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Abstract

Soft tissue artefact (STA), *i.e.* the motion of the skin, fat and muscles gliding on the underlying bone, may lead to a marker position error reaching up to 8.7 cm for the particular case of the scapula. Multibody kinematic optimisation (MBO) is one of the most efficient approaches used to reduce STA. It consists in minimising the distance between the positions of experimental markers on a subject skin and the simulated positions of the same markers embedded on a kinematic model. However, the efficiency of MBO directly relies on the chosen kinematic model. This paper proposes an overview of the different upper limb models available in the literature and a discussion about their applicability to MBO.

The advantages of each joint model with respect to its biofidelity to functional anatomy are detailed both for the shoulder and the forearm areas. Models capabilities of personalisation and of adaptation to pathological cases are also discussed. Concerning model efficiency in terms of STA reduction in MBO algorithms, a lack of quantitative assessment in the literature is noted. In priority, future studies should concern the evaluation and quantification of STA reduction depending on upper limb joint constraints.

**Keywords:** Multibody kinematic optimisation; Upper limb; Shoulder; Forearm; Kinematic model
1. Introduction

An accurate estimate of the upper limb kinematics is essential for ergonomic and clinical applications such as the prediction of the “reachable space” or the assessment of potential pathologies or lesions during arm elevations. However, estimating the skeleton kinematics from sensors or markers put on the skin is not trivial due to the soft tissue artefact (STA), i.e. the motion of the skin, fat and muscles gliding on the underlying bone. STA on the upper limb can be up to 8.7 cm on the scapula (Matsui et al., 2006) and up to 48% of the effective humeral axial rotation performed for the humerus (Cutti et al., 2005).

To reduce STA, both experimental and numerical approaches have been developed. Experimentally, the acromial part of the scapula (Leboeuf et al., 2012) and epicondyles of the humerus (Begon et al., 2015; Blache et al., 2016) are known to minimise STA. As for numerical approaches, some correction factors were determined (Bourne et al., 2009), but most of the studies relied on optimisation approaches. For instance, multibody kinematic optimisation (MBO) method is increasingly used since the first application of the Lu and O’Connor (1999) algorithm to the upper-limb by Roux et al. (2002). MBO consists in minimising the distance between the positions of experimental markers on the participant’s skin and the estimated positions of the associated markers on a kinematic chain model. Optimisation performed on a single anatomical segment, called single-body optimisation (Cheze et al., 1995; Söderkvist and Wedin, 1993; Spoor and Veldpaus, 1980), might be ineffective. Indeed, it only correct marker cluster deformation while STA is mainly composed of cluster rigid transformations (Barré et al., 2013). Thus, compared to single-body optimisation, MBO should be more effective and non-physiological apparent joint dislocations should be avoided.

In the process of bone kinematic estimation through MBO, the choice of the upper limb joint models is decisive: MBO accuracy directly relies on the chosen joint constraints and degrees-of-freedom (DoF) (Duprey et al., 2010; Valente et al., 2015; Clément et al., 2014). Joint models should derive from actual functional anatomy. Several upper limb kinematic models are already available in the literature (see reviews by Yang et al. (2010), Dumas et al. (2016) and Tondu (2007)) and their number is expanding. Favre et al. (2009) highlighted an increasing interest in shoulder modelling: 30 publications from 1990 to 2009 versus more than 60 from 2000 to 2009. In the past 6 years, about 15 articles get published on shoulder modelling, confirming this interest.
Thus, the aim of this study was to provide an overview of the existing upper limb kinematic. Each model is discussed with respect to its biofidelity to functional anatomy, its capabilities of personalisation and adaptation to pathological cases, as well as its efficiency in terms of STA reduction in MBO algorithms.

2. Overview of the upper limb models

This overview is based on an extensive search in the Embase, Medline, Scopus, PubMed, and Web of Science databases with several combinations of the following keywords in the title, abstract or keywords: ‘optim* or kalman’, ‘kinemat* joint’, ‘subject or human or limb’, ‘model* or over*determ*’ and ‘upper-limb or shoulder or elbow or wrist or *arm’, and their references were searched for relevant upper limb kinematic models to be added.

