Predictive Health Analysis in Industry 5.0: A Scientometric and Systematic Review of Motion Capture in Construction

Md Hadisur Rahman^{1*}, Md Rabiul Hasan¹, Nahian Ismail Chowdhury¹, Md Asif Bin Syed¹, Mst Ummul Farah²

1 Department of Industrial and Management Systems Engineering, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV 26506, USA
2 Bangladesh University of Textiles, Dhaka 1208, Bangladesh

 $\underline{mr00063@mix.wvu.edu, mh00071@mix.wvu.edu, nahiyan313@gmail.com, ms00110@mix.wvu.edu, \underline{ummulfarah894@gmail.com, ms00110@mix.wvu.edu, \underline{ummulfarah804@gmail.com, ms00110@gmail.com, ms00110@gmai$

*Correspondence: <u>mr00063@mix.wvu.edu</u>; Tel.: +13042829952

Abstract

In an era of rapid technological advancement, the rise of Industry 4.0 has prompted industries to pursue innovative improvements in their processes. As we advance towards Industry 5.0, which focuses more on collaboration between humans and intelligent systems, there is a growing requirement for better sensing technologies for healthcare and safety purposes. Consequently, Motion Capture (MoCap) systems have emerged as critical enablers in this technological evolution by providing unmatched precision and versatility in various workplaces, including construction. As the construction workplace requires physically demanding tasks, leading to work-related musculoskeletal disorders (WMSDs) and health issues, the study explores the increasing relevance of MoCap systems within the concept of Industry 4.0 and 5.0. Despite the growing significance, there needs to be more comprehensive research, a scientometric review that quantitatively assesses the role of MoCap systems in construction. Our study combines bibliometric, scientometric, and systematic review approaches to address this gap, analyzing articles sourced from the Scopus database. A total of 52 papers were carefully selected from a pool of 962 papers for a quantitative study using a scientometric approach and a qualitative, indepth examination. Results showed that MoCap systems are employed to improve worker health and safety and reduce occupational hazards. The in-depth study also finds the most tested construction tasks are masonry, lifting, training, and climbing, with a clear preference for markerless systems. One significant finding highlights the types of MoCap technology that focus on "technology and design improvement," then "safety and risk management." The studies examined feature a wide range of sample sizes, from 1 to 126 participants, with IMU sensors being the most used. Finally, the paper discusses future research directions, contributing significantly to the existing body of knowledge in applying MoCap within the construction workplace and aligning seamlessly with the principles of Industry 4.0 and 5.0.

Keywords: Motion Capture (MoCap), construction, occupational health, and safety, ergonomic, Industry 4.0, Industry 5.0, scientometric, systematic review

1. Introduction

Motion Capture (MoCap) systems are advanced technological solutions designed to digitally record the patterns, gait, and human movement in three-dimensional space [1]. MoCap systems provide precise data on position, orientation, and a comprehensive phenomenon of movements employing various sensors, cameras, and techniques [2-4]. Several types of MoCap systems available in the market, each of which utilizes distinct technologies and operational methods. The optical MoCap system is classified into two categories: marker-based and marker-less. It relies on optical sensors such as cameras, which are equipped with specialized features (Infrared (IR) or visible light markers) to monitor the position and orientation of markers for marker-based systems [5–8]. Marker-less optical MoCap systems track and record motions without using physical markers attached to the human body, employing cameras with depth-sensing or image recognition capabilities [9]. On the other hand, the non-optical MoCap system employs other types of sensors, such as inertial sensors which combine accelerometers, gyroscopes, and magnetometers [10]. Magnetic and electro-magnetic MoCap systems operate using magnetic and electro-magnetic fields, respectively. These non-optical MoCap systems are applicable where the optical MoCap systems might be impractical due to some challenges and limitations, for instance, occlusions, restricted to the line-of-sight, indoor environment, or failure to operate in real-time MoCap. The MoCap systems, which include Inertial Measurement Units (IMUs), are lightweight, portable, can operate remotely without any wire connections, and may overcome those limitations and challenges [3]. Therefore, recently, researchers have focused on IMU-based MoCap systems to track and monitor human motion in different industrial workplaces such as sports, entertainment, gaming, construction, aerospace, automotive, robotics, healthcare, and safety [11–13]. Moreover, hybrid and versatile MoCap systems combining two or more MoCap technologies have emerged to overcome those challenges and improve data accuracy and precision [14–16].

The versatility of MoCap systems has led them to be employed in a wide range of applications [4,17–21]. Firstly, in medical and healthcare, MoCap systems help to diagnose and treat movement disorders [22], such as Parkinson's disease, cerebral palsy, and stroke can be diagnosed, and doctors can respond accordingly to the medications [23–26]. Other applications include rehabilitation programs, assessment of surgical outcomes, and reviewing a patient's motor functions, and protecting them from occupational injuries. Furthermore, previous research has investigated different approaches to protect patients from health hazards, including those caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, to ensure safety in healthcare environments [27]. In the automotive industry, MoCap systems can be applied to track the movements of workers in assembly lines, optimize the design of workstations, and develop new safety features [28–30]. MoCap applications in the aerospace industry include training astronauts, simulating the assembly of spacecraft, and developing new maintenance and repair services [1,31,32]. Manufacturing industries employ MoCap technologies to track the movement of robots and workers on production floors, optimize processess and improve quality [10,33]. Moreover,

MoCap systems are also used to maximize packing operations and enhance safety and efficiency in the logistics industry [34]. The entertainment and gaming industry also predominantly uses these technologies [35–40]. Finally, construction industries have benefited from this technological advancement while identifying ergonomic hazards, risks of falling and collision, and developing training programs and safety protocols [41]. Reducing ergonomic hazards and ensuring workers' health and safety are two of the most utilized applications of MoCap systems in construction workplaces [42–45].

With the evolution of Industry 4.0 and Industry 5.0 concepts, the application of MoCap technologies has become more convenient and cost-effective to ensure not only workers' health and safety but also increase the efficiency and productivity of worksites. Therefore, it is crucial to track technological advancement, progress, and trends of publications over the past few decades. A few reviews were conducted on the applications of MoCap systems other than construction fields [46–50]. One previous review paper focused on MoCap in general industrial applications, which includes the construction industry [1]. The study [1] only focused on an in-depth analysis of previous articles from 2015 to 2019. Another study [51] explores the crucial role of emerging technologies in addressing ergonomic hazards in construction workplaces during the Industry 4.0 era. The study focuses on the use of wearable sensors, extended reality technologies such as virtual reality (VR), augmented reality (AR), mixed reality (MR), and exoskeletons, and robotics as effective measures to minimize non-fatal injuries in construction workplaces. As the construction workplace is one of the biggest industries, requiring physically demanding tasks and increasing the risk of work-related musculoskeletal disorders (WMSDs), the application of MoCap technologies has emerged to overcome those challenges in this workplace.

However, there has yet to be a comprehensive review that investigates both scientometric and systematic reviews to explicitly examine the application of the MoCap systems in the construction workplace. The scientometric analysis is a quantitative and data-driven approach to examine scientific literature, citations, trends, patterns, and relationships within a particular field [51–55]. Thus, the bibliometric, scientometric, and in-depth analyses employing MoCap technologies in construction industries have not yet been systematically investigated. Therefore, a clear gap exists in the previous literature of understanding the publication trends, scientometric and in-depth analyses of MoCap systems applied in construction workplaces. To fill this gap, this systematic review paper employed bibliometric, scientometric, and in-depth analyses. The purpose of the paper is to report the publication trends, keywords co-occurrence analysis, co-authorship analysis, citations by document analysis and bibliometric coupling analysis. Following that, an in-depth review provides insight into MoCap technologies in construction. Finally, we aim to provide the limitations and future research directions based on the findings of this review paper. The broad scope of this study makes it appealing to a wide range of stakeholders, including those with a stake in MoCap from various industries, including research, education, construction, healthcare, manufacturing, and other relevant sectors. This study is structured as follows: the materials and methodology are described in Section 2, and the results, including scientometric and thorough evaluations of the literature, are presented in Section 3. The discussion is covered in Section 4, and Section 5 contains the future research directions. Lastly, Section 6 provides the conclusions of the review paper.

2. Materials and Methods

The study focuses on bibliometric, scientometric, and in-depth analyses to review articles pertaining to the application of MoCap systems in construction workplaces. Bibliometric (phase 1) and scientometric analyses (phase 2) were conducted using VOSviewer software (version 1.6.20). For in-depth analysis (phase 3), we carefully read the selected articles and pointed out the key findings in Microsoft Excel sheets. Following that, we then analyzed the insights and key features in the results and discussion sections (phase 4). The overall research procedures are depicted in Figure 1.




Figure. 1: Overall research methodology

2.1. Search Strategy and data extraction

We utilized the Scopus database as our primary source to collect a comprehensive compilation of literature on MoCap systems in the construction workplace. We chose Scopus for its extensive coverage and well-established reputation as a highly reliable and exhaustive bibliographic database [56,57]. Scopus is widely known for its comprehensive coverage of peer-reviewed journals, conference papers, and patents, providing an unmatched depth and breadth in its inclusion of scientific, technical, medical, and social sciences literature. We carefully designed our search strategy to encompass the broad range of MoCap technology used in the construction industry. We used a combination of specific phrases: ((MoCap*) OR ("motion data*") OR ("motion

track*") OR ("motion record*")) AND (construction*). The search query was designed to cover the wide range of names and terms used in MoCap systems to include a complete selection of relevant research. Using this search approach in March 2023, we obtained a total of 962 documents. The metadata of these papers was extracted in CSV format, enabling a systematic and structured approach to data analysis. Extracting data simplifies the process for later Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) framework, scientometric analysis, and in-depth review.

