-speed camera values, bias for heel strike varied from -0.001 s uphill to -0.016 s downhill, with RMSEs and typical errors of 0.02

s for both terrains. For toe off, bias was -0.061 s uphill and -0.052 s downhill and typical errors were 0.02 s and 0.03 s respectively. For cadence, bias was -0.15 steps/min for uphill and -0.06 steps/min for downhill, and corresponding typical errors were 3.60 steps/min and 2.69 steps/min. In uphill, bias was -0.06 s for stance duration and 0.06 s for swing duration, with corresponding values of -0.04 s and 0.04 s for downhill. Intraclass correlation coefficients (2,1) were excellent for step and stride durations uphill and downhill and stance duration during downhill walking, fair for uphill stance duration and poor for other parameters. Bias for step length estimation was 2.4 cm and for walking speed 0.04 m/s during uphill walking. In downhill walking, bias for step length estimation was 11.25 cm and for walking speed 0.238 m/s. Bland-Altman plots, intraclass correlation coefficients, bias and its standard deviation, root mean square error and typical errors for all walking parameters are reported in the Supplementary material (Supplement 2).

Because the validity of IMU estimates of step length and walking speed downhill was limited, only temporal walking parameters (step, stride, swing, stance durations and cadence) were further compared between level, uphill and downhill conditions.

Walking parameters in different outdoor terrains

Participants (N=35) whose outdoor walking parameters from IMU data were compared in different terrains were 69-92 years old (mean age 76, SD 5 years) and 71% of them were female (N=25). Mean height was 165 cm (range 150-184 cm, SD 9 cm) and mean body mass 72 kg (SD 13 kg). Mean walking speed, assessed from video data from the first trial on all terrains, was 1.42 m/s (SD 0.17 m/s) on level, 1.34 m/s (SD 0.19 m/s) in uphill and 1.39 m/s (SD 0.21 m/s) in downhill walking.

Statistically significant differences in mean values were found for step duration ($p<.001$), stride duration ($p<.001$), swing duration ($p<.001$), stance duration ($p<.001$) and cadence ($p<.001$) on different terrains. Raincloud plots of walking parameters are shown in

Figure 1, and mean values for walking parameters in different environments are presented in detail as Supplementary material (Supplement 3).

Post hoc comparisons revealed that cadence was lower, and step, stride, and swing durations were longer on level and uphill terrain compared to downhill (Table 2). Cadence was higher and step, stride, and stance durations were shorter on level terrain compared to uphill. Swing duration did not differ between level and uphill terrains.

Statistically significant differences were found between variability of step duration ($p=.005$), stride duration ($p<.001$) and swing duration ($p=.013$) and cadence ($p=.005$) in different terrains. Variability of stance duration ($p=.196$) did not differ statistically between terrains (Figure 2). Mean values for variability of walking parameters in different environments are presented in detail as Supplementary material (Supplement 3).

Post hoc comparisons for variability values revealed that in the uphill condition, cadence and stride duration varied more compared to downhill (Table 3). Step, stride, and swing durations, and cadence varied more in uphill than on the level. Step and stride durations and cadence also varied more in uphill than in downhill. Cadence varied more in downhill than on the level.

Discussion

The first aim of this study was to examine the validity of IMUs for assessing walking parameters of older adults outdoors in uphill and downhill terrain. IMUs exhibited good to excellent validity for uphill and downhill temporal walking parameters, and reasonable validity for swing duration both uphill and downhill. For spatial walking parameters, validity was good in uphill but not downhill walking. The second aim was to quantify changes in walking parameters of older adults between level, uphill and downhill terrain. Uphill walking resulted in the lowest cadence and the longest step, stride, and stance

1 durations. In downhill walking, step, stride, and swing durations were shortest, and cadence
 2 was highest. Step, stride and swing, durations and cadence varied the most in uphill walking.
 3 These changes in outdoor walking parameters seem to reflect the demand faced by older
 4 adults particularly when walking uphill.