Functional anatomy and existing kinematic models will be described and assessed, first for the shoulder and then for the forearm. All found models are sorted in Tables 1-2 according to their joint description. Only examples for each model category are cited in the following sections.

2.1. Shoulder

a) Functional anatomy

The shoulder is composed of three bones, the humerus, scapula and clavicle, and of four joints, the glenohumeral, sternoclavicular, acromioclavicular and the scapulathoracic joints (Figure 1). The glenohumeral joint is made of two spherical contact surfaces: the glenoid cavity and the humeral head connecting the scapula to the humerus. This results in a three DoFs rotation joint over a large range of motion (i.e. abduction 150-180°, flexion 180°, extension 45-60° and internal-external rotation 90°) with interaction between the DoFs as shown by Haering et al. (2014). Since both contact surfaces have different radii (e.g. a 1.3 mm difference was found in El Habachi et al. (2015)), the joint motion has also been described as “the movement of a ball on a seal nose” (Hill et al., 2008) implying a combination of large rotations and millimetre translations. Glenohumeral translations up to 12.4 mm were measured through in vivo studies (Dal Maso et al., 2014; Graichen et al., 2000; Sahara et al., 2007).

The sternoclavicular joint connects the clavicle to the thorax. In spite of its 2-DoF saddle-shaped joint nature, Zatsiorsky (1998, p348) emphasised this joint behaves as a ball-and-socket joint with three DoFs. The acromioclavicular joint links the acromion of the scapula to the lateral part of the clavicle. It allows a
rotation of the scapula about a specific screw axis passing through the insertions of both the acromioclavicular and the coracoclavicular ligaments with negligible translations (Sahara et al., 2006). The scapulothoracic joint does not include any articular structure, the gliding movement of the scapula on the thorax being only constrained by the surrounding muscles.

b) Modelling

Shoulder models account for previously described functional anatomy using series of kinematic constraints. The glenohumeral joint (or the shoulder as a whole) is commonly modelled as a spherical joint. To consider glenohumeral translations, some studies proposed a 6-DoF joint (Roux et al., 2002; van den Bogert et al., 2013) where soft constraints using a penalty-based method may be added (Charbonnier et al., 2014). In a different way, El Habachi et al. (2015) considered two spheres of different radii, one rolling on the other, to represent the glenoid cavity and humeral head interactions with possible translations (Figure 2). This constraint was modelled as a rod connecting the two sphere centres. Finally, a recent study suggested to model the glenohumeral joint as a simplified 2D cam-follower mechanism in order to predict shoulder instability using surface geometries and contact forces as inputs (Willemot et al., 2015).

The shoulder girdle can be represented as a single equivalent mechanism between the thorax and the glenohumeral joint. Different models of the shoulder girdle have been proposed namely a single universal joint, two prismatic joints, a universal joint with a prismatic joint or a parallel mechanism (Figure 3). Contrariwise, detailed representations of the shoulder girdle integrate the sternoclavicular and acromioclavicular joints separately.

The above modelling choices result in open-loop kinematic models, while models including a scapulothoracic joint result in a closed-loop chain. The combined motions of the clavicle and scapula relative to the thorax are constrained by the sternoclavicular, acromioclavicular and scapulothoracic joints (Figure 4). The scapulothoracic joint is commonly described as a contact between a cone or an ellipsoid representing the thorax and different points of the scapula. Recently, an equivalent but simpler mechanism made of two universal and two prismatic joints was proposed (Ingram et al., 2016). Finally, another way to integrate the interdependency between shoulder girdle DoFs is to introduce scapular and clavicular rhythm equations as a function of the humeral angles (de Groot and Brand, 2001).
c) **Assessment of the modelling choices**

Modelling the glenohumeral joint as a spherical joint is controversial. Glenohumeral translations are often considered as negligible since they are mostly under 5 mm for healthy subjects, however they might be up to 12.4 mm in maximum abduction (Dal Maso et al., 2014). Furthermore, in a clinical context, excessive translations may be related to shoulder disorders (Willemot et al., 2015) and have to be estimated to better understand the pathomechanics. Thus, depending on the application and the need for translation estimations, the glenohumeral joint can be set either as a spherical joint or include translations. For models dedicated to MBO, the use of a 6-DoF (no constraint) glenohumeral joint model would be a misuse of the method since MBO relies on physiological constraints to minimise the STA-related errors. Thus, for MBO purposes, models including limited translations seem to be an appropriate choice (Charbonnier et al., 2014; El Habachi et al., 2015), even though the “soft constraints” method raises the question of the weightings in the MBO cost function, since these factors controlling the amount of possible joint translations may be task or subject-dependent.