The PRISMA framework is crucial for ensuring a meticulous and precise methodology in systematic reviews, which is essential for accurately synthesizing research findings [58–60]. We initiated our study using the PRISMA framework by conducting an extensive search in Scopus, as shown in Figure 2. This search yielded a total of 962 records. After carefully scrutinizing the titles and abstracts, we identified 113 relevant records. Following full-text evaluations, we narrowed the selection to 52 studies suitable for detailed analysis. To prevent any potential risk of biases in our review paper, we adopted a collaborative approach, where three authors reviewed the documents and categorized them based on their alignment with the scope of our research. The articles were classified into five categories: "Not Aligned," "Fully Aligned,"




Figure. 2: Data extraction with PRISMA framework

"Partially Aligned," "Tangent Papers," and "Discussion of selection or rejection." Only publications classified as "Fully Aligned" by all three authors were included in our review. We excluded full-text articles for some reasons, such as the MoCap system being used to measure whole-body vibration for seated conditions, the technical aspects of motion data, and motion data configuration, which were outside of the scope of our study. Our study guarantees reproducibility and reduces biases by excluding articles that do not use MoCap systems or are unrelated to construction workplaces. This approach greatly enhances the reliability and precision of our comprehensive research, offering a more concentrated and precise overview of the utilization of MoCap systems in the construction industry.

3. Results

3.1. Yearly publication trends

Figure 3 provides an overview of research publication patterns on MoCap systems in construction workplaces from 1972 to March 2023. The bar graph shows that the field was in its early stages, with occasional activity and very few publications per year until a significant increase in publications began in 2002. There were also periods of time when no publications were produced, especially during the years 1974, 1975, 1977, 1978, 1982-1984, and 1992, which may suggest a lack of concentration or restricted technological capabilities during those decades. Starting in 2002, there was a progressive increase in publications, with a more noticeable surge from 2008 onwards. The years 2020, 2021, and 2022 had the highest number of publications, with 94, 83, and 83 documents, respectively, which indicates a recent surge influenced by several factors, including the COVID19 pandemic. The outbreak of the pandemic has accelerated the adoption of




Figure. 3: Yearly publication trends (1972- March 2023)

technology in various industries, including construction. As a result, there has been an increased interest in MoCap systems as a means of remote monitoring, training, and enforcing safety rules at construction workplaces. However, there was also a slight decline of about 11.7% in 2021 compared to 2020. Between 2008 and 2020, the number of publications rose from 25 to 94, representing a remarkable 276% growth, indicating a strong and expanding interest in the application of MoCap technology within the construction workplace. The growth can be attributed to advancements in wearable sensor technology, cost-effective price, availability of MoCap systems, and a stronger focus on using emerging technology to promote workplace safety and productivity.

3.2. Scientometric analyses

3.2.1. Keywords co-occurrence network analysis

The keyword co-occurrence network analysis is shown in Figure 4. For this analysis, in VOSviewer software, a minimum number of occurrences of a keyword was selected five, and a total of 15 keywords met the requirement among 565 keywords. Some identical terms were merged, such as workers, human, and humans merged as construction workers, motion capture, motion capture systems, and motion trackers merged as MoCap. In the network, the nodes (keywords) with larger circle sizes have a higher frequency of appearance in the literature, indicating their greater significance. The width of the links between nodes indicates the intensity of the association between keywords, with thicker lines indicating a more robust thematic connection. In the red cluster, "MoCap" is a prominent and significant node, which confirms its vital role in the research field, and it has strong associations with other notable entities such as "occupational risks," "construction industry," "construction workers," "safety," and "ergonomics." The red cluster node suggests a significant focus on utilizing MoCap technology to improve safety,




Figure. 4: Keywords co-occurrence network

minimize injuries and ergonomic hazards, and enhance the physical well-being of workers in the construction workplace. Another notable cluster with green color is associated with "WMSDs," "IMUs," "wearable sensors," and "pattern recognition," indicating the utilization of wearable sensors to reduce WMSDs and the analysis of recorded motion data to identify patterns. On the other hand, the interrelationships among "biomechanics," "injury," and "WMSDs" underscore a health-focused study area that investigates the effects of MoCap technologies on the identification, tracking, and prevention of musculoskeletal problems for construction workers. The findings suggest that there is a strong acknowledgment of the possible advantages of MoCap technology in reducing occupational hazards and improving worker well-being.

3.2.2. Co-authorship by author analysis

The author co-authorship network analysis identifies five clusters, depicted by different colors, signify groups of researchers who frequently collaborate (Figure 5). The red cluster defined as highly significant, with "Han S." being the most productive and influential author, who has published eight papers and has made a significant impact in the academic community, as evidenced by the impressive number of 224 citations and the overall link strength of 11 indicates a wide range of collaborative connections. Nonetheless, the green cluster, "Abdel-Rahman E." has six documents and 48 citations, whereas "Haas C.T." and "Ryu J." each have five documents and a link strength of 11. On the other hand, "Li h." has five documents and 291 citations, as shown in the yellow cluster. Lastly, Obonyo e. and Zhao J. have six documents, 56 citation counts, and link




Figure. 5: Author co-authorship network analysis

strengths of 6, but they are independent nodes (violet cluster), suggesting new research directions or specialized contributions. The detail of the analysis is shown in Appendix A.

3.2.3. Citation by document network analysis

The Citations by documents network analysis visually represents the scholarly influence and interconnectedness of publications as shown in Figure 6 (interconnected nodes are shown only), and Figure 7 shows the number of citations and links per document. The document authored by "Yin K. (2007)" has the highest level of influence with 242 citations, suggesting its significance and potential pioneering role in the field due to the novelty of the research, methodological benchmark, or relevance. Although lacking direct bibliographic ties to other publications in this analysis, the absence of links may indicate that "Yin K.'s" work is fundamental but may be unique in this area of focus or has had a significant impact on a wide range of studies that extends beyond the scope of the network being evaluated. Next in line is "Yan X. (2017)," with 186 citations and two links, showcasing its significant influence through the number of citations and its relevance within the network and suggesting that the document may have had a crucial role in shaping future research directions. Additionally, the documents authored by Valero E. (2016) and Chen J. (2017) have received significant attention, with citation counts of 136 and 116, respectively.




Figure. 6: Citation by document network analysis

Considering the clusters, the red cluster, with "Yan X. (2017)," is characterized by the most influential documents considering citation count and interconnectedness.




Figure. 7: Number of citation and link per document

3.2.4. Bibliometric coupling by countries

Bibliometric coupling by countries refers to when research papers from two nations reference the same articles; they are considered bibliometrically coupled. It helps visualize the collaborative links and intellectual connections among countries in a particular research domain. Table 1 shows that the United States has the highest number of documents (29) and citations (955), as well as the most robust total link strength (1120), indicating its prominent position in both productivity and influence in international collaborations. Canada has contributed significantly to the research network, with 16 papers receiving 456 citations and a strong link strength of 861. Moreover, Hong Kong has fewer documents (7). Still, it has a substantial citation count (426) and a strong link strength (794), indicating its influential research has been effectively incorporated into the global research network. Similarly, China has also actively engaged in the research network, with a document count of 7, a citation number of 410, and a significant link strength of 633. Figure 8 depicts the visualization network where the red cluster comprises the USA, Canada, India, and South Korea, which share similarities in terms of their research references, research methodologies, and thematic emphases in MoCap technology. On the other hand, the blue

cluster, which includes Hong Kong and China, signifies a distinct collection of common points of reference or research topics within these nations. This difference may arise from various sources, such as regional research agendas, specific technical breakthroughs, or collaboration patterns within these countries.

Country	Documents	Citations	Total Link Strength
United States	29	955	1120
Canada	16	456	861
China	7	410	633
Hong Kong	7	426	794
India	2	0	12
South Korea	2	33	156

Table 1. Bibliometric coupling by countries




Figure. 8: Bibliometric coupling by countries network analysis

3.3. In-depth analysis

3.3.1. Types of construction work

After analyzing 52 articles on various types of construction work, it is clear that most of the research focuses on general construction tasks like lifting, climbing, or training, which make up 48% of the publications. Masonry is also a significant construction task for research, addressed in 20% of the publications. The activity of ladder climbing comprises 12% of the total reported studies. Still, specialist jobs such as bricklaying/concreting, carpentry and painting, rebar, building roofing, and inventory and structural work have lower representation, ranging from 2% to 6%. The distribution of jobs in MoCap research indicates a preference for basic construction

tasks for research purposes, while other areas have a more specialized or unique use of MoCap technology.




Figure. 9: Distribution of research papers by construction work type

3.3.2. Type of MoCap technology

The summary of the type of MoCap technology used in reported studies is shown in Table 2. It is evident that "Vision-based and camera systems" are the primary focus, accounting for roughly 37% of the studies (19 papers). These technologies, such as Microsoft Kinect, video cameras, or RGB-D sensors, are clearly inclined toward visual motion tracking in research. The use of IMUs is about 28.85% of the reported studies (15 papers), which indicates a significant dependence on this technology. Hybrid technologies, which involve IMUs with VR, Kinect, or smartphones, together with specialized systems such as the Noitom Perception Neuron, make up about 11.54% of the studies (6 publications). These technologies demonstrate an integrated approach to MoCap systems in the era of Industry 5.0. The importance of VICON systems and other vision-based technologies is evident in 13.46% of cases, as indicated by seven studies. Finally, a small but increasing number of investigations (4 publications, accounting for 7.69% of the total) employ advanced technologies like EMG and VR for modeling, indicating a developing interest and new research trends in these current approaches. The findings demonstrate the widespread adoption of vision-based and camera systems in the construction industry, indicating a shift towards technologies that provide user-friendly interfaces and comprehensive data collection. The prominent use of IMUs and hybrid systems shows a versatile methodology for MoCap, amalgamating the advantages of various technologies.

Table 2. Type of MoCap technology used in reported studies.

MoCap	Technology included	Number of	Studies	Percentage
technology type		papers		of studies
				(%)

IMUs	17, 5,6,7 IMUs were used	15	[61–75]	28.85
Hybrid systems	IMUs and VR, IMUs and	6	[76–81]	11.54
	Kinect, IMUs and			
	smartphone, Noiton			
	perception neuron			
Vision-based	Microsoft Kinect, video	19	[82–100]	36.54
and camera	camera, RGB-D,			
systems	smartphone, motion			
	camera			
Optical MoCap	VICON, vision-based,	7	[91,101–	13.46
	direct optical encoder		106]	
	system			
Contemporary	EMG, VR for simulation,	4	[107-110]	7.69
technology	helmet mounted			

On the other hand, considering the use of markers (Table 3), it was found that the marker-less systems were the most frequently used method, making up 67.31% of all reported studies, suggesting that non-invasive motion tracking approaches are the preferred choice for current research. Nonetheless, marker-based systems were mentioned in 9.62% of the publications, which indicates that they are still valuable but less commonly used than marker-less technologies. A small percentage, precisely 5.77%, investigated a combination of marker-less and marker-based methods, showing an interest in hybrid systems that can utilize both benefits. Around 17.31% of papers did not provide specific information about the type of system used.