5 Our IMU validation results for estimating spatiotemporal walking parameters in
 6 hilly terrain are consistent with those of previous studies done on level terrain with IMUs or
 7 accelerometers, whereby temporal parameter validity was good to excellent apart from swing
 8 duration (Del Din et al., 2016; O'Brien et al., 2019; Pepa et al., 2017). In our study, swing
 9 duration estimation bias with IMUs was 0.05-0.06 s. This was due to toe off estimation bias
 10 of -0.6 s for uphill walking and -0.04 s for downhill walking. In the uphill condition, spatial
 11 parameters showed good validity but not in downhill walking. Step length estimation with
 12 IMUs is inherently variable and challenging for several reasons. In older adults, during
 13 downhill walking, the pelvic region undergoes increased acceleration compared to level
 14 walking (Scaglioni-Solano & Aragón-Vargas, 2015). The model for step length estimation
 15 with IMUs is rigid (O'Brien et al., 2019); it assumes the leg to be one stiff segment and does
 16 not consider movement of the hip, knee or ankle. Because we used the same model for all
 17 terrains, it did not perfectly reflect the mechanical demand of downhill walking. For these
 18 reasons, step length and walking speed were not compared between level and hilly terrains.

19 Walking uphill is more physically demanding than walking on a level surface or
 20 downhill. The center of mass of the body must be raised during uphill walking (Dewolf et al.,
 21 2021) and muscle activity is increased compared to level walking (Dewolf et al., 2019; Franz
 22 & Kram, 2012). Older adults' lower limb muscle activity has been shown to be higher during
 23 uphill walking compared to downhill or level walking (Tikkanen et al., 2015). Thus, during
 24 uphill walking, the propulsive requirements of the leg are higher than in level walking (Lay et
 25 al., 2006). Older adults typically have impaired leg propulsion during uphill walking, because

1 they generate significantly less ankle power during the push-off phase than younger adults
2 (Franz & Kram, 2014). Kinematics and joint moments in uphill walking have also been
3 shown to differ from level walking, potentially indicating unique control strategies between
4 terrains (Lay et al., 2006). These factors may explain why walking varied the most in uphill,
5 and cadence and other temporal parameters differed between uphill and downhill.

6 In downhill walking, modifications are needed to accommodate the increased
7 acceleration demands. Kinematics, ground reaction forces and joint moments have all been
8 shown to differ between downhill and level walking (Lay et al., 2006). In downhill walking,
9 knee extensor muscle activity increases (Franz & Kram, 2012) and oxygen consumption
10 decreases compared to level walking (Gault et al., 2013). Walking downhill requires different
11 neural activation than uphill walking (Dewolf et al., 2021). In this study, older adults walked
12 outdoors with higher cadence in downhill versus level terrain and level versus uphill. These
13 results are consistent with those of previous studies of older adults walking in level and hilly
14 environments (Ferrano et al., 2015; Thomson et al., 2019; Twardzik et al., 2019). Scaglioni-
15 Solano and Aragón-Vargas (2015) reported differences in cadence between level and steeper
16 downhill walking but did not examine uphill walking. In our study, there was no statistical
17 difference in variability of step duration between level and downhill walking, which is in line
18 with the results of Scaglioni-Solano and Aragón-Vargas (2015).

19 In addition to the effects of terrain on walking mechanics, outdoor
20 environments also introduce other challenges such as variable weather conditions and the
21 presence of other people. Level walking was done on a sport track and hilly walking in
22 pedestrian area outdoors, both away from any major traffic, and in clear weather. Older adults
23 have been shown to increase the variability of walking in response to perturbed visual
24 feedback (Francis et al., 2015). During hilly tests, other people were passing by near the
25 walking test area, and although they did not cross the walking route of the participant, their

presence may have affected the variability of older adults' walking. Thus, there is scope for future research to examine the possible effects of these variables on walking patterns.

The main limitation of this study is that when validating step length and velocity in the downhill condition, poor ICC values were achieved with IMUs compared to high-speed video camera data. For this reason, we compared only temporal walking parameters across different terrains. In future, it would be important to develop a walking model and analysis approach that take into account the nature and requirements of downhill walking. In addition, we only studied relatively healthy older adults, so our results may not apply to different clinical populations.

In conclusion, IMUs are valid for estimating temporal parameters in hilly terrain especially, but also spatial parameters in uphill terrain. Our research shows that there are changes in walking depending on the environment. Therefore, it is important to assess walking in outdoor "real-life" environments, which may tell us more about older adults possibilities of outdoor mobility than traditional walking measurements conducted in laboratory environments. These results could be utilized when planning walking programs or rehabilitation interventions for older adults, for example by gradually introducing outdoor hilly walking sections and using IMUs to estimate walking parameters. In this way, the demand level could be progressively increased, whilst allowing people to walk in more realistic outdoor environments compared to the typical laboratory environment.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank laboratory staff, research assistants and research group members for helping us with data collection and express thanks to participants for giving their valuable time for research. *[Funding information blinded for review]*. The funder had no role in the design, implementation, analyses, or reporting of the results.

