

## FINITE HELICAL AXIS BEHAVIOR IN CERVICAL KINEMATICS

Erik Cattrysse<sup>1</sup>, Corrado Cescon<sup>2</sup>, Ron Clijsen<sup>3,4</sup>, Marco Barbero<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Experimental Anatomy, Fac. Physical Education and Physiotherapy, Vrije Universiteit Brussel-Belgium <sup>2</sup> University of Applied Sciences and Arts of Southern Switzerland, Department of Health Sciences, Manno, Switzerland. <sup>3</sup> University of Applied Sciences and Arts of Southern Switzerland, Department of Health Sciences, Landquart, Switzerland. <sup>4</sup> University College Physiotherapy, Thim Van Der Laan AG, Landquart, Switzerland.  
email: [ecattrys@vub.ac.be](mailto:ecattrys@vub.ac.be) [www.vub.ac.be/EXAN](http://www.vub.ac.be/EXAN)

### SUMMARY

The Finite Helical Axis (FHA) is still confronted with representational difficulties. The present study investigates the applicability of the Minimum Convex Hull (MCH) method and the angle dispersion method to represent cervical kinematics.

### INTRODUCTION

Although a far more stable approach and very common in spacecraft dynamics and graphic imaging, the FHA struggles with interpretational and representational difficulties compared to a six degrees of freedom analysis especially in clinical context and among medical professionals. The dispersion of the 3D-motion axis has been used previously to express the stability of the motion in cervical kinematics for whiplash patients (Osterbauer et al. 1992; Panjabi 1979; Woltring et al. 1985). However, graphical representations do not allow for mathematical and statistical comparison of data in larger dataset. It may as well cause difficulties to establish reproducibility measures and to set normative data for comparison in clinical cases. The present study investigates the applicability of a method to represent cervical kinematics and to quantify FHA behavior.

### METHODS

A sample of 10 healthy subjects was studied, five males and five females, ranging in age from 21.5 to 28.9 years (24.4 ± 1.8 years). Subjects were not considered if they had a history of headache or neck surgery or had received treatment for neck or shoulder conditions within the past three months. Cervical movements were registered with the Polhemus-G4, a non-invasive 3D-electromagnetic device, which tracks the positions and attitude of sensors relative to a source (120Hz). The subjects were asked to perform three series of movements of the head at a natural spontaneous speed (Cattrysse et al., 2012). Each series consisted of five consecutive pair of opposite planar movements (flexion-extension, left-right rotation, left-right lateral bending). Each movement was portioned in 4 phases, between neutral and extreme left and right rotation. Minimum Convex Hull method and the angle between IHA (instantaneous Helical axis) and FHA were calculated as a measure of dispersion. The effect of angle steps was calculated on the estimation global FHA-parameters.

### RESULTS

Figure 1 shows the effect of angle intervals on the estimation of global parameters extracted from groups helical axis: mean angle between each axis and the main axis (Mean Angle), convex hull area (area CH). The mean angle between the main helical axis and each of the helical axis computed with different angle intervals did not depend from the angle interval. The convex hull area dramatically decreased with increasing angle steps. The optimal compromise, which was selected for further analysis was a 10 degree angle.

Figure 2 shows the comparison between global helical axis parameters during different planar movements of the head and different movement phases using angle steps of 10°. The movements are flexion extension, lateral bending and axial rotation. The movement phases are: neutral to flexion (N → F) flexion to neutral (F → N) neutral to extension (N → E) and extension to neutral (E → N) for the first movement, while for the lateral bending and axial rotation the phases were: neutral to left (N → L) left to neutral (L → N) neutral to right (N → R) and right to neutral (R → N).

### CONCLUSION

The FHA dispersion can be represented by the minimum convex hull and the distribution of angles of the IHA relative to the FHA.


The optimal compromise, which was selected for further analysis was a 10 degree angle step to estimate global FHA parameters.

No significant differences were observed between movement phases for mean angle, convex hull area.

**REFERENCES**

- Osterbauer, P.J. et al., Journal of manipulative and physiological therapeutics, **15(8)**, pp.501–11, 1992.
- Panjabi, M.M., Journal of Biomechanics, **12(12)**, pp.911–920, 1979..
- Woltring, H.J. et al., Journal of biomechanics, **18(5)**, pp.379–89, 1985.
- Cattrysse, E. et al., European spine journal, **21(7)**, pp.1353–9, 2012.

**Figure 1:** The effect of angle steps on FHA-estimation.



**Figure 2:** The effect of movement phase on FHA-estimation.