Table 3. MoCap technology based on the use of markers.

Types	Number	Studies	Percentage of
	of papers		paper
marker-based	5	[87,102,104,105,108]	9.62
marker-less	35	[61–63,67–75,77–82,84–	67.31
		86,88,90,91,93–95,97–	
		101,106,110,111]	
Combination of marker-	3	[76,78,103]	5.77
less and marker based			

3.3.3. Sensor attachment location

The sensors were placed on various areas of the human body to capture motion, where approximately 9.62% of the studies focused on the upper limb (including the head), but only 3.85% focused on the lower limb (Table 4). Over half of the studies (53.85%) aimed to capture the entire body's motion, while only 7.69% focused on the hand. Nonetheless, around 25.00% of the

studies didn't mention the specific areas where the sensors were attached. Tracking motion from the whole body allows for a thorough understanding of human biomechanics and ergonomics, which is particularly important in the construction industry, where complex activities and movements occur. It provides a holistic view of human motion, crucial for accurate ergonomic assessments, injury prevention, and increased efficiency. The approach helps understand the relationships between various anatomical components better, providing valuable insights for developing safer and more efficient work environments.

Sensor attached location	Number of papers	Studies	Percentage of study
Upper limb (including head)	5	[66,79,83,107,110]	9.62
Lower limb	2	[88,106]	3.85
Whole body	28	[61–65,67–72,74– 77,80,81,84,87,90,94,98,99,102– 105,108]	53.85
Hand	4	[73,78,89,109]	7.69

Table 4. Sensor attached locations on human body.

3.3.4. Theme analysis

Theme analysis with the selected papers shows that the majority of the papers studied, comprising 38.46%, emphasized "technology and design improvement," as shown in Table 5, which highlights the industry's strong inclination towards developing new technology, increasing accuracy (%) of the developed method and improving design approaches. In contrast, only 7.69% of the research works were related to "performance optimization," which suggests that although it is a crucial component of the construction business, it has not received the same scholarly attention and implies a promising area for future research. In addition, the literature extensively covers the themes of "safety and risk management" and "health and ergonomics," which account for 26.92% and 25.00% of the publications, respectively. The findings indicate that the construction industry is highly dedicated to innovation, particularly technology and design. However, there seems to be a lack of emphasis on performance optimization, which presents a promising opportunity for future research. Additionally, the industry's strong focus on safety, risk management, health, and ergonomics reflects its commitment to protecting workers and minimizing potential ergonomic hazards. As a result, the construction appears to have a wellrounded workplace that prioritizes technological advancement while ensuring safety and efficiency.

Table 5. Themes of reported studies

Themes	Number of papers	Studies	Percentage of paper
Performance optimization	4	[70,82,89,105]	7.69
Safety and risk management	14	[61,63,64,64,65,69,71,74,78,79,87,88,99,104]	26.92
Health and ergonomics	13	[66,72,73,75,81,83,84,98,100–102,107,108]	25.00
Technology and design improvement	20	[62,67,68,76,80,85,86,90–97,103,106,109– 111]	38.46

3.3.5. Summary of study designs, application, and recommendations

The summary of study designs, applications, and recommendations are illustrated in Table 6. We found a wide range of sample sizes, varying from 1 to 126 individuals, which indicates significant differences in research scale and objectives. Researchers have employed various sensors and technologies, such as Kinect sensors, smart insoles, IMUs, and cameras, to examine movement in a multidimensional manner. Focusing on MoCap applications, the systems are widely used in the construction industry for various purposes, such as estimating labor productivity, analyzing work duration, monitoring ergonomic hazards, and preventing fall risks. Additionally, designing worksites according to Mechanical Energy Expenditure (MEE), identifying ergonomically hazardous postures, evaluating worker tiredness in real-time, and instructing apprentices or novices to avoid risky postures are some other applications. It also enables behavior monitoring, demonstrating their versatility in enhancing the construction industry's safety, health, and efficiency.

On the other hand, the recommendations emphasized improved accuracy in estimating productivity, the use of non-invasive measurement methods, real-time assessment, and the possibility of 3D visualization-based modeling to mitigate ergonomic hazards. A noticeable trend is the increasing use of advanced MoCap technologies, especially in virtual reality (VR) settings, indicating the field's progression towards using technology to improve safety, performance, and reduce ergonomic hazards in construction workplaces. The growing reliance on emerging technologies for precise motion analysis demonstrates an ever-increasing dependence on technology for thorough ergonomic evaluations.

Table 6. Summary of study designs, applications, and recommendations.

Study	Sample size	Number of sensor or devices	Applications	Recommendation/innovation
[82]	5	1 Kinect sensor and 1 depth camera	Labor productivity estimation and compare labor cost and duration of task can be assessed.	Reliable productivity estimates can be achieved without huge historical data.
[101]	1	2 smart insoles	Mechanical Energy Expenditure (MEE) is used to design worksite.	This is a non-invasive process to measure MEE.
[61]	6	17 IMUs	Jerk can be utilized to calculate physical exertion and fatigue.	Feature selection method to identify motion changes, optimal sensor number and placement could be considered to improve the method.
[62]	4	5 IMUs	Model test for awkward posture recognition.	-
[102]	3	-	Ergonomically risky postures can be recognized.	A 3D visualization-based modeling method is suggested to reduce ergonomic risks.
[83]	126	-	Effect of social influence on construction workers' behavior can be assessed.	The study only focused on high rise building hazardous situation, and calibration accuracy between actual movement and virtual animation could be improved.
[63]	45	17 IMUs	Apprentice training to avoid risky posture and improve movement.	Biomechanical analysis can be used to determine joint forces and moment, and efficiency and productivity can be analyzed.
[76]	4	3 cameras, 2 IMUs	Ergonomic hazard monitoring and fall risk prevention.	Further study can be conducted on gait analysis- based monitoring technique for the construction environment.
[107]	126	1 camera	Interpersonal influence of workers' mistake and unsafe behaviors.	More accurate motion tracking system could be used, other hazardous scenarios could be investigated.
[77]	4	VR and IMUs	-	-
[64]	1	5 IMU	Proper placement of sensors, increase computational performance.	More participants can be included to validate the proposed model, assess long term operation, and real time performance for activity recognition.
[65]	45	17 IMUs	Expert and apprentice work diff, training, minimize health and safety risks.	Other kinematic factors such as joint angle, carrying distance, joint loads may affect safety and productivity
[103]	1	2	MoCap system can be used to identify potential safety and health risk.	-
[66]	3	Virtual Reality environment	Construction safety training through virtual reality.	First time VR users will be collected for holistic approach, and apprentices could be incorporated.
[67]	4	5 IMUs	Monitor risky or injury related postures and prevent them.	The developed model will be deployed on mobile device for real-time safety.
[84]	4	13 UMUs	Fatigue assessment in real-time automatically and invasively.	The mass of material and tools should be considered in the future studies and workers rest status could measure automatically.
[85]	1	1 Kinect	Detect motion data in real-time, automatically process biomechanical analysis to detect the risk of WMSDs.	The reliability of this study needs to be identified.
[86]	1	1 Kinect	Understanding the causes of WMSDs in manual construction work.	Marker-based MoCap system can be used.
[87]	1	8 cameras	Identify unsafe actions while lifting heavy objects and increase productivity by reducing work dimension.	Marker-less system and sufficient data will be used in the future.
[88]	2	1 Kinect	Prevent WMSD related to ladder climbing and identify causes of falls	However, the process is less accurate than marker based MoCap system. In future, how error in motion data affects joint moments can be identified.

[78]	1	2 (1 Kinect and 1 IMU)	Combination of two system could enhance the safety measures in construction.	In future, Kinect data can be used to improve accuracy of IMUs through data fusion.
[89]	2	2 smartphones	To increase productivity, analyze workflow processes and remove bottlenecks.	-
[79]	1	2 IMUs and 1 smartphone	Real-time hazard and WMSDs prevention in construction.	Solar-charged or chargeless IMUs could be employed to monitor real-time ergonomic hazards.
[90]	1	1 Stereo MoCap and 1 Kinect (RGB- D)	The proposed stereo vision cameras can be used for high data precision and environmentally harsh condition.	Pose estimation techniques can be expanded and more harsh environmental condition will be tested measuring motion data using multiple cameras.
[91]	1	1 Kinect, and iPi soft MoCap	Detect unsafe actions using depth sensor.	The developed system is not applicable in outdoor construction sites. Light condition, effect of occlusion and enough sampling could be considered.
[92]	1	1 smartphone	Hazard prevention and alert system are studied.	Multiple hazards (stationary and moving) can be considered, and more complex settings can be tested.
[68]	4	IMUs	Compress and reorganize motion data and use less power and memory while collecting and analyzing motion data.	Number of tensing channels can be reduced; accuracy can be increased, and data fusion and distributed data processing can be included.
[93]	1	2 smartphone cameras	Behavior monitoring, ergonomic assessment, and productivity analysis. No sensor was attached to human body.	3D construction accuracy could be studied later. This data can be used for ergonomic assessment and productivity analysis.
[94]	1	1 Kinect	Inaccurate motion data and errors should be corrected for ergonomic analysis.	Real error of motion data will be used instead of random error data in the future.
[95]	1	1 Kinect	Unsafe action recognition using motion data (rotation angle, joint angle, position vector).	Large field data with more movements (lifting, slipping, twisting kneeling) will be measured. For real time monitoring, kernel PCA can be applied.
[96]	1	1 Kinect and 1 Vicon MoCap	Accuracy of Kinect and VICON can be measured.	Kinect system may not be applicable for hand related ergonomic analysis. Other actions like walking, running, lifting and carrying object can be evaluated by it.
[111]	1	1 Computer vision (camera)	The approach can detect unsafe actions using motion data.	Future study will evaluate the validity of this approach for automatic unsafe actions detection.
[108]	3	sEMG sensors	Muscle fatigue can be identified following the study.	This model can be used to minimize muscle forces with the final goal of preventing muscle injuries including more experimental data.
[97]	1	1 Kinect	L5/S1 disc, left knee and elbow were considered for data collection.	Reliability and accuracy of motion data, BVH, needs to be improved with collection data from more joints.
[69]	8	IMUs	Reduce WMSDs and increase safety, health, and productivity.	Working height should be reduced to minimize WMSDs and waist level could be optimal height for individual material handling.
[109]	10	1 armband and 1 metabolic analyzer	The proposed system is suitable for construction workers continuous fatigue measurement to assess physiological status and early detection of risk.	Only forearm band was considered for data collection whereas other joints could be considered to measure physical fatigue.
[81]	10	IMUs	Whole body joints were analyzed.	Integrated CML data can be used for further analysis.
[73]		1	Established that the accuracy of the action recognition with raw dataset.	Acceleration of forearm was analyzed, but other body parts could be considered.
[80]	5	17	Improvement of workstation design through reduction of prototype iteration and time.	-
[98]	8	3	Posture recognition using smartphone.	In pocket, smartphone can be used to recognize posture.
	1	I		I