The acromioclavicular and sternoclavicular joints are mostly modelled as spherical joints. This modelling choice is satisfying since these DoFs may replicate kinematic observations. Furthermore, this choice enables the axial rotation of the clavicle which appears to play an important role in upper-extremity elevation since it may help to draw out the ligaments closing the acromioclavicular joint (Yang et al., 2010). However, clavicle axial rotation can hardly be measured due to STA, which raises the question of the legitimacy of modelling this clavicle DoF. Furthermore, most of the experimental studies do not attempt to measure this DoF (de Groot and Brand, 2001), while some try to assess axial rotation through optimisations either by minimising the acromioclavicular rotations (van der Helm and Pronk, 1995) or by constraining the conoid ligament to a constant length (Bolsterlee et al., 2013). To the best of our knowledge, only Sahara et al. (2006) and (Jackson et al., 2012a) provided 3D acromioclavicular and sternoclavicular kinematics during arm elevations, using either MRI data or several cutaneous markers on the clavicle, respectively. A partial solution could be to add bounds based on these experimental observations.

The modelling choice of the scapulothoracic joint which consists in defining contact points of the scapula on an ellipsoid representing the thorax is widespread. However, there is no consensus on the number and location of the contact points. The ellipsoid construction also depends on the study (scaled or optimised shapes). Furthermore, this method can lead to non-physiological interpenetrations of the scapula into the thorax. Solutions to this problem have been proposed in the literature by imposing the scapula plane to be
tangential to different geometries representing the thorax (Naaim et al., 2015; Tondu, 2007) or by introducing an equivalent parallel mechanism made of universal and prismatic joints (Ingram et al., 2016) that may be simpler to implement than the gliding conditions. These last models have the advantages of being easily customisable to patients.

The approach relying on a set shoulder rhythm (i.e. coupling equations of sternoclavicular, acromioclavicular and glenohumeral joint angles as function of the thoracohumeral elevation) is easy to implement, nevertheless these equations are based on measurements performed on relatively small and homogeneous samples of healthy subjects and selected movements (de Groot and Brand, 2001; Grewal and Dickerson, 2013). Thus, models integrating such regressions might fail to represent independent scapula and humerus motions like shrugging and will not allow to discriminate between normal and pathological scapular kinematics.

2.2. Forearm

a) Functional anatomy

The forearm is composed of two bones, the radius and ulna that interact together proximally with the humerus and distally with the hand through five joints, the humeroulnar, the humeroradial, the proximal and distal radioulnar, and the wrist or radiocarpal joints (Figure 5).

The humeroulnar joint consists in the contact between the humeral trochlea and the trochlear notch of the ulna. This joint allows three DoFs. The primary DoF corresponds to the flexion-extension with up to 160° of passive flexion. For that, the humeral trochlea has a diabolo shape and the trochlear notch of the ulna presents a high congruence to this shape. This prevents any medial-lateral displacements and thus ensures the stability of the joint. It must be noticed that the trochlea extends more distally than the capitulum, leading to an angulation called carrying angle observed between the longitudinal axes of the humerus and the forearm. Additionally, during pronosupination, the ulna describes an arc of circle composed of an extension followed by a lateral motion and finally a flexion relative to the humerus (Duchenne, 1959; Dwight, 1885). Two additional DoFs are thus observed: an ulna axial displacement and a humeroulnar abduction-adduction movement (i.e. swaying) (Gattamelata et al., 2007).

The humeroradial joint connects the humerus capitulum to the radial head. While the bony surfaces of this joint enable three rotational DoFs, a second contact between the radial head and the ulnar radial notch prevents instability and limits the movement to almost a unique DoF in flexion-extension. The latter contact,
ensured by the annular ligament, corresponds to the proximal radioulnar joint. The combination of proximal and distal radioulnar joints allows the pronosupination. This additional rotational DoF ensures an accurate positioning of the hand which is connected to the distal end of the radius through the radiocarpal joint.