1 **Disclosure of interests**

2 The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

- Aminian, K., Najafi, B., Büla, C., Leyvraz, P.-F., & Robert, Ph. (2002). Spatio-temporal parameters of gait measured by an ambulatory system using miniature gyroscopes. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 35(5), 689–699. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9290\(02\)00008-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9290(02)00008-8)
- Bertoli, M., Cereatti, A., Trojaniello, D., Avanzino, L., Pelosin, E., Del Din, S., Rochester, L., Ginis, P., Bekkers, E. M. J., Mirelman, A., Hausdorff, J. M., & Della Croce, U. (2018). Estimation of spatio-temporal parameters of gait from magneto-inertial measurement units: Multicenter validation among Parkinson, mildly cognitively impaired and healthy older adults. *BioMedical Engineering OnLine*, 17(1), 58. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12938-018-0488-2>
- Bland, J. M., & Altman, D. G. (1986). Statistical methods for assessing agreement between two methods of clinical measurement. *Lancet (London, England)*, 1(8476), 307–310.
- Bock, O., & Beurskens, R. (2010). Changes of locomotion in old age depend on task setting. *Gait & Posture*, 32(4), 645–649. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2010.09.009>
- Brodie, M. A. D., Coppens, M. J. M., Lord, S. R., Lovell, N. H., Gschwind, Y. J., Redmond, S. J., Del Rosario, M. B., Wang, K., Sturnieks, D. L., Persiani, M., & Delbaere, K. (2016). Wearable pendant device monitoring using new wavelet-based methods shows daily life and laboratory gaits are different. *Medical & Biological Engineering & Computing*, 54(4), 663–674. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11517-015-1357-9>
- Cicchetti, D. V. (1994). Guidelines, criteria, and rules of thumb for evaluating normed and standardized assessment instruments in psychology. *Psychological Assessment*, 6(4), 284–290. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.6.4.284>
- Del Din, S., Godfrey, A., & Rochester, L. (2016). Validation of an Accelerometer to Quantify a Comprehensive Battery of Gait Characteristics in Healthy Older Adults and

- Parkinson's Disease: Toward Clinical and at Home Use. *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics*, 20(3), 838–847. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JBHI.2015.2419317>
- Dewolf, A. H., Ivanenko, Y. P., Zelik, K. E., Lacquaniti, F., & Willems, P. A. (2019). Differential activation of lumbar and sacral motor pools during walking at different speeds and slopes. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 122(2), 872–887. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00167.2019>
- Dewolf, A. H., Sylos-Labini, F., Cappellini, G., Zhvansky, D., Willems, P. A., Ivanenko, Y., & Lacquaniti, F. (2021). Neuromuscular Age-Related Adjustment of Gait When Moving Upwards and Downwards. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 15, 749366. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2021.749366>
- Ferraro, R. A., Pinto-Zipp, G., Simpkins, S., & Clark, M. (2013). Effects of an Inclined Walking Surface and Balance Abilities on Spatiotemporal Gait Parameters of Older Adults. *Journal of Geriatric Physical Therapy*, 36(1), 31–38. <https://doi.org/10.1519/JPT.0b013e3182510339>
- Francis, C. A., Franz, J. R., O'Connor, S. M., & Thelen, D. G. (2015). Gait variability in healthy old adults is more affected by a visual perturbation than by a cognitive or narrow step placement demand. *Gait & Posture*, 42(3), 380–385. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2015.07.006>
- Franz, J. R., & Kram, R. (2012). The effects of grade and speed on leg muscle activations during walking. *Gait & Posture*, 35(1), 143–147. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2011.08.025>
- Franz, J. R., & Kram, R. (2014). Advanced age and the mechanics of uphill walking: A joint-level, inverse dynamic analysis. *Gait & Posture*, 39(1), 135–140. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2013.06.012>