[72]	7	5	Generative Adversarial Network in conjunction with DNN can improve the posture recognition.	-
[100]		1	Objective approach is better for fatigue detection.	Quantitative assessment could be incorporated.
[74]	30	5	Designed wearable sensing system to detect posture and improve worker safety awareness. The UI can deliver actionable MSD risk assessment to user readily.	Workers and manager real-time feedback systems could be studied to reduce WMSDs.
[70]	66	17	Getting experienced workers' postures, it can be applicable for apprentice training program.	Bricklaying task was considered, however, other tasks such as climbing, welding, and cutting could be considered.
[75]	1 excavator	6	The study can be applied for real-time productivity monitoring, safety analysis, and dynamic simulation input in construction.	Focus on more generalizable and accurate activity identification models, potentially enhancing automated monitoring and operational analysis in construction environments.
[110]	1	1	The system can be used to improve the forward leaning and squatting postures.	Future studies could incorporate more construction workers.
[104]	9	1	Reveals that dynamic kneeling postures during shingle installation can generate significantly higher knee flexion, abduction, adduction, internal and external rotation compared to static postures, indicating increased MSD risk.	More professional roofers, assessing work-related factors like different slopes and postures on knee MSDs, observing EMG signals of knee muscles and joint contact stress.
[99]	-	1	Using smartphones equipped with accelerometers and gyroscopes can detect and identify near-miss falls in construction workers.	Enhance algorithm accuracy and apply in real-world construction sites.
[71]	-	7	-	Novel wearable wireless system can be used to long term and ubiquitous tracking of body posture and motion in noninvasive way.
[105]	1	8	Highlights the feasibility of using the OpenSim biomechanical analysis tool and presents a case study on ladder climbing activities using motion data from VICON.	Marker-less motion data can be applied for assessing WMSDs.
[106]	1	1	Knee joint angle measurement without complex mathematical operations.	-

4. Discussion

The results of the comprehensive analysis of MoCap technology in construction are crucial within the framework of Industry 4.0 and 5.0 [112,113]. Integrating digital transformation and human-centered innovation improves efficiency and safety in the construction workplace [114–116]. The study emphasizes the importance of the use of MoCap systems to assess and enhance ergonomic safety and worker well-being as part of the transition to Industry 5.0, aiming to prioritize human-centric practices and align human skills with technical advancements. The annual publication trends reveal a growing interest in MoCap technology in the construction workplaces, aligning with the digital upsurge in Industry 4.0. The scientometric analysis demonstrates that the industry places significant emphasis on occupational risks, safety, and ergonomics, highlighting its dedication to promoting worker health, a fundamental principle of Industry 5.0. The examination of the keyword co-occurrence network demonstrates a significant emphasis on occupational hazards, safety measures, and ergonomics in the field, highlighting the industry's commitment to ensuring the well-being of its workers [117,118]. The prevalence of terminology

such as "IMUs" and "wearable sensors" in this network highlights the technical transition towards more sophisticated, non-intrusive, real-time, automated, and all-encompassing MoCap techniques [119,120]. Furthermore, the author co-authorship network analysis highlights how researchers collaborate with each other, taking a multidisciplinary approach in this field. The citation by document analysis identifies significant studies that have had a powerful impact and demonstrates a vigorous exchange of knowledge and fundamental research that has shaped the development in this field. Finally, the bibliometric coupling by country analysis reveals the global scope of research, with countries such as the United States and Canada leading the way in making contributions. The widespread connectivity of the world illustrates the broad usefulness and importance of MoCap technology in the construction workplace [1]. It transcends geographical limits, promotes international collaboration and indicates a vibrant and interconnected research environment driven by collaboration, significant studies, and global involvement.

The in-depth review reveals a diverse variety of sample sizes, ranging from individual case studies to larger cohort analyses, which not only showcases the distinct research methodologies but also demonstrates the versatility of MoCap technologies in numerous construction-related situations. Moreover, the primary focus of the construction tasks examined primarily encompasses fundamental actions such as lifting, training, and climbing, which are essential components of daily operations inside a construction workplace [121]. The emphasis on these jobs highlights the dedication of researchers to enhancing the functional aspects of work and guaranteeing the ergonomic well-being of these regularly executed motions. The extensive utilization of emerging technologies such as Kinect sensors, IMUs, and VR technologies indicates an industry that is leading in incorporating state-of-the-art technology for practical purposes [122–124]. This trend suggests a movement towards non-invasive and user-friendly technologies, while also providing extensive data collection capabilities in real-time, which are essential for improving safety and on-site productivity [125,126]. In addition, the research indicates a preference for marker-less systems, which are more streamlined, less obtrusive and non-invasive for capturing human motion. The strategy is in line with the requirement for pragmatic, tangible solutions that minimize interruptions to the organic workflow in the construction workplaces [127,128].

The findings of this systematic analysis emphasize a changing profession that is increasingly dependent on advanced technology to tackle conventional obstacles in the construction workplaces. The industry's emphasis on worker safety, ergonomic enhancements, and the implementation of sophisticated MoCap systems demonstrates its active embrace of technical advancements and recognition of their capacity to transform conventional methods. The findings obtained from this review provide valuable information about current trends and practices and establish a foundation for future research endeavors focused on improving worker safety and operational efficiency in the construction workplace.

5. Future research directions

Research into MoCap technologies has revealed certain limitations that need to be addressed in future studies. There is a lack of multimodal motion assessment techniques, such as assessing two or more motion parameters (joint angles, acceleration, jerk, spatial position, and orientation), which are necessary for conducting thorough safety assessments [129,130]. In addition, the lack of real-time and automated data collection makes monitoring and analyzing movements when they occur efficiently difficult. Additionally, limitations include quickly identifying and correcting risky or potentially hazardous body positions. To address these issues, real-time feedback systems in tactile, visual, or auditory feedback could be incorporated to promptly notify users of potential risks and guide them to take corrective actions. Improving these elements makes MoCap systems more effective and useful in real-time industrial applications. Another major challenge is obtaining precise three-dimensional kinematics without markers, as in traditional systems [131]. Machine learning techniques promise to overcome this issue, but their suitability for biomechanical applications needs further exploration [132]. Additionally, most validation studies focus on slow or single-plane movements, emphasizing the need to thoroughly evaluate sport-specific, faster movements. Moreover, conventional markers may lead to inaccuracies when used simultaneously with marker-less MoCap systems. Overcoming these limitations can significantly enhance the accuracy and usefulness of MoCap systems in various applications.

To further enhance the applicability of MoCap technology in the construction industry, future investigations should prioritize utilizing real-time data analysis to make informed decisions on worker safety and productivity. Integrating MoCap technology with Industry 4.0 technologies such as AI and IoT (Internet of Things) can create highly responsive systems that can accurately detect risky postures, provide feedback, and guide to reduce ergonomic hazards. In addition, to ensure broader industry acceptance, MoCap systems should be customizable, portable, and costeffective to different construction conditions and workforce profiles while being pleasant, unobtrusive, less invasive or non-invasive, and user-centric and should be capable of monitoring real-time health and ensure the safety of construction workers [133,134]. A single smartphone software or less invasive sensors such as Wristband could be studied and utilized to detect ergonomic hazards in real-time, provide feedback to workers and recommend necessary actions to avoid injury in construction workplaces. Furthermore, it is also crucial to address privacy and ethical concerns as MoCap technology becomes more integrated into construction operations. On the other hand, promoting interdisciplinary collaboration can foster the creation of comprehensive solutions that are both technologically advanced and practically feasible in the construction workplaces. Moreover, the review paper has certain limitations due to its reliance on the Scopus database, which might restrict the range of available material. While ensuring a focused and consistent analysis was effective, including multiple databases, such as Web of Science, PubMed, ScienceDirect, and Google Scholar, could have provided more viewpoints. Although it ensured consistency, using the same number of papers (n = 52) for both scientometric and in-depth analyses may have limited a broader perspective of the topic. More studies could be considered for scientometric visualization analysis in the future research. These suggestions and areas of study indicate future research recommendations in which MoCap technology could significantly contribute to improving health, safety, and productivity in the construction workplace.

6. Conclusion

The study provides a comprehensive review of MoCap systems in the construction workplace, set against the backdrop of Industry 4.0 and the emerging Industry 5.0 paradigms. MoCap technology is increasingly used in construction to enhance safety and improve ergonomic practices. The study analyzed 52 selected studies and conducted bibliometric, scientometric, and in-depth systematic reviews. The scientometric results showed that the high frequency of keywords such as "MoCap," "occupational risks," "construction workers," "construction industry," and "WMSDs" indicate that the research community is heavily focused on using MoCap technology to understand and mitigate the occupational hazards in the construction industry and increasing awareness of the health and safety challenges faced by construction workers, specifically concerning Work-Related Musculoskeletal Disorders (WMSDs). In addition, the United States is a leading country in MoCap research, contributing a significant number of documents (29), citations (955), and total link strength (1120), which indicates that the United States is responsible for a considerable portion of fundamental and influential research in MoCap technology, particularly in construction. Additionally, it suggests that the nation has strong academic and research networks, which contribute to the global repository of information in this field.