The articular surface of the radius forms a transversely elliptical concave surface that can receive the smooth convex surface of the condyle formed by the superior articular surfaces of the carpal bones, specifically the navicular, lunate, and triangular bones (i.e. radiocarpal joint). The movements permitted by this joint are flexion-extension and abduction-adduction.

b) Modelling

In biomechanics, the forearm is commonly considered as a single segment. The elbow and the wrist are modelled as universal joints where the pronosupination is often reported at the elbow. For instance, Prokopenko et al. (2001) integrated non-orthogonal and non-intersecting axes in the elbow and wrist joints in their open-loop arm model in order to respect anatomical considerations.

When a more detailed model of the forearm is required, the main challenge is to reproduce the pronosupination in an anatomical manner. Introduced by Fick as early as 1904 (cited in Fick, 2013), a first level of modelling integrating pronosupination consists in two L-shaped elements connected by two spherical joints representing the humeroradial and distal radioulnar joints. This model leads to an unrealistic adduction movement of the hand since the parallelism between elbow and wrist flexion-extension axis cannot be conserved during pronosupination. To remove this limitation, some authors proposed to add a translational DoF between radius and ulna, at the proximal radioulnar (Pennestri et al., 2007; Weinberg et al., 2000) or at the distal radioulnar joint (Lemay and Crago, 1996). In the model of Lemay and Cargo (1996), the distal radioulnar joint was modelled as a cylindrical joint along the axis going through the capitulum and the centre of the distal part of the ulna. Weinberg et al (2000) proposed another closed-loop kinematic chain enabling to reproduce the anatomical evasive motion between ulna and radius. The proximal radioulnar joint was a spherical joint (at the ulna proximal end) rigidly linked to a prismatic joint (at the radius proximal end), and the distal radioulnar joint was a hinge joint (at the ulna distal end) rigidly linked to a universal joint (at the radius distal end). Pennestri et al (2007) proposed a similar mechanism where the universal joint was replaced by a spherical joint and the prismatic joint by a guide joint (Figure 6).

To reproduce the ulna axial displacement and the swaying observed in vivo (Gattamelata et al., 2007), further DoFs may be introduced into the humeroulnar joint, namely a translation in the direction of the hinge
axis and a rotation for humeroulnar abduction-adduction. Moreover, the carrying angle is rarely reported in the models. To fill these gaps, Laitenberger et al. (2014) proposed a complete model of the upper limb, integrating a closed-loop forearm model. The forearm part of this model was composed of the humeroulnar joint (hinge joint), the humeroradial joint (spherical joint), the proximal radioulnar joint (hinge joint coupled with a prismatic joint), and the distal radioulnar joint (three hinge joints).

c) **Assessment of the modelling choices**

The open-loop models with universal joints at both the elbow and wrist can be a reasonable compromise between accuracy and simplicity of the human arm description (Prokopenko et al., 2001) for direct kinematics applications. For models dedicated to MBO, additional details are required to reproduce pronosupination in an anatomical manner and closed-loop models seem thus more appropriate (Laitenberger et al., 2014). However, as for the shoulder girdle, adding too many DoFs can be deleterious to the MBO approach as the STA-related errors are partially corrected through the kinematic constraints. Anyway, the models defining one DoF at the humeroulnar joint (Pennestrì et al., 2007) and one and two DoFs at the closed-loop associated to the radioulnar and humeroradial joints (Laitenberger et al., 2014) were both able to reproduce the complex movement of the forearm based on anatomical considerations.

In most of the forearm models, the focus is put on the pronosupination function of the forearm, leaving the humeroulnar joint to its primary function (*i.e.* flexion-extension) through the use of a hinge joint. However, the anatomy of this joint is more complex and allows further DoFs, as described previously. To the authors’ knowledge, only Laitenberger et al. (2014) defined the humeroulnar joint by a universal joint (*i.e.* flexion-extension, abduction-adduction) coupled with a prismatic joint. Compared to other forearm models, this model demonstrated a better biofidelic reproduction of the movements between forearm bones.