- Gamwell, H. E., Wait, S. O., Royster, J. T., Ritch, B. L., Powell, S. C., & Skinner, J. W. (2022). Aging and Gait Function: Examination of Multiple Factors that Influence Gait Variability. *Gerontology and Geriatric Medicine*, 8, 233372142210803. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23337214221080304>
- Gault, M. L., Clements, R. E., & Willems, M. E. T. (2013). Cardiovascular Responses During Downhill Treadmill Walking at Self-Selected Intensity in Older Adults. *Journal of Aging and Physical Activity*, 21(3), 335–347. <https://doi.org/10.1123/japa.21.3.335>
- Hausdorff, J. M., Rios, D. A., & Edelberg, H. K. (2001). Gait variability and fall risk in community-living older adults: A 1-year prospective study. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 82(8), 1050–1056. <https://doi.org/10.1053/apmr.2001.24893>
- Hillel, I., Gazit, E., Nieuwboer, A., Avanzino, L., Rochester, L., Cereatti, A., Croce, U. D., Rikkert, M. O., Bloem, B. R., Pelosin, E., Del Din, S., Ginis, P., Giladi, N., Mirelman, A., & Hausdorff, J. M. (2019). Is every-day walking in older adults more analogous to dual-task walking or to usual walking? Elucidating the gaps between gait performance in the lab and during 24/7 monitoring. *European Review of Aging and Physical Activity*, 16(1), 6. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s11556-019-0214-5>
- Hollander, K., Petersen, E., Zech, A., & Hamacher, D. (2022). Effects of barefoot vs. Shod walking during indoor and outdoor conditions in younger and older adults. *Gait & Posture*, 95, 284–291. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2021.04.024>
- Hong, S.-W., Leu, T.-H., Wang, T.-M., Li, J.-D., Ho, W.-P., & Lu, T.-W. (2015). Control of body's center of mass motion relative to center of pressure during uphill walking in the elderly. *Gait & Posture*, 42(4), 523–528. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2015.08.007>

- Komulainen, P. & Vuori, I. (2015). Ikääntymiseen liittyvät fysiologiset muutokset ja liikuntaharjoittelu. In current care guideline: Exercise. Working group set up by the Finnish Medical Society Duodecim and the Finnish Cardiac Society. Helsinki: The Finnish Medical Society Duodecim, 2016 (referred October 8, 2023). Available online at: www.kaypahoito.fi
- Kuntapun, J., Silsupadol, P., Kamnardsiri, T., & Lugade, V. (2020). Smartphone Monitoring of Gait and Balance During Irregular Surface Walking and Obstacle Crossing. *Frontiers in Sports and Active Living*, 2, 560577. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fspor.2020.560577>
- Lay, A. N., Hass, C. J., & Gregor, R. J. (2006). The effects of sloped surfaces on locomotion: A kinematic and kinetic analysis. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 39(9), 1621–1628. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2005.05.005>
- Lindemann, U., Schwenk, M., Schmitt, S., Weyrich, M., Schlicht, W., & Becker, C. (2017). Effect of uphill and downhill walking on walking performance in geriatric patients using a wheeled walker. *Zeitschrift Für Gerontologie Und Geriatrie*, 50(6), 483–487. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00391-016-1156-4>
- Madgwick, S. O. H., Harrison, A. J. L., & Vaidyanathan, R. (2011). Estimation of IMU and MARG orientation using a gradient descent algorithm. *2011 IEEE International Conference on Rehabilitation Robotics*, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICORR.2011.5975346>
- [blinded for review]
- McGibbon, C. A. (2003). Toward a Better Understanding of Gait Changes With Age and Disablement: Neuromuscular Adaptation: *Exercise and Sport Sciences Reviews*, 31(2), 102–108. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00003677-200304000-00009>