On the other hand, the in-depth analysis found that lifting, climbing, training, and masonry are the most assessed construction tasks utilizing MoCap technology, primarily through marker less and IMU sensors. Most researchers (53.85%) considered whole-body motion tracking analysis. It indicates the need for a comprehensive analysis, essential for understanding complex activities and actions through examination of human biomechanics and ergonomics, which is crucial for accurate evaluations, injury prevention, and improved efficiency. By analyzing whole-body movements, researchers can gain a better understanding of how various body parts interact with each other, providing useful insights for the development of work environments that are both safer and more efficient. The review emphasizes the themes of selected studies and found that 38.46% of studies focused on "technology and design improvement," around 23% emphasized "safety, and risk management," and 25% considered "health and ergonomics." By prioritizing "safety and risk management," and "health and ergonomics," it shows the commitment to protecting worker well-being and minimizing ergonomic hazards, which also aligned with the results of the scientometric analysis.

Finally, the study suggests areas for future research, including enhanced real-time data processing, integration with Industry 4.0 and 5.0 technologies, customization for diverse

construction environments, a focus on worker-centric design, and addressing privacy and ethical considerations. The review paper contributes significantly to the body of knowledge in the field of technology use in construction, highlighting the potential of MoCap technology to revolutionize the construction industry by enhancing safety, efficiency, and overall worker wellbeing.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, M.H.R., M.R.H.; methodology, M.H.R. and M.R.H; software, M.H.R.; validation, M.H.R. and N.I.C; formal analysis, M.H.R., N.I.C; investigation, M.H.R.,N.I.C,M.R.H and M.U.F; data curation, M.H.R.; writing—original draft preparation, M.H.R.; writing—review and editing, M.H.R., M.R.H, M.U.F and M.A.B.S; visualization, M.H.R.; project administration, M.H.R and M.R.H

Funding: This research received no external fundings.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest or personal connections that could be perceived as influencing the research presented in this paper.

Appendix A

Appendix A. Co-authorship by author network analysis

Author	Documents	Citations	Total Link Strength
Han S.	8	224	11
Abdel-Rahman E.	6	48	12
Obonyo E.	6	56	6
Zhao J.	6	56	6
Haas C.T.	5	37	11
Lee S.	5	129	9
Li H.	5	291	3
Peña-Mora F.	5	242	10
Ryu J.	5	37	11
Lee S.H.	4	247	8
Li X.	4	34	4
Al-Hussein M.	3	4	4
Alwasel A.	3	44	6
Han S.U.	3	140	6
Seo J.	3	94	6
Yu Y.	3	105	3

Refences

- 1. Menolotto, M.; Komaris, D.-S.; Tedesco, S.; O'Flynn, B.; Walsh, M. Motion Capture Technology in Industrial Applications: A Systematic Review. *Sensors* **2020**, 20, 5687, doi:10.3390/s20195687.
- Kim, S.; Nussbaum, M.A. Performance Evaluation of a Wearable Inertial Motion Capture System for Capturing Physical Exposures during Manual Material Handling Tasks. *Ergonomics* 2013, 56, 314–326, doi:10.1080/00140139.2012.742932.
- 3. Baek, S.Y.; Ajdaroski, M.; Shahshahani, P.M.; Beaulieu, M.L.; Esquivel, A.O.; Ashton-Miller, J.A. A Comparison of Inertial Measurement Unit and Motion Capture Measurements of Tibiofemoral Kinematics during Simulated Pivot Landings. *Sensors* **2022**, *22*, 4433, doi:10.3390/s22124433.
- 4. Field, M.; Stirling, D.; Naghdy, F.; Pan, Z. Motion Capture in Robotics Review.; 2009; pp. 1697–1702.
- 5. Guerra-Filho, G. Optical Motion Capture: Theory and Implementation. RITA 2005, 12, 61–90.
- 6. Kurihara, K.; Hoshino, S.; Yamane, K.; Nakamura, Y. Optical Motion Capture System with Pan-Tilt Camera Tracking and Real Time Data Processing. In Proceedings of the Proceedings 2002 IEEE international conference on robotics and automation (Cat. No. 02CH37292); IEEE, 2002; Vol. 2, pp. 1241–1248.
- 7. Mihradi, S.; Dirgantara, T.; Mahyuddin, A.I. Development of an Optical Motion-Capture System for 3D Gait Analysis. In Proceedings of the 2011 2nd International Conference on Instrumentation, Communications, Information Technology, and Biomedical Engineering; IEEE, 2011; pp. 391–394.
- 8. Aurand, A.M.; Dufour, J.S.; Marras, W.S. Accuracy Map of an Optical Motion Capture System with 42 or 21 Cameras in a Large Measurement Volume. *J. Biomech.* **2017**, *58*, 237–240.
- 9. Kanko, R.M. VALIDATION OF A MARKERLESS MOTION CAPTURE SYSTEM FOR HUMAN MOVEMENT ANALYSIS.
- 10. Fletcher, S.R.; Johnson, T.L.; Thrower, J. A Study to Trial the Use of Inertial Non-Optical Motion Capture for Ergonomic Analysis of Manufacturing Work. *Proc. Inst. Mech. Eng. Part B J. Eng. Manuf.* **2018**, 232, 90–98, doi:10.1177/0954405416660997.
- 11. Brodie, M.; Walmsley, A.; Page, W. Fusion Motion Capture: A Prototype System Using Inertial Measurement Units and GPS for the Biomechanical Analysis of Ski Racing. *Sports Technol.* **2008**, *1*, 17–28, doi:10.1080/19346182.2008.9648447.
- 12. Anwary, A.R.; Yu, H.; Callaway, A.; Vassallo, M. Validity and Consistency of Concurrent Extraction of Gait Features Using Inertial Measurement Units and Motion Capture System. *IEEE Sens. J.* **2020**, *21*, 1625–1634.
- 13. Maruyama, T.; Tada, M.; Sawatome, A.; Endo, Y. Constraint-Based Real-Time Full-Body Motion-Capture Using Inertial Measurement Units. In Proceedings of the 2018 IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics (SMC); IEEE, 2018; pp. 4298–4303.
- 14. Xu, Y.; Yang, C.; Liang, P.; Zhao, L.; Li, Z. Development of a Hybrid Motion Capture Method Using MYO Armband with Application to Teleoperation. In Proceedings of the 2016 IEEE International Conference on Mechatronics and Automation; IEEE, 2016; pp. 1179–1184.
- 15. Jung, H.-H.; Kim, M.-K.; Lyou, J. Realization of a Hybrid Human Motion Capture System. In Proceedings of the 2017 17th International Conference on Control, Automation and Systems (ICCAS); IEEE, 2017; pp. 1581–1585.
- 16. Lin, J.; Zhang, R.; Chen, J.; Zeng, L.; Jiang, L.; McGrath, S.; Yang, J. Using Hybrid Sensoring Method for Motion Capture in Volleyball Techniques Training. In Proceedings of the 2018 12th International Conference on Sensing Technology (ICST); IEEE, 2018; pp. 217–222.
- 17. Rahul, M. Review on Motion Capture Technology. Glob. J. Comput. Sci. Technol. 2018, 18, 22-26.
- 18. Thompson, M. The Application of Motion Capture to Embodied Music Cognition Research. *Jyväsk. Stud. Humanit.* **2012**.
- 19. Ortega, B.P.; Olmedo, J.M.J. Application of Motion Capture Technology for Sport Performance Analysis. *Retos Nuevas Tend. En Educ. Física Deporte Recreación* **2017**, 241–247.
- 20. Petrosyan, T.; Dunoyan, A.; Mkrtchyan, H. Application of Motion Capture Systems in Ergonomic Analysis. *Armen. J. Spec. Educ.* **2020**, *4*, 107–117.
- 21. Van Der Kruk, E.; Reijne, M.M. Accuracy of Human Motion Capture Systems for Sport Applications; State-of-the-Art Review. *Eur. J. Sport Sci.* **2018**, *18*, 806–819, doi:10.1080/17461391.2018.1463397.
- 22. Mousavi Hondori, H.; Khademi, M. A Review on Technical and Clinical Impact of Microsoft Kinect on Physical Therapy and Rehabilitation. *J. Med. Eng.* **2014**, 2014.