### 3. **Discussion**

The objective of the present overview was to describe existing upper limb models and discuss their applicability using MBO. This overview is based on an extensive search of several major databases. The large variability and inaccuracy of the expressions used to describe MBO (*e.g.* global optimisation, inverse kinematics, motion reconstruction, overdetermined system as previously highlighted by Dumas et al. (2016)) made a systematic review inappropriate. A search with specific keywords could fail finding relevant
articles, while a search with general keywords would lead to a very substantial number of articles. This overview manages to render the major trends concerning upper limb modelling in the goal of STA reduction. In all, 37 studies about upper limb modelling were found, with 38% of them used in MBO (Tables 1-2). While lower limb models are classically dedicated to gait analysis, there is no standard activity for the upper limb. Thus the models are built according to the purpose and the intended application. This may explain the variety of models found in the literature.

### 3.1 Personalisation of upper limb kinematic model

Each joint model was assessed by considering its biofidelity to functional anatomy. However, in the context of STA reduction, joint constraints do not only have to be anatomically biofidelic but also have to 1) be easily customisable to each participant including those with musculoskeletal disorders (Clément et al., 2016) and 2) to reduce STA. Subjects’ anthropometry fitting can easily be performed by adjusting each segment length based on geometrical measurements for simple upper limb models. For more complex models, medical images might be needed, to adjust the humeral head and glenoid radii for instance (El Habachi et al., 2015), to find the ellipsoid best fitting the thorax (Prinold and Bull, 2014) or accurately locate joint centres (Michaud et al., 2016). This requirement is somehow a limitation since it can only be afforded in a clinical context. Adaptation of joint constraints to fit pathological cases is a complex step since it requires an a priori knowledge of the pathology in order to adequately reduce STA. In the case of pathologies leading to bone deformities or range of motions restrictions, joint models allowing to adapt joint surface geometries or allowing to tune the bounds of some DoFs, especially translations, are of interest. The approaches relying on coupling equations cannot account for pathologies.

### 3.2. Upper-limb MBO and STA reduction

In MBO framework, open-loop chain models including mostly universal and spherical joints present the advantage of avoiding non-physiological joint dislocation which appears when using single-body optimisation. In the context of clinical applications, more complex models may be needed for their higher biofidelity in terms of functional anatomy and their personalisation capabilities as mentioned above. However, in the literature, there is a lack of studies concerning the assessment of STA reduction through MBO for the upper limb: only a few studies (El Habachi et al., 2015; Charbonnier et al., 2014; Begon et al., n.d., Naaim et al., 2015) quantified the errors due to STA compared to experimental reference data. All but
Naaim et al. (n.d.) generally reported significant reductions of the STA. However, the lack of comparative studies investigating different upper limb joint constraints makes it difficult to conclusively determine the best joint kinematic constraints/models for STA reduction. Also, all segments and joints should be modelled since each constraint may affect all DoFs (Begon et al., n.d.). Another shortage of the literature is the lack of sensitivity studies enabling to assess the influence of the model parameters such as clavicle length, position of the scapulo-thoracic contact and of the thorax ellipsoid centre (El Habachi et al., 2013). Such studies are essential to identify the key parameters of a model.

3.3 Conclusion and future directions

A large number of upper limb models with a large variety of joint modelling choices was pointed out. Models as close as possible to functional anatomy appear to be attractive: they can be adapted to pathological cases and a better STA reduction is expected. Nevertheless, the influence of joint constraints on STA reduction appears to be little known. Thus, major future directions should concern the evaluation and quantification of STA reduction depending on joint constraints, as well as the determination, through sensitivity studies, of the most influential parameters in the upper limb models dedicated to MBO.
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Figures

Figure 1: Shoulder girdle anatomy

Figure 2: Glenohumeral joint modelled as a sphere-to-sphere contact (El Habachi et al., 2015)
Figure 3: Shoulder girdle modelled as a parallel mechanism (Lenarcic and Stanisic, 2003)

Figure 4: A closed-loop kinematic chain of the shoulder
Figure 5: Forearm joints

Figure 6: Forearm kinematic model as proposed by Pennestri et al. (2007)
### Tables