- O'Brien, Hidalgo-Araya, Mummidisetty, Vallery, Ghaffari, Rogers, Lieber, & Jayaraman. (2019). Augmenting Clinical Outcome Measures of Gait and Balance with a Single Inertial Sensor in Age-Ranged Healthy Adults. *Sensors*, 19(20), 4537. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s19204537>
- Pepa, L., Verdini, F., & Spalazzi, L. (2017). Gait parameter and event estimation using smartphones. *Gait & Posture*, 57, 217–223. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2017.06.011>
- [blinded for review]
- Rantalainen, T., Pirkola, H., Karavirta, L., Rantanen, T., & Linnamo, V. (2019). Reliability and concurrent validity of spatiotemporal stride characteristics measured with an ankle-worn sensor among older individuals. *Gait & Posture*, 74, 33–39. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2019.08.006>
- Renggli, D., Graf, C., Tachatos, N., Singh, N., Meboldt, M., Taylor, W. R., Stieglitz, L., & Schmid Daners, M. (2020). Wearable Inertial Measurement Units for Assessing Gait in Real-World Environments. *Frontiers in Physiology*, 11. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fphys.2020.00090>
- Scaglioni-Solano, P., & Aragón-Vargas, L. F. (2015). Age-related differences when walking downhill on different sloped terrains. *Gait & Posture*, 41(1), 153–158. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2014.09.022>
- Shafizadeh, M., Bonner, S., Fraser, J., Parvinpour, S., Shabani, M., & Barnes, A. (2023). Effects of Sport Participation on Gait Coordination, Symmetry, and Variability in Older Adults. *Journal of Aging and Physical Activity*, 31(6), 940–947. <https://doi.org/10.1123/japa.2022-0363>
- Schmitt, A. C., Baudendistel, S. T., Lipat, A. L., White, T. A., Raffegau, T. E., & Hass, C. J. (2021). Walking indoors, outdoors, and on a treadmill: Gait differences in healthy

1 young and older adults. *Gait & Posture*, 90, 468–474.

2 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2021.09.197>

3 Seidler, R. D., Bernard, J. A., Burutolu, T. B., Fling, B. W., Gordon, M. T., Gwin, J. T., Kwak,
4 Y., & Lipps, D. B. (2010). Motor control and aging: Links to age-related brain
5 structural, functional, and biochemical effects. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral*
6 *Reviews*, 34(5), 721–733. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2009.10.005>

7 Thomson, D., Liston, M., & Gupta, A. (2019). Is the 10 metre walk test on sloped surfaces
8 associated with age and physical activity in healthy adults? *European Review of Aging*
9 *and Physical Activity*, 16(1), 11. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s11556-019-0219-0>

10 Tikkanen, O., Sipilä, S., Kuula, A.-S., Pesola, A., Haakana, P., & Finni, T. (2016). Muscle
11 activity during daily life in the older people. *Aging Clinical and Experimental*
12 *Research*, 28(4), 713–720. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40520-015-0482-5>

13 Twardzik, E., Duchowny, K., Gallagher, A., Alexander, N., Strasburg, D., Colabianchi, N., &
14 Clarke, P. (2019). What features of the built environment matter most for mobility?
15 Using wearable sensors to capture real-time outdoor environment demand on gait
16 performance. *Gait & Posture*, 68, 437–442.
17 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2018.12.028>

18 Vaughan, C. L., Davis, B. L., & O'Connor, J. C. (1992). Dynamics of human gait. *Human*
19 *Kinetics*.

20 Vähä-Ypyä, H., Husu, P., Suni, J., Vasankari, T., & Sievänen, H. (2018). Reliable recognition
21 of lying, sitting, and standing with a hip-worn accelerometer. *Scandinavian journal of*
22 *medicine & science in sports*, 28(3), 1092–1102. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sms.13017>

23 Werner, C., Heldmann, P., Hummel, S., Bauknecht, L., Bauer, J. M., & Hauer, K. (2020).
24 Concurrent Validity, Test-Retest Reliability, and Sensitivity to Change of a Single

- 1 Body-Fixed Sensor for Gait Analysis during Rollator-Assisted Walking in Acute
- 2 Geriatric Patients. *Sensors*, 20(17), 4866. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s20174866>
- 3 Winter, D. 1979. Biomechanics of human movement, Wiley & Sons, New York.
- 4 Zhang, Y., Zhou, X., Pijnappels, M., & Bruijn, S. M. (2021). Differences in Gait Stability and
- 5 Acceleration Characteristics Between Healthy Young and Older Females. *Frontiers in*
- 6 *Rehabilitation Sciences*, 2, 763309. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fresc.2021.763309>
- 7 Zijlstra, W., & Hof, A. L. (1997). Displacement of the pelvis during human walking:
- 8 Experimental data and model predictions. *Gait & Posture*, 6(3), 249–262.
- 9 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0966-6362\(97\)00021-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0966-6362(97)00021-0)
- 10 Zijlstra, W., & Hof, A. L. (2003). Assessment of spatio-temporal gait parameters from trunk
- 11 accelerations during human walking. *Gait & Posture*, 18(2), 1–10.
- 12 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0966-6362\(02\)00190-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0966-6362(02)00190-X)

Table 1

Definitions of spatiotemporal walking parameters based on IMUs used in this study