- 23. Scott, B.; Seyres, M.; Philp, F.; Chadwick, E.K.; Blana, D. Healthcare Applications of Single Camera Markerless Motion Capture: A Scoping Review. *PeerJ* **2022**, *10*, e13517.
- 24. Zhang, Q.; Jin, T.; Cai, J.; Xu, L.; He, T.; Wang, T.; Tian, Y.; Li, L.; Peng, Y.; Lee, C. Wearable Triboelectric Sensors Enabled Gait Analysis and Waist Motion Capture for IoT-Based Smart Healthcare Applications. *Adv. Sci.* **2022**, *9*, 2103694, doi:10.1002/advs.202103694.
- 25. de la Torre, J.; Marin, J.; Ilarri, S.; Marin, J.J. Applying Machine Learning for Healthcare: A Case Study on Cervical Pain Assessment with Motion Capture. *Appl. Sci.* **2020**, *10*, 5942.
- 26. Ye, Y.; Ci, S.; Katsaggelos, A.K.; Liu, Y. A Multi-Camera Motion Capture System for Remote Healthcare Monitoring. In Proceedings of the 2013 IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and Expo (ICME); IEEE, 2013; pp. 1–6.
- 27. Ashraf, R.H.; Rahman, M.; Rahman, M. Comparative Study on Antimicrobial Activity of Four Bangladeshi Medicinal Plants Used as Antimicrobial Finishes on Cotton Fabric. *J. Text. Sci. Fash. Technol.* **2021**, *8*, 6.
- 28. Du, J.C.; Duffy, V.G. A Methodology for Assessing Industrial Workstations Using Optical Motion Capture Integrated with Digital Human Models. *Occup. Ergon.* **2007**, *7*, 11–25.
- 29. Agethen, P.; Otto, M.; Mengel, S.; Rukzio, E. Using Marker-Less Motion Capture Systems for Walk Path Analysis in Paced Assembly Flow Lines. *Procedia Cirp* **2016**, *54*, 152–157.
- 30. Manns, M.; Otto, M.; Mauer, M. Measuring Motion Capture Data Quality for Data Driven Human Motion Synthesis. *Procedia CIRP* **2016**, *41*, 945–950.
- 31. Puthenveetil, S.C.; Daphalapurkar, C.P.; Zhu, W.; Leu, M.C.; Liu, X.F.; Gilpin-Mcminn, J.K.; Snodgrass, S.D. Computer-Automated Ergonomic Analysis Based on Motion Capture and Assembly Simulation. *Virtual Real.* **2015**, *19*, 119–128.
- 32. Guo, W.-J.; Chen, Y.-R.; Chen, S.-Q.; Yang, X.-L.; Qin, L.-J.; Liu, J.-G. Design of Human Motion Capture System Based on Computer Vision. In Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Advanced Design and Manufacturing Engineering; Atlantis Press, 2015; pp. 1891–1894.
- 33. Bortolini, M.; Faccio, M.; Gamberi, M.; Pilati, F. Motion Analysis System (MAS) for Production and Ergonomics Assessment in the Manufacturing Processes. *Comput. Ind. Eng.* **2020**, *139*, doi:10.1016/j.cie.2018.10.046.
- 34. Rybnikár, F.; Kačerová, I.; Hořejší, P.; Šimon, M. Ergonomics Evaluation Using Motion Capture Technology Literature Review. *Appl. Sci.* **2022**, *13*, 162.
- 35. Patoli, M.Z.; Gkion, M.; Newbury, P.; White, M. Real Time Online Motion Capture for Entertainment Applications. In Proceedings of the 2010 Third IEEE International Conference on Digital Game and Intelligent Toy Enhanced Learning; IEEE, 2010; pp. 139–145.
- 36. Bregler, C. Motion Capture Technology for Entertainment [In the Spotlight]. *IEEE Signal Process. Mag.* **2007**, 24, 160+156-158, doi:10.1109/MSP.2007.906023.
- 37. Baker, T. The History of Motion Capture Within The Entertainment Industry. 2020.
- 38. Marks, R.; Deshpande, R.; Wideman, C.M.; Kokkevis, V.; Sargaison, S.; Larsen, E. Real-Time Motion Capture for Interactive Entertainment. In Proceedings of the Proceedings of ACM SIGGRAPH 2003 Emerging Technologies; 2003.
- 39. Xu, L.; Zhang, F. A MoCap System for Real-Time Entertainment Interaction. In Proceedings of the International Symposium on Artificial Intelligence and Robotics 2020; SPIE, 2020; Vol. 11574, pp. 191–198.
- Tobias, J.L.; Di Mitri, D. Using Accessible Motion Capture in Educational Games for Sign Language Learning. In Responsive and Sustainable Educational Futures; Viberg, O., Jivet, I., Muñoz-Merino, P.J., Perifanou, M., Papathoma, T., Eds.; Lecture Notes in Computer Science; Springer Nature Switzerland: Cham, 2023; Vol. 14200, pp. 762–767 ISBN 978-3-031-42681-0.
- 41. Tooch, K. Developments in Construction Workers' Compensation Insurance with the Use of Biometrics.
- 42. Dias Barkokebas, R.; Li, X. VR-RET: A Virtual Reality–Based Approach for Real-Time Ergonomics Training on Industrialized Construction Tasks. *J. Constr. Eng. Manag.* **2023**, *149*, 04023098, doi:10.1061/JCEMD4.COENG-13433.
- 43. Alves, J.; Lima, T.M.; Gaspar, P.D. Novel Design of Assistive Technologies Based on the Interconnection of Motion Capture and Virtual Reality Systems to Foster Task Performance of the Ageing Workforce. *Designs* **2023**, 7, 23.
- 44. Aqueveque, P.; Peña, G.; Gutiérrez, M.; Gómez, B.; Germany, E.; Retamal, G.; Ortega-Bastidas, P. Utilizing Motion Capture Systems for Instrumenting the OCRA Index: A Study on Risk Classification for Upper Limb Work-Related Activities. *Sensors* **2023**, *23*, 7623.

- 45. Salisu, S.; Ruhaiyem, N.I.R.; Eisa, T.A.E.; Nasser, M.; Saeed, F.; Younis, H.A. Motion Capture Technologies for Ergonomics: A Systematic Literature Review. *Diagnostics* **2023**, *13*, 2593.
- 46. Wang, X.; Yu, H.; Kold, S.; Rahbek, O.; Bai, S. Wearable Sensors for Activity Monitoring and Motion Control: A Review. *Biomim. Intell. Robot.* **2023**, 100089.
- 47. Lind, C.M.; Abtahi, F.; Forsman, M. Wearable Motion Capture Devices for the Prevention of Work-Related Musculoskeletal Disorders in Ergonomics—An Overview of Current Applications, Challenges, and Future Opportunities. *Sensors* **2023**, 23, 4259.
- 48. Wibowo, M.C.; Nugroho, S.; Wibowo, A. The Use of Motion Capture Technology in 3D Animation. *Int. J. Comput. Digit. Syst.* **2023**, *14*, 1–13.
- 49. Putranto, J.S.; Heriyanto, J.; Achmad, S.; Kurniawan, A. Implementation of Virtual Reality Technology for Sports Education and Training: Systematic Literature Review. *Procedia Comput. Sci.* **2023**, 216, 293–300.
- 50. Gu, C.; Lin, W.; He, X.; Zhang, L.; Zhang, M. IMU-Based Mocap System for Rehabilitation Applications: A Systematic Review. *Biomim. Intell. Robot.* **2023**, 100097.
- 51. Rahman, M.H.; Ghasemi, A.; Dai, F.; Ryu, J. Review of Emerging Technologies for Reducing Ergonomic Hazards in Construction Workplaces. *Buildings* **2023**, *13*, 2967.
- 52. Chen, C.; Song, M. Visualizing a Field of Research: A Methodology of Systematic Scientometric Reviews. *PloS One* **2019**, *14*, e0223994.
- 53. Konur, O. Biooils: A Scientometric Review of the Research. Biodiesel Fuels 2021, 113–135.
- 54. Ruiz-Rosero, J.; Ramirez-Gonzalez, G.; Williams, J.M.; Liu, H.; Khanna, R.; Pisharody, G. Internet of Things: A Scientometric Review. *Symmetry* **2017**, *9*, 301.
- 55. Hasan, M.R.; Wuest, T. A Review of Sustainable Composites Supply Chains. In *Advances in Production Management Systems*. *Smart Manufacturing and Logistics Systems*: *Turning Ideas into Action*; Kim, D.Y., Von Cieminski, G., Romero, D., Eds.; IFIP Advances in Information and Communication Technology; Springer Nature Switzerland: Cham, 2022; Vol. 663, pp. 448–455 ISBN 978-3-031-16406-4.
- 56. Burnham, J.F. Scopus Database: A Review. Biomed. Digit. Libr. 2006, 3, 1, doi:10.1186/1742-5581-3-1.
- 57. Oliveira, A.S.; de Barros, M.D.; de Carvalho Pereira, F.; Gomes, C.F.S.; da Costa, H.G. Prospective Scenarios: A Literature Review on the Scopus Database. *Futures* **2018**, *100*, 20–33.
- 58. Shamseer, L.; Moher, D.; Clarke, M.; Ghersi, D.; Liberati, A.; Petticrew, M.; Shekelle, P.; Stewart, L.A. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: Elaboration and Explanation. *Bmj* **2015**, *349*.
- 59. Page, M.J.; Moher, D.; Bossuyt, P.M.; Boutron, I.; Hoffmann, T.C.; Mulrow, C.D.; Shamseer, L.; Tetzlaff, J.M.; Akl, E.A.; Brennan, S.E. PRISMA 2020 Explanation and Elaboration: Updated Guidance and Exemplars for Reporting Systematic Reviews. *bmj* **2021**, *372*.
- 60. Page, M.J.; McKenzie, J.E.; Bossuyt, P.M.; Boutron, I.; Hoffmann, T.C.; Mulrow, C.D.; Shamseer, L.; Tetzlaff, J.M.; Akl, E.A.; Brennan, S.E. The PRISMA 2020 Statement: An Updated Guideline for Reporting Systematic Reviews. *Int. J. Surg.* 2021, 88, 105906.
- 61. Zhang, L.; Diraneyya, M.M.; Ryu, J.; Haas, C.T.; Abdel-Rahman, E. Automated Monitoring of Physical Fatigue Using Jerk. In Proceedings of the ISARC. Proceedings of the International Symposium on Automation and Robotics in Construction; IAARC Publications, 2019; Vol. 36, pp. 989–997.
- 62. Zhao, J.; Obonyo, E. Convolutional Long Short-Term Memory Model for Recognizing Construction Workers' Postures from Wearable Inertial Measurement Units. *Adv. Eng. Inform.* **2020**, *46*, 101177, doi:10.1016/j.aei.2020.101177.
- 63. Ryu, J.; Zhang, L.; Haas, C.T.; Abdel-Rahman, E. Motion Data Based Construction Worker Training Support Tool: Case Study of Masonry Work.; Taipei, Taiwan, July 22 2018.
- 64. Zhao, J.; Obonyo, E. E-Health of Construction Works: A Proactive Injury Prevention Approach. In Proceedings of the 2018 14th International Conference on Wireless and Mobile Computing, Networking and Communications (WiMob); IEEE: Limassol, October 2018; pp. 145–152.
- 65. Ryu, J.; McFarland, T.; Haas, C.T.; Abdel-Rahman, E. Automatic Clustering of Proper Working Postures for Phases of Movement. *Autom. Constr.* **2022**, *138*, 104223.
- 66. Bükrü, S.; Wolf, M.; Golovina, O.; Teizer, J. Using Field of View and Eye Tracking for Feedback Generation in an Augmented Virtuality Safety Training. In Proceedings of the Construction Research Congress 2020; American Society of Civil Engineers: Tempe, Arizona, November 9 2020; pp. 625–632.

