

What the %PCSA? Addressing Diversity in Lower-Limb Musculoskeletal Models: Age- and Sex-related Differences in PCSA and Muscle Mass.

R. Maarleveld¹, H.E.J. Veeger¹, F.C.T. van der Helm¹, J. Son², R.L. Lieber^{3,4,5,6}, E. van der Kruk^{1*}

¹Department of Biomechanical Engineering, Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, Delft University of Technology, the Netherlands

²Department of Biomedical Engineering, New Jersey Institute of Technology, Newark, NJ 07102, USA.

³Shirley Ryan AbilityLab, Chicago, IL 60611, USA.

⁴Department of Physiology, Northwestern University, Chicago, IL 60611, USA.

⁵Department of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, Northwestern University, Chicago, IL 60611, USA.

⁶Research Service, Hines VA Hospital, Maywood, IL 60153, USA.

*corresponding author: e.vanderkruk@tudelft.nl

Keywords: musculoskeletal model, muscles, maximum isometric force, PCSA, muscle mass, ageing, sex, gender, diversity, sexual dimorphism

Abstract

Musculoskeletal (MSK) models offer a non-invasive way to understand biomechanical loads on joints and tendons, which are difficult to measure directly. Variations in muscle strength, especially relative differences between muscles, significantly impact model outcomes. Typically, scaled generic MSK models use maximum isometric forces that are not adjusted for different demographics, raising concerns about their accuracy. This review provides an overview on experimentally derived strength parameters, including physiological cross-sectional area (PCSA), muscle mass (Mm), and relative muscle mass (%Mm), which is the relative distribution of muscle mass across the leg. We analysed differences by age and sex, and compared open-source lower limb MSK model parameters with experimental data from 57 studies. Our dataset, with records dating back to 1884, shows that uniformly increasing all maximum isometric forces in MSK models does not capture key muscle ratio differences due to age and sex. Males have a higher proportion of muscle mass in the rectus femoris and semimembranosus muscles, while females have a greater relative muscle mass in the pelvic (gluteus maximus and medius) and ankle muscles (tibialis anterior, tibialis posterior, and extensor digitorum longus). Older adults have a higher relative muscle mass in the gluteus medius, while younger individuals show more in the gastrocnemius. Current MSK models do not accurately represent muscle mass distribution for specific age or sex groups, and none of them accurately reflect female muscle mass distribution. Further research is needed to explore musculotendon age- and sex differences.

Introduction

Over the past three decades, musculoskeletal (MSK) computer models have served as a tool for understanding biomechanical loads on joints and tendons during movements that are difficult or impossible to measure experimentally. These models are valuable for studying musculoskeletal pathologies, optimizing movement in sports, assessing surgical interventions, and developing assistive devices.

The most commonly used MSK models are defined by rigid bodies, joints, and muscles, representing the musculoskeletal system in a generalized way. However, muscle parameters such as muscle path, muscle moment arm, tendon slack length, optimal fiber length, activation and deactivation dynamics, and maximum isometric force vary between individuals. To scale a generic musculoskeletal model, one or more of these parameters are adjusted to match the characteristics of a specific population or individual. Studies have shown that force predictions in MSK simulations are sensitive to the parameters of Hill-type muscle models, particularly optimal fiber length, physiological cross-sectional area (PCSA), and tendon slack length (Heinen et al., 2016).

Most biomechanical studies rely on scaled open-source generic models, such as those in OpenSim, which are based on a limited number of cadaver studies. In this process, segment properties are scaled linearly to an individual or population, with the parameters optimal fiber length and tendon slack length scaled according to segment length. However, PCSA, and thus maximum isometric force parameters, are often left unscaled (OpenSim Confluence, 2024b). Researchers typically increase these values uniformly when simulations fail, but no standardized guidelines exist for appropriately scaling. So while for example everyone is aware of the changes aging brings to the body, these effects are generally not incorporated into the maximum isometric strength parameters of the models. Moreover, incorporating age-differences also requires understanding of the relationship between age and sex. For example, research showed that isokinetic strength in older men is lower than in young men but comparable to that of young women even when corrected for body mass (van der Kruk et al., 2022). Musculoskeletal disorders often present differently between sexes and throughout the lifespan. Ignoring age-sex differences therefore severely compromises the power and applicability of musculoskeletal models to improve our understanding and treatment of musculoskeletal health.

Maximum Isometric Force

In musculoskeletal modelling, maximum isometric force (F_m^0) is the highest contractile force produced by a fully activated muscle at its optimal fiber length and zero contraction velocity. This force depends on the number of parallel sarcomeres, represented by the physiological cross-sectional area (PCSA), and the muscle-specific tension (σ_{muscle}), which is the ability of the sarcomeres to produce force:

$$F_m^0 = PCSA \cdot \sigma_{muscle}$$

For muscles with fibers running parallel to the long axis, such as the hamstrings, PCSA is equal to the anatomical cross-sectional area (ACSA) and can be measured at the thickest part of the muscle. In pennate muscles, such as the rectus femoris, PCSA is measured perpendicular to the fibers, resulting in a V- or arc-shaped cut (Fick, 1910) (Fig 1a). Pennate muscles generate greater strength than muscles with parallel fibers and similar ACSA due to their larger PCSA (i.e., larger number of fibers).

Relative distribution of Maximum Isometric Forces

Particularly the ratio of maximum isometric forces, which is the relative distribution of maximum isometric forces across muscles, is essential because of the redundancy solver often applied in MSK

simulations. This mathematical solver resolves muscle redundancy by minimizing a cost function, often reducing muscle activation and favouring muscles with higher maximum isometric forces (*Supplementary Material 1*). Therefore, optimizations are sensitive to the relative differences of maximum isometric force across muscles, raising concerns about the validity of using the same ratios for different populations.

Although differences in specific tension among fiber types and motor units have been observed in animal studies (S. Bodine et al., 1987; S. C. Bodine et al., 1988), most musculoskeletal models assume that σ_{muscle} is constant across muscles and individuals. This means that σ_{muscle} acts as a scaling factor for maximum isometric force, with PCSA being the main determinant of the distribution between muscles.

Despite the increasing use of medical imaging to estimate PCSA data, there are still no reference materials for scaling muscle parameters across specific age or sex groups. Furthermore, it remains unclear which of these groups are adequately represented by the most frequently downloaded open-source MSK models. This raises the question of whether current practices in scaling MSK models effectively account for differences in PCSA between sex and age groups.

Aim

The goal of this meta-analysis was to use the literature to understand how lower limb muscle PCSA, and thus, maximum isometric force, should be scaled relative to sex and age. This review aims to provide a comprehensive overview of experimentally derived PCSA parameters, focusing on PCSA as an indicator of maximum isometric strength. This approach avoids bias introduced by variations in muscle-specific tension (σ_{muscle}) when comparing maximum isometric strength between literature values and those used in OpenSim models. The study differentiates among various age groups, sexes, and fitness levels, examines distribution of PCSA (%PCSA), and compares these findings to the muscle parameters used in generic open-source lower limb MSK models.




Figure 1 a) ACSA is the anatomical cross sectional area, PCSA is the cross sectional area perpendicular to the muscle fibers; b) geometric simplification used to estimate PCSA from muscle volume. Cuboid 1 represents a muscle with the muscle fibers in line with the muscle tendon, cuboid 2 represents a theoretical situation in which the muscle fibers have a pennation angle of 90 degrees, the parallelogram represents a bipennate muscle. The dotted area is the PCSA c) Hill type muscle model with an active and a passive element in parallel and a passive element in series with pennation angle (θ). d) projection of the muscle force in the direction of the tendon ("functional" force).

Method

Search strategy

A literature search was performed in the Scopus, Pubmed, and Google Scholar databases between April 2023 to July 2024. The following keywords were used: ("*Physiological cross-sectional area*" OR "*PCSA*" OR "*Muscle Volume*") AND ("*Pelvis*" OR "*Pelvic*" OR "*Shank*" OR "*Thigh*" OR "*Leg*" OR "*Foot*" OR "*extensors*" OR "*Flexors*" OR "*Lower limb*" OR "-specific muscle name-") AND ("*MRI*" OR "*MR Imaging*" OR "*Magnetic resonance imaging*" OR "*CT*" OR "*computer tomography*" OR "*Ultrasound*" OR "*cadaver*" OR "*Dissection*" OR "*in-vivo*" OR "*ex-vivo*").

The bibliography of the located studies was thoroughly reviewed to ensure that all relevant works were included, even those that were inadvertently omitted from the keyword-based search.

The studies were initially selected based on the relevance of their titles and abstracts. Subsequently, any studies written in English that provided explicit values for PCSA for healthy individuals were included. Non-human studies and numerical simulation studies were excluded. Articles presenting only graphical representations of PCSA outcomes without numerical data were also excluded. Additionally, foot muscles were omitted from the analysis since they are not included in current lower limb MSK models. When only summarized data were presented, original data were requested from the authors.

Data extraction

Data from measurements

Papers were organized based on relevant topics, including the lower limb location (leg, pelvis), participant group (children, young adults, adults, elderly, athletes), muscle-specific tension, and image modality reliability. We categorized the reported values into four age groups according to the average onset of muscle mass decline at 30 years and the onset of accelerated muscle mass decline at 65 years (van der Kruk et al., 2021):

- Children (CH): 18 years and younger
- Young Adults (YA): 18 - 30 years
- Adults (AD): 30-65 years
- Elderly (EL): 65 years and older

If a study explicitly mentioned that reported values were from athletes, we categorized them under the label 'Ath', followed by the respective age group. We utilized two sex groups (female (F) and male (M)) to determine the ratio and number of individuals of each sex within each category.

We gathered the following additional information from each paper:

- Imaging modality
- Mean, Standard deviation (SD) , and range of PCSA values.
- Sample size
- Male-Female ratio
- Participant characteristics (weight, height, age)
- Body position during measurements
- Muscle characteristics: (optimal) fiber length & pennation angle
- Method for determining PCSA
- Specific strength

Data from generic open-source MSK models

We included the model parameters of the five most used OpenSim lower limb models (Simtk, 2023) in the comparison Table 1.

- **Model D** (Delp et al., 1990), simulates a 1.8-meter tall individual with a bodymass of 75.16 kg using muscle parameters primarily sourced from Wickiewicz et al. (1983a), supplemented by data from Friederich & Brand (1990), with the lower leg represented by 13 rigid-body segments interconnected through various joints, resulting in 14 degrees of freedom. The model has 43 muscle-tendon actuators.
- **Model G** (OpenSim Confluence, 2024a), known as the Gait2392/2354 model, is a three-dimensional representation of a 1.80-meter tall individual weighing 75.16 kg, incorporates muscle parameters from Model D but scaled to align with joint torque-angle relationships measured in living subjects (Carhart, 2000). The model's lower extremity feature 13 rigid-body segments and 23 degrees of freedom with joint definitions stem from Model D, while low back joint and anthropometry details are sourced from Anderson & Pandy (1999), with a planar knee model from Yamaguchi & Zajac (1989); The model has 92 (Gait2392) and 54 (Gait2354) muscle-tendon actuators.
- **Model A** (Arnold et al., 2010), depicting a 1.70m tall individual, integrates model geometry from Model D but adopts muscle architecture detailed by Ward et al. (2009a), featuring 14 rigid-body segments for the lower leg, encompassing 23 degrees of freedom and incorporating muscle lines of action for 44 muscle-tendon actuators.
- **Model L** (Horsman, 2007; Modenese et al., 2011), also known as the 'London Lower Limb model' (OpenSim, n.d.), depicts a human, utilizing muscle architecture detailed by Klein Horsman et al. (2007), with the lower leg modeled by 11 rigid-body segments and 12 degrees of freedom, and incorporating muscle lines of action for 163 actuators representing 38 muscles.
- **Model R** (Rajagopal et al., 2016), depicts a 1.7m tall individual weighing 75kg, utilizing model geometry from Model A, and incorporates musculotendon parameters derived from anatomical measurements of cadaver specimens Ward et al. (2009a) and magnetic resonance images of young healthy subjects Handsfield et al. (2014), featuring 13 rigid-body segments for the lower leg with 37 degrees of freedom and including muscle lines of action for 80 actuators in the lower limb and 17 ideal torque actuators driving the upper body.

Table 1: OpenSource Musculoskeletal models and their sources for muscle parameters

Model	Model description					Dataset				
	segments	actuators	dof	length (m)	weight (kg)	Source Muscle Parameters	Samples (M:F)	Age (years)	Height (m)	Weight (kg)
Model D (Delp et al., 1990)	13	43	14	1.8	75.2	Wickiewicz(1984) Friederich&Brand(1990)	3(?) 2(1:1)	37 & 63	1.83 & 1.68	91 & 59
Model G (OpenSim Confluence, 2024a)	13	92/54	23	1.8	75.2	Scaled Model D				
Model A (Arnold et al., 2010)	14	44	23	1.7		Ward (2009)	21 (9:12)	83+-9	1.68±0.09	82.7±15.3
Model L (Horsman, 2007; Modenese et al., 2011)	11	163	12			Klein Horsman (2007)	1 (1:0)	77	1.74	105
Model R (Rajagopal et al., 2016)	13	97	37	1.7	75	Ward 2009 (Lf) Handsfield 2014 (Vm)	21 (9:12) 24 (16:8)	83±9 25.5±11.1	1.68±0.09 1.71±0.01	82.7±15.3 71.8±14.6

Data Analysis

Relative muscle strength (%Mm)

To investigate age- and sex-related differences in %PCSA, we identified studies reporting PCSA data for individual males and females, focusing on those that included data on the muscles of at least one full leg. Due to the limited number of such studies for young adults, we decided to report the relative muscle mass (%Mm) as a proxy for %PCSA, which provided us with a more extensive dataset. This measure is a reliable indicator of muscle strength and PCSA, although it does not account for optimal fiber length differences.

We estimated %Mm by dividing the mass of each individual muscle by a minimal set of lower limb muscles (J. P. Charles et al., 2019a): adductor brevis (AB), adductor longus (AL), adductor magnus (AM), gracilis (GRA), biceps femoris (BIC), semimembranosus (SM), semitendinosus (ST), rectus femoris (RF), vastus lateralis (VL), vastus medialis (VM), tibialis anterior (TA), extensor digitorum longus (EDL), extensor hallucis longus (EHL), soleus (SOL), gastrocnemius (GAS), and sartorius (SAR).

To enable comparison among studies, we combined the masses of related muscles to form muscle groups: gastrocnemius (GAS = medial gastrocnemius (MG) + lateral gastrocnemius (LG)), vastus (VAS = vastus intermedius (VI) + vastus lateralis (VL) + vastus medialis (VM)), iliopsoas (ILIOPS = iliacus (Iliac) + psoas major (Psoas)), and biceps femoris (BIC = biceps femoris short head (BFSH) + biceps femoris long head (BFLH)).

We categorized the data into defined sex (F,M) and age (YA, AD, EL) groups and conducted a two-way ANOVA to detect significant differences in %Mm.

Absolute muscle strength (PCSA and Mm)

To provide a comprehensive overview of all PCSA values, including those that did not report on a full lower leg, we presented PCSA values in a graphical format, categorized by age, sex, and fitness level. The graphic depicted the mean PCSA values, and if available, the range. In cases where the range was not provided, the 95% confidence interval (CI) was estimated using the formula:

$$CI_{95} = PCSA_{mean} \pm Z \cdot \frac{PCSA_{SD}}{\sqrt{n}}$$

In which $Z = 1.96$ for $n \geq 30$ and the t-distribution value for Z when $n < 30$.

For the articles used to estimate %Mm, we also reported the absolute muscle mass (Mm) and categorized the data into defined age and sex groups. We conducted a two-way ANOVA to detect significant differences in Mm.

Comparison generic open-source MSK models

In each of the graphical overviews, we integrated %Mm, Mm, and PCSA values from the generic open-source MSK model data. For each muscle, we evaluated the model's representation across specific age-sex-fitness groups. If a particular group had a sample size of fewer than five individuals for a muscle parameter measurement, we deemed the data insufficient for drawing conclusions.

To enable comparison of %Mm with the generic models, we determined the muscle masses in the models using the formula:

$$M_{m-model} = PCSA \cdot L_o \cdot \rho$$

In which L_o is optimal fiber length, and ρ is the muscle density (1.056 g/cm³ (Méndez, 1960)). We then obtained %Mm by dividing the mass of each individual muscle by the total mass of the previously mentioned minimal set of lower limb muscles.









Results


Search results

Initially, 879 papers were identified, with 330 remaining after pre-selection. After removing duplicates, 322 papers were reviewed, and 57 containing explicit PCSA data were included for further analysis. Table 2 shows the number of participants per demographic group for each muscle and the graphical overviews present all PCSA values are provided in Supplementary Material Tables 1-3. Most data are available for the knee flexors (SM, ST) and extensors (RF, VAS), and larger plantar flexors (GAS), primarily for young adults and the elderly. However, males are underrepresented in the elderly group, and females in the young adult group. There is also a lack of data for children (<18 years) and adults (30-65 years).

To determine %Mm, we identified articles that reported muscle mass (Mm) for at least one full leg and separately for males and females (*Supplementary Material 2*): (J. P. Charles et al., 2019b; Friederich & Brand, 1990; Klein Horsman et al., 2007; Ruggiero et al., 2016; Son et al., 2024a; Theile, 1884; Ward et al., 2009a). Studies lacking participant characteristics (Seireg & Arvikar (1973) and Wickiewicz et al. (1983a)) were excluded. %Mm was chosen over %PCSA due to limitations in using these articles to estimate PCSA, as some studies did not measure optimal fiber length (Theile, 1884) or based their calculations on mean fiber length (Friederich & Brand (1990), J. P. Charles et al. (2019a)). As a result, no %PCSA data were available for young individuals.

Table 2: number of participants per demographic group for each muscle

	Muscle	CH 	CH 	YA 	YA 	AD 	AD 	EL 	EL 
Knee flexors	BFSH	0	0	8	16	7	8	25	4
	BFLH	0	0	8	16	6	8	25	4
	SM	0	0	11	19	6	7	53	32
	ST	0	0	11	19	6	8	25	4
Knee extensors	RF	0	0	11	80	7	8	22	1
	VL	9	21	16	226	17	16	61	29
	VM	0	0	11	80	7	8	22	1
	VI	0	0	11	80	7	8	22	1
Plantar flexors	SOL	0	0	8	39	7	8	22	9
	MG	12	18	97	100	33	8	118	54
	LG	0	11	8	67	7	8	22	58
	TP	0	0	8	16	7	8	22	9
	PerB	0	0	0	0	7	8	22	9
	PerL	0	0	0	0	7	8	0	9
	FDL	0	0	8	16	7	8	0	9
	FHL	0	0	8	16	7	8	0	9
Dorsi flexors	TA	0	0	8	16	7	8	22	9
	FDL	0	0	0	0	6	7	0	9
	EHL	0	0	0	0	7	8	0	9
Hip	Gmax	0	0	11	19	7	8	24	5
	Gmed	0	0	14	22	7	8	22	1
	Gmin	0	0	11	19	1	1	0	1
	ILIAC	0	0	8	16	7	8	22	1
	Ps	0	0	8	16	7	8	0	1
	SAR	0	0	11	19	7	8	22	1
	Piri	0	0	11	19	1	1	0	1
	TFL	0	0	11	19	1	1	22	1
Adductors	AB	0	0	11	19	7	8	22	1
	AL	0	0	11	19	6	7	22	1
	AM	0	0	11	19	7	8	22	1
	GRA	0	0	11	19	7	8	22	1
	PECT	0	0	11	19	1	1	0	1
	QdF	0	0	11	19	0	1	0	1



PCSA definition

Although direct measurement of PCSA is possible (Veeger et al., 1991), it is challenging, especially for pennate muscles. Therefore, proxies have frequently been used. These approximations simplify muscle geometry, assuming it as a cuboid, and calculate cross-sectional areas based on this approximation (Fig 1b). The PCSA is directly proportional to muscle volume and inversely proportional to fiber length (Fick, 1910; Pfuhl, 1937), where nowadays the optimal fiber length is used (Lieber & Fridén, 2000):

Method 1:

$$PCSA = \frac{M_m}{L_o \cdot \rho}$$

Where M_m is the muscle mass, L_o is optimal fiber length, and ρ is the muscle density (1.056 g/cm³ (Méndez, 1960)). Dissection studies used muscle mass as it was easier to determine than volume. Modern imaging simplifies this, allowing PCSA to be calculated as

Method 2:

$$PCSA = \