Parameters	Definition
step duration	time between two consecutive contralateral heel strikes, seconds (s)
stride duration	time between two consecutive ipsilateral heel strikes, seconds (s)
swing duration	time between consecutive toe off and heel strike of the same foot, seconds (s)
stance duration	time between consecutive heel strike and toe off of the same foot, seconds (s)
cadence	60/step duration, steps per minute (steps/min)
step length	length calculated between two consecutive contralateral heel strikes with the methods of Zijlstra & Hof (1997, 2003) using an inverted pendulum model adjusted for leg length, centimeters (cm)
walking speed	the sum of the step lengths divided by the time taken, meters per second (m/s)

1

Table 2

Post hoc comparison with Bonferroni correction of mean of the walking parameters of older adults between outdoor terrains.

Parameter	Terrains comparison	Mean difference	SE	t	pBonferroni
Step duration(s)	level vs uphill	-0.012	0.003	-3.676	.001
	level vs downhill	0.014	0.003	4.368	<.001
	uphill vs downhill	0.026	0.003	8.044	<.001
Stride duration (s)	level vs uphill	-0.023	0.007	-3.574	.002
	level vs downhill	0.029	0.007	4.404	<.001
	uphill vs downhill	0.052	0.007	7.978	<.001
Swing duration (s)	level vs uphill	0.002	0.004	0.588	1.000
	level vs downhill	0.017	0.004	4.109	<.001

	uphill vs downhill	0.015	0.004	3.521	.002
Stance duration (s)	level vs uphill	-0.025	0.007	-3.797	< .001
	level vs downhill	0.012	0.007	1.789	.234
	uphill vs downhill	0.036	0.007	5.586	< .001
Cadence (steps/min)	level vs uphill	2.498	0.721	3.466	.003
	level vs downhill	-3.619	0.721	-5.021	< .001
	uphill vs downhill	-6.118	0.721	-8.487	< .001

Note. N=35

1

Table 3

Post hoc comparison of variability of walking parameters of older adults between outdoor terrains

Parameter	Terrains comparison	Z	p_{Bonferroni}
Step duration (CoV%)	level vs uphill	-3.800	< .001*
	level vs downhill	-2.097	.036
	uphill vs downhill	-2.752	.006*
Stride duration (CoV%)	level vs uphill	-4.815	< .001*
	level vs downhill	-3.243	.001*
	uphill vs downhill	-3.178	.001*
Swing duration (CoV%)	level vs uphill	-2.932	.003*
	level vs downhill	-1.998	.046
	uphill vs downhill	-1.048	.295
Cadence (CoV%)	level vs uphill	-3.767	< .001*
	level vs downhill	-1.965	.049
	uphill vs downhill	-2.670	.008*

Note. N=35, * Statistically significant difference according to Bonferroni correction (p value < 0.017 (0.05/3)) (Wilcoxon signed-rank tests)

2

Supplement 2, table 1

IMU data compared to reference during hilly walking. Validation values for step events.

Parameter	Bias (SD) [95% Limit of agreement of bias]	Typical error	RMSE
Heel strike, uphill (s)	-0.001 (0.031) [-0.061, 0.059]	0.02	0.031
Heel strike, downhill (s)	-0.016 (0.030) [-0.075, 0.043]	0.02	0.034
Toe off, uphill (s)	-0.061 (0.034) [-0.127, 0.005]	0.02	0.634
Toe off, downhill (s)	-0.052 (0.037) [-0.125, 0.020]	0.03	0.575

Note. N=6

1

Supplement 2, table 2

IMU data compared to high-speed video reference data during hilly walking. Validation values for step and stride duration, stance and swing duration, cadence, step length and walking speed.

Parameter	Bias (SD) [95% Limit of agreement of bias]	ICC, two-way random effect, absolute agreement [95% limit of agreement]	Typical error	RMSE
Step duration, uphill (s)	0.001 (0.019) [-0.037, 0.039]	0.88 [0.86, 0.89]	0.01	0.019
Step duration, downhill (s)	0.001 (0.014) [-0.026, 0.028]	0.94 [0.94, 0.95]	0.01	0.014