- 67. Zhao, J.; Obonyo, E. Convolutional Long Short-Term Memory Model for Recognizing Postures from Wearable Sensor.
- 68. Chen, J.; Qiu, J.; Ahn, C. Construction Worker's Awkward Posture Recognition through Supervised Motion Tensor Decomposition. *Autom. Constr.* **2017**, 77, 67–81, doi:10.1016/j.autcon.2017.01.020.
- Ryu, J.; Banting, B.; Abdel-Rahman, E.; Haas, C.T. Ergonomic Characteristics of Expert Masons. J. Constr. Eng. Manag. 2023, 149, 04022150, doi:10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0002434.
- 70. Ryu, J.; Alwasel, A.; Haas, C.T.; Abdel-Rahman, E. Analysis of Relationships between Body Load and Training, Work Methods, and Work Rate: Overcoming the Novice Mason's Risk Hump. *J. Constr. Eng. Manag.* **2020**, 146, 04020097, doi:10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0001889.
- 71. Valero, E.; Sivanathan, A.; Bosché, F.; Abdel-Wahab, M. Musculoskeletal Disorders in Construction: A Review and a Novel System for Activity Tracking with Body Area Network. *Appl. Ergon.* **2016**, *54*, 120–130, doi:10.1016/j.apergo.2015.11.020.
- 72. Zhao, J.; Obonyo, E.; Yin, Q. Improving Posture Recognition among Construction Workers through Data Augmentation with Generative Adversarial Network. In Proceedings of the IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science; IOP Publishing, 2022; Vol. 1101, p. 092005.
- 73. Ogunseiju, O.R.; Olayiwola, J.; Akanmu, A.A.; Nnaji, C. Recognition of Workers' Actions from Time-Series Signal Images Using Deep Convolutional Neural Network. *Smart Sustain. Built Environ.* **2022**, *11*, 812–831.
- 74. Zhao, J.; Obonyo, E.; G Bilén, S. Wearable Inertial Measurement Unit Sensing System for Musculoskeletal Disorders Prevention in Construction. *Sensors* **2021**, *21*, 1324.
- 75. Rashid, K.M.; Louis, J. Automated Activity Identification for Construction Equipment Using Motion Data from Articulated Members. *Front. Built Environ.* **2020**, *5*, 144.
- 76. Yang, K.; Ahn, C.R.; Kim, H. Validating Ambulatory Gait Assessment Technique for Hazard Sensing in Construction Environments. *Autom. Constr.* **2019**, *98*, 302–309, doi:10.1016/j.autcon.2018.09.017.
- 77. Barkokebas, R.D.; Al-Hussein, M.; Li, X. Virtual Reality-Motion Capture-Based Ergonomic Risk Assessment of Workstation Designs of Construction Manufacturing Facilities. In *Proceedings of the Canadian Society of Civil Engineering Annual Conference* 2021; Walbridge, S., Nik-Bakht, M., Ng, K.T.W., Shome, M., Alam, M.S., El Damatty, A., Lovegrove, G., Eds.; Lecture Notes in Civil Engineering; Springer Nature Singapore: Singapore, 2023; Vol. 247, pp. 359–370 ISBN 978-981-19096-7-2.
- 78. Chen, J.; Ahn, C.R.; Han, S. Detecting the Hazards of Lifting and Carrying in Construction through a Coupled 3D Sensing and IMUs Sensing System. In Proceedings of the Computing in Civil and Building Engineering (2014); American Society of Civil Engineers: Orlando, Florida, United States, June 17 2014; pp. 1110–1117.
- 79. Yan, X.; Li, H.; Li, A.R.; Zhang, H. Wearable IMU-Based Real-Time Motion Warning System for Construction Workers' Musculoskeletal Disorders Prevention. *Autom. Constr.* **2017**, *74*, 2–11, doi:10.1016/j.autcon.2016.11.007.
- 80. Dias Barkokebas, R.; Al-Hussein, M.; Li, X. VR–MOCAP-Enabled Ergonomic Risk Assessment of Workstation Prototypes in Offsite Construction. *J. Constr. Eng. Manag.* **2022**, *148*, 04022064, doi:10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0002319.
- 81. Tian, Y.; Li, H.; Cui, H.; Chen, J. Construction Motion Data Library: An Integrated Motion Dataset for on-Site Activity Recognition. *Sci. Data* **2022**, *9*, 726.
- 82. Kim, J.; Golabchi, A.; Han, S.; Lee, D.-E. Manual Operation Simulation Using Motion-Time Analysis toward Labor Productivity Estimation: A Case Study of Concrete Pouring Operations. *Autom. Constr.* **2021**, *126*, 103669, doi:10.1016/j.autcon.2021.103669.
- 83. Shi, Y.; Du, J.; Ragan, E.; Choi, K.; Ma, S. Social Influence on Construction Safety Behaviors: A Multi-User Virtual Reality Experiment. In Proceedings of the Construction Research Congress 2018; American Society of Civil Engineers: New Orleans, Louisiana, March 29 2018; pp. 174–183.
- 84. Yu, Y.; Li, H.; Yang, X.; Kong, L.; Luo, X.; Wong, A.Y.L. An Automatic and Non-Invasive Physical Fatigue Assessment Method for Construction Workers. *Autom. Constr.* **2019**, *103*, 1–12, doi:10.1016/j.autcon.2019.02.020.
- 85. Seo, J.O.; Starbuck, R.; Han, S.; Lee, S.H.; Armstrong, T.J. Dynamic Biomechanical Analysis for Construction Tasks Using Motion Data from Vision-Based Motion Capture Approaches. In Proceedings of the Computing in Civil and Building Engineering (2014); American Society of Civil Engineers: Orlando, Florida, United States, June 17 2014; pp. 1005–1012.
- 86. Seo, J.; Han, S.; Lee, S.; Armstrong, T.J. Motion Data-Driven Unsafe Pose Identification through Biomechanical Analysis. In Proceedings of the Computing in Civil Engineering; American Society of Civil Engineers: Los Angeles, California, June 24 2013; pp. 693–700.

- 87. Han, S.; Lee, S.; Peña-Mora, F. Application of Dimension Reduction Techniques for Motion Recognition: Construction Worker Behavior Monitoring. In Proceedings of the Computing in Civil Engineering (2011); American Society of Civil Engineers: Miami, Florida, United States, June 16 2011; pp. 102–109.
- 88. Seo, J.O.; Han, S.U.; Lee, S.H.; Armstrong, T.J. Feasibility of Onsite Biomechanical Analysis during Ladder Climbing. In Proceedings of the Construction Research Congress 2014; American Society of Civil Engineers: Atlanta, Georgia, May 13 2014; pp. 739–748.
- 89. Nath, N.D.; Shrestha, P.; Behzadan, A.H. Human Activity Recognition and Mobile Sensing for Construction Simulation. In Proceedings of the 2017 Winter Simulation Conference (WSC); IEEE: Las Vegas, NV, December 2017; pp. 2448–2459.
- 90. Starbuck, R.; Seo, J.; Han, S.; Lee, S. A Stereo Vision-Based Approach to Marker-Less Motion Capture for On-Site Kinematic Modeling of Construction Worker Tasks. In Proceedings of the Computing in Civil and Building Engineering (2014); American Society of Civil Engineers: Orlando, Florida, United States, June 17 2014; pp. 1094–1101.
- 91. Han, S.; Lee, S.; Peña-Mora, F. Vision-Based Detection of Unsafe Actions of a Construction Worker: Case Study of Ladder Climbing. *J. Comput. Civ. Eng.* **2013**, 27, 635–644, doi:10.1061/(ASCE)CP.1943-5487.0000279.
- 92. Rashid, K.M.; Datta, S.; Behzadan, A.H. Coupling Risk Attitude and Motion Data Mining in a Preemtive Construction Safety Framework. In Proceedings of the 2017 Winter Simulation Conference (WSC); IEEE: Las Vegas, NV, December 2017; pp. 2413–2424.
- 93. Liu, M.; Han, S.; Lee, S. Tracking-Based 3D Human Skeleton Extraction from Stereo Video Camera toward an on-Site Safety and Ergonomic Analysis. *Constr. Innov.* **2016**, *16*, 348–367, doi:10.1108/CI-10-2015-0054.
- 94. Golabchi, A.; Han, S.; Abourizk, S. Evaluating the Impact of Motion Sensing Errors on Ergonomic Analysis. In Proceedings of the Construction Research Congress 2016; American Society of Civil Engineers: San Juan, Puerto Rico, May 24 2016; pp. 890–897.
- 95. Han, S.; Lee, S.; Peña-Mora, F. Comparative Study of Motion Features for Similarity-Based Modeling and Classification of Unsafe Actions in Construction. *J. Comput. Civ. Eng.* **2014**, *28*, A4014005, doi:10.1061/(ASCE)CP.1943-5487.0000339.
- 96. Han, S.; Achar, M.; Lee, S.; Peña-Mora, F. Empirical Assessment of a RGB-D Sensor on Motion Capture and Action Recognition for Construction Worker Monitoring. *Vis. Eng.* **2013**, *1*, *6*, doi:10.1186/2213-7459-1-6.
- 97. Seo, J.; Starbuck, R.; Han, S.; Lee, S.; Armstrong, T.J. Motion Data-Driven Biomechanical Analysis during Construction Tasks on Sites. *J. Comput. Civ. Eng.* **2015**, 29, B4014005, doi:10.1061/(ASCE)CP.1943-5487.0000400.
- 98. Wang, G.; Yu, Y.; Li, H. Automated Activity Recognition of Construction Workers Using Single In-Pocket Smartphone and Machine Learning Methods. In Proceedings of the IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science; IOP Publishing, 2022; Vol. 1101, p. 072008.
- 99. Zhang, M.; Cao, T.; Zhao, X. A Study of Using Smartphone to Detect and Identify Construction Workers' near-Miss Falls Based on ANN. In Proceedings of the Nondestructive Characterization and Monitoring of Advanced Materials, Aerospace, Civil Infrastructure, and Transportation XII; SPIE, 2018; Vol. 10599, pp. 499–504.
- 100. Sharma, A.; Sethi, G. Fatigue Detection Post Physical Activity Using Machine Learning Algorithms. In Proceedings of the Journal of Physics: Conference Series; IOP Publishing, 2022; Vol. 2327, p. 012072.
- 101. Kong, L.; Li, H.; Yu, Y.; Luo, H.; Skitmore, M.; Antwi-Afari, M.F. Quantifying the Physical Intensity of Construction Workers, a Mechanical Energy Approach. *Adv. Eng. Inform.* **2018**, *38*, 404–419, doi:10.1016/j.aei.2018.08.005.
- 102. Wang, J.; Li, X.; Han, S.; Al-Hussein, M. Construction Workers' Behavior Assessment Using 3D Visualization and Fuzzy Logic Method. In Proceedings of the ICCREM 2020; American Society of Civil Engineers: Stockholm, Sweden (Conference Held Virtually), October 14 2020; pp. 47–54.
- 103. Seo, J.; Alwasel, A.; Lee, S.; Abdel-Rahman, E.M.; Haas, C. A Comparative Study of In-Field Motion Capture Approaches for Body Kinematics Measurement in Construction. *Robotica* **2019**, *37*, 928–946, doi:10.1017/S0263574717000571.
- 104. Breloff, S.P.; Dutta, A.; Dai, F.; Sinsel, E.W.; Warren, C.M.; Ning, X.; Wu, J.Z. Assessing Work-Related Risk Factors for Musculoskeletal Knee Disorders in Construction Roofing Tasks. *Appl. Ergon.* **2019**, *81*, 102901, doi:10.1016/j.apergo.2019.102901.
- 105. Seo, J.; Lee, S.; Armstrong, T.J.; Han, S. Dynamic Biomechanical Simulation for Identifying Risk Factors for Work-Related Musculoskeletal Disorders during Construction Tasks. In Proceedings of the ISARC. Proceedings of the International Symposium on Automation and Robotics in Construction; Citeseer, 2013; Vol. 30, p. 1.

- 106. Alwasel, A.; Elrayes, K.; Abdel-Rahman, E.; Haas, C. A Human Body Posture Sensor for Monitoring and Diagnosing MSD Risk Factors. In Proceedings of the ISARC. Proceedings of the International Symposium on Automation and Robotics in Construction; IAARC Publications, 2013; Vol. 30, p. 1.
- 107. Shi, Y.; Du, J.; Ahn, C.R.; Ragan, E. Impact Assessment of Reinforced Learning Methods on Construction Workers' Fall Risk Behavior Using Virtual Reality. *Autom. Constr.* **2019**, *104*, 197–214, doi:10.1016/j.autcon.2019.04.015.
- 108. Li, X.; Komeili, A.; Gül, M.; El-Rich, M. A Framework for Evaluating Muscle Activity during Repetitive Manual Material Handling in Construction Manufacturing. *Autom. Constr.* **2017**, 79, 39–48, doi:10.1016/j.autcon.2017.01.005.
- 109. Bangaru, S.S.; Wang, C.; Aghazadeh, F. Automated and Continuous Fatigue Monitoring in Construction Workers Using Forearm EMG and IMU Wearable Sensors and Recurrent Neural Network. *Sensors* **2022**, 22, 9729, doi:10.3390/s22249729.
- 110. Tanaka, R.; Yabuki, N.; Fukuda, T. Development of a Workers' Behavior Estimation System Using Sensing Data and Machine Learning. In Proceedings of the ISARC. Proceedings of the International Symposium on Automation and Robotics in Construction; IAARC Publications, 2020; Vol. 37, pp. 878–885.
- 111. Han, S.; Lee, S.; Peña-Mora, F. Vision-Based Motion Detection for Safety Behavior Analysis in Construction. In Proceedings of the Construction Research Congress 2012; American Society of Civil Engineers: West Lafayette, Indiana, United States, May 17 2012; pp. 1032–1041.
- 112. Nguyen, T.; Tran, K.D.; Raza, A.; Nguyen, Q.-T.; Bui, H.M.; Tran, K.P. Wearable Technology for Smart Manufacturing in Industry 5.0. In *Artificial Intelligence for Smart Manufacturing*; Tran, K.P., Ed.; Springer Series in Reliability Engineering; Springer International Publishing: Cham, 2023; pp. 225–254 ISBN 978-3-031-30509-2.
- 113. Jafari, N.; Azarian, M.; Yu, H. Moving from Industry 4.0 to Industry 5.0: What Are the Implications for Smart Logistics? *Logistics* **2022**, *6*, 26.
- 114. Kadir, B.A.; Broberg, O. Human-Centered Design of Work Systems in the Transition to Industry 4.0. *Appl. Ergon.* **2021**, *92*, 103334.
- 115. Colla, V.; Matino, R.; Schröder, A.J.; Schivalocchi, M.; Romaniello, L. Human-Centered Robotic Development in the Steel Shop: Improving Health, Safety and Digital Skills at the Workplace. *Metals* **2021**, *11*, 647.
- 116. Froschauer, R.; Kurschl, W.; Wolfartsberger, J.; Pimminger, S.; Lindorfer, R.; Blattner, J. A Human-Centered Assembly Workplace for Industry: Challenges and Lessons Learned. *Procedia Comput. Sci.* **2021**, *180*, 290–300.
- 117. Adah, C.A.; Aghimien, D.O.; Oshodi, O. Work–Life Balance in the Construction Industry: A Bibliometric and Narrative Review. *Eng. Constr. Archit. Manag.* **2023**.
- 118. Fei, W.; Opoku, A.; Agyekum, K.; Oppon, J.A.; Ahmed, V.; Chen, C.; Lok, K.L. The Critical Role of the Construction Industry in Achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs): Delivering Projects for the Common Good. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 9112.
- 119. Nagaraj, D.; Schake, E.; Leiner, P.; Werth, D. An RNN-Ensemble Approach for Real Time Human Pose Estimation from Sparse IMUs. In Proceedings of the Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Applications of Intelligent Systems; ACM: Las Palmas de Gran Canaria Spain, January 7 2020; pp. 1–6.
- 120. Resende, A.; Cerqueira, S.; Barbosa, J.; Damásio, E.; Pombeiro, A.; Silva, A.; Santos, C. Ergowear: An Ambulatory, Non-Intrusive, and Interoperable System towards a Human-Aware Human-Robot Collaborative Framework. In Proceedings of the 2021 IEEE International Conference on Autonomous Robot Systems and Competitions (ICARSC); IEEE, 2021; pp. 56–61.
- 121. Choudhry, R.M.; Fang, D. Why Operatives Engage in Unsafe Work Behavior: Investigating Factors on Construction Sites. *Saf. Sci.* **2008**, *46*, 566–584.
- 122. Yu, Y.; Umer, W.; Yang, X.; Antwi-Afari, M.F. Posture-Related Data Collection Methods for Construction Workers: A Review. *Autom. Constr.* **2021**, *124*, 103538.
- 123. Rao, A.S.; Radanovic, M.; Liu, Y.; Hu, S.; Fang, Y.; Khoshelham, K.; Palaniswami, M.; Ngo, T. Real-Time Monitoring of Construction Sites: Sensors, Methods, and Applications. *Autom. Constr.* **2022**, *136*, 104099.
- 124. Chen, T. Improving the Safety of Construction Site. PhD Thesis, 博士論文, 2023.
- 125. Ferreira, F.; Luxardi, G.; Reid, B.; Ma, L.; Raghunathan, V.; Zhao, M. Real-Time Physiological Measurements of Oxygen Using a Non-Invasive Self-Referencing Optical Fiber Microsensor. *Nat. Protoc.* **2020**, *15*, 207–235.
- 126. Yang, B.; Li, X.; Hou, Y.; Meier, A.; Cheng, X.; Choi, J.-H.; Wang, F.; Wang, H.; Wagner, A.; Yan, D. Non-Invasive (Non-Contact) Measurements of Human Thermal Physiology Signals and Thermal Comfort/Discomfort Poses-a Review. *Energy Build.* **2020**, 224, 110261.

- 127. Mündermann, L.; Corazza, S.; Andriacchi, T.P. The Evolution of Methods for the Capture of Human Movement Leading to Markerless Motion Capture for Biomechanical Applications. *J. NeuroEngineering Rehabil.* **2006**, *3*, 6, doi:10.1186/1743-0003-3-6.
- 128. Metcalf, C.D.; Robinson, R.; Malpass, A.J.; Bogle, T.P.; Dell, T.A.; Harris, C.; Demain, S.H. Markerless Motion Capture and Measurement of Hand Kinematics: Validation and Application to Home-Based Upper Limb Rehabilitation. *IEEE Trans. Biomed. Eng.* **2013**, *60*, 2184–2192.
- 129. Gavrilova, M.L.; Ahmed, F.; Bari, A.H.; Liu, R.; Liu, T.; Maret, Y.; Sieu, B.K.; Sudhakar, T. Multi-Modal Motion-Capture-Based Biometric Systems for Emergency Response and Patient Rehabilitation. In *Research Anthology on Rehabilitation Practices and Therapy*; IGI global, 2021; pp. 653–678.
- 130. Rodrigues, T.B.; Salgado, D.P.; Catháin, C.Ó.; O'Connor, N.; Murray, N. Human Gait Assessment Using a 3D Marker-Less Multimodal Motion Capture System. *Multimed. Tools Appl.* **2020**, 79, 2629–2651, doi:10.1007/s11042-019-08275-9.
- 131. Ripic, Z.; Nienhuis, M.; Signorile, J.F.; Best, T.M.; Jacobs, K.A.; Eltoukhy, M. A Comparison of Three-Dimensional Kinematics between Markerless and Marker-Based Motion Capture in Overground Gait. *J. Biomech.* **2023**, *159*, 111793.
- 132. Suwardi, A.; Wang, F.; Xue, K.; Han, M.; Teo, P.; Wang, P.; Wang, S.; Liu, Y.; Ye, E.; Li, Z.; et al. Machine Learning-Driven Biomaterials Evolution. *Adv. Mater.* **2022**, *34*, 2102703, doi:10.1002/adma.202102703.
- 133. Awolusi, I.; Marks, E.; Hallowell, M. Wearable Technology for Personalized Construction Safety Monitoring and Trending: Review of Applicable Devices. *Autom. Constr.* **2018**, *85*, 96–106.
- 134. Zou, P.X.; Xu, N.; Yang, R.J.; Ma, S.X.; Li, P. A REAL-TIME MONITORING SYSTEM FOR IMPROVING CONSTRUCTION WORKERS'HEALTH AND SAFETY. *Proc. CIB W099 Belf.* 2015 **2015**, 19.