Table 1: Joint models of the shoulder (the MBO column indicates whether the model was initially built for multibody kinematic optimisation purposes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joints</th>
<th>Kinematics</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>MBO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder as a single joint</td>
<td>Spherical joint</td>
<td>Engin and Tümer, 1989</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prokopenko et al., 2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cerveri et al., 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pontonnier and Dumont, 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Debril et al., 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fehanno et al., 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH joint</td>
<td>Spherical joint</td>
<td>Prokopenko et al., 2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cerveri et al., 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pontonnier and Dumont, 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Debril et al., 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fehanno et al., 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH joint</td>
<td>6 DoF</td>
<td>Roux et al., 2002</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>van den Bogert et al., 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soft constraints</td>
<td>Charbonnier et al., 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sphere-to-sphere</td>
<td>El Habachi et al., 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder girdle as a single mechanism</td>
<td>Cam-follower mechanism</td>
<td>Willemot et al., 2015</td>
<td>2D mechanism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Universal joint</td>
<td>Lenarcic and Umek, 1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Abdel-Malek et al., 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two prismatic joints</td>
<td>Yang et al., 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Universal joint + Prismatic joint</td>
<td>Klopčar and Lenarčič, 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parallel mechanism</td>
<td>Lenarcic and Stanisic, 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC and SC joints</td>
<td>Two spherical joints</td>
<td>Högfors et al., 1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yang et al., 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jackson et al., 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Charbonnier et al., 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Laitenberger et al., 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cone or ellipsoid contact</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maurel and Thalmann, 1999</td>
<td>Ellipsoid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>El Habachi et al., 2015</td>
<td>Ellipsoid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quental et al., 2012</td>
<td>Ellipsoid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Karlsson and Peterson, 1992</td>
<td>Ellipsoid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dubowsky et al., 2008</td>
<td>Ellipsoid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prinold and Bull, 2014</td>
<td>Ellipsoid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Berthonnaud et al., 2006</td>
<td>Cone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST joint</td>
<td>Gliding plane</td>
<td>van der Helm, 1994a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blana et al., 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Garner and Pandy, 1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tondu, 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel mechanism</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ingram et al., 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coupling equations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sholukha et al., 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seth et al., 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Holzbaur et al., 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dickerson et al., 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Saul et al., 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: GH = glenohumeral joint, AC = acromioclavicular joint, SC = sternoclavicular joint, ST = scapulathoracic joint, DoF = degrees of freedom.
Table 2: Joint models of the forearm (the MBO column indicates whether the model was initially built for multibody kinematic optimisation purposes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joints (merged HU and HR joints)</th>
<th>Kinematics</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>MBO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elbow joint</td>
<td>Universal joint</td>
<td>Prokopenko et al., 2001 Cerveri et al., 2003 Debril et al., 2011 Fohanno et al., 2013</td>
<td>Ulna and radius as a single segment Allow pronosupination</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU joint</td>
<td>Hinge joint</td>
<td>Lemay and Crago, 1996 Pennestri et al., 2007 Laitenberger et al., 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR joint</td>
<td>Spherical joint</td>
<td>Lemay and Crago, 1996 Pennestri et al., 2007 Weinberg et al., 2000 Laitenberger et al., 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrist joint (merged RU and RC joints)</td>
<td>Universal joint</td>
<td>Prokopenko et al., 2001 Cerveri et al., 2003 Debril et al., 2011 Fohanno et al., 2013</td>
<td>Ulna and radius as a single segment</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RU joint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kinematics</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spherical joint (distal RU joint)</td>
<td>Fick, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cylindrical joint (distal RU joint)</td>
<td>Lemay and Crago, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide joint (proximal RU joint) + Spherical joint (distal RU joint)</td>
<td>Pennestri et al., 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{Spherical joint + Prismatic joint} (proximal RU joint) + Hinge joint (distal RU joint)</td>
<td>Weinberg et al., 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{Hinge joint + Prismatic joint} (proximal RU joint) + 3 Hinge joints (distal RU joint)</td>
<td>Laitenberger et al., 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RC joint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kinematics</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universal joint</td>
<td>Lemay and Crago, 1996 Weinberg et al., 2000 Laitenberger et al., 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spherical joint</td>
<td>Pennestri et al., 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: HU = humeroulnar joint, HR = humeroradial joint, RU = radioulnar joint, RC = radiocarpal joint, DoF = degrees of freedom.