Stride duration, uphill (s)	0.001 (0.015) [-0.027, 0.030]	0.98 [0.98, 0.98]	0.01	0.015
Stride duration, downhill (s)	0.001 (0.012) [-0.022, 0.024]	0.99 [0.99, 0.99]	0.01	0.012
Cadence, uphill (steps/min)	-0.15 (5.09) [-10.13, 9.83]	0.85 [0.83, 0.87]	3.60	5.09
Cadence, downhill (steps/min)	-0.06 (3.80) [-7.50, 7.39]	0.93 [0.92, 0.94]	2.69	3.80
Stance duration, uphill (s)	-0.061 (0.025) [-0.110, -0.011]	0.54 [-0.07, 0.84]	0.02	0.066
Stance duration, downhill (s)	-0.036 (0.028) [-0.091, 0.019]	0.75 [-0.02, 0.91]	0.02	0.046
Swing duration, uphill (s)	0.060 (0.023) [0.015, 0.106]	0.25 [-0.06, 0.60]	0.02	0.065
Swing duration, downhill (s)	0.036 (0.028) [-0.019, 0.091]	0.37 [-0.08, 0.66]	0.02	0.046
Step length, uphill (cm)	2.43 (3.41) [-4.26, 9.12]	0.70 [0.31, 0.87]	2.41	4.14
Step length, downhill (cm)	11.25 (3.58) [4.27, 18.26]	0.13 [-0.04, 0.43]	2.53	11.79
Walking speed, uphill (m/s)	0.04 (0.07) [-0.09, 0.17]	0.62 [0.24, 0.82]	0.05	0.078
Walking speed, downhill (m/s)	0.24 (0.08) [0.09, 0.39]	0.17 [-0.04, 0.51]	0.05	0.249

Note. N=6, Bias= mean error between IMU and reference data, SD= standard deviation of bias, ICC= intraclass correlation coefficient, typical error = the standard deviation of the difference divided by $\sqrt{2}$, RMSE= root mean square error

Descriptives of walking parameters on different terrains outdoors with older adults

Parameter	Terrain	M	SD	Min	Max	Repeated measures ANOVA / Friedman's test variables
Step duration, mean (s)	level	0.502	0.039	0.446	0.599	F(1.653, 56.194) =
	uphill	0.513	0.047	0.447	0.662	32.445, p<.001 ^s
	downhill	0.487	0.040	0.423	0.595	
Stride duration, mean (s)	level	1.003	0.078	0.892	1.198	F(1.659, 56.399) =
	uphill	1.026	0.094	0.891	1.323	31.939, p<.001 ^s
	downhill	0.974	0.081	0.845	1.189	
Swing duration, mean (s)	level	0.421	0.038	0.354	0.528	F(2, 68) = 9.876,
	uphill	0.419	0.043	0.336	0.541	p<.001
	downhill	0.404	0.038	0.349	0.505	
Stance duration, mean (s)	level	0.581	0.052	0.485	0.668	F(1.408, 47.866) =
	uphill	0.606	0.070	0.475	0.782	16.274, p<.001 ^s
	downhill	0.570	0.053	0.494	0.697	
Cadence, mean (steps/min)	level	120.5	9.1	100.4	134.9	F(2, 68) = 36.420,
	uphill	118.0	10.1	90.9	134.6	p<.001
	downhill	124.1	9.9	101.1	142.0	
Step duration, variability (%)	level	3.537	0.954	2.039	6.249	$\chi^2(2) = 10.800$,
	uphill	4.549	1.469	2.024	8.736	p=.005
	downhill	3.863	0.930	2.578	6.103	
Stride duration, variability (%)	level	2.012	0.440	1.341	3.271	$\chi^2(2) = 29.314$,
	uphill	2.919	1.034	1.517	6.060	p<.001
	downhill	2.393	0.695	1.277	4.402	
Swing duration, variability (%)	level	5.364	2.106	2.354	10.124	$\chi^2(2) = 8.629$,
	uphill	6.335	1.978	3.281	9.545	p=.013

	downhill	5.933	1.999	1.700	10.875	
Stance duration,	level	3.941	1.472	1.575	7.051	$\chi^2(2) = 3.257,$
variability (%)	uphill	4.391	1.546	1.755	7.666	p=.196
	downhill	4.285	1.644	2.033	8.164	
Cadence, variability (%)	level	3.544	0.978	2.024	6.280	$\chi^2(2) = 10.800,$
	uphill	4.588	1.686	2.019	11.189	p=.005
	downhill	3.868	0.943	2.607	5.880	

Note. N=35, ^s Greenhouse-Geiser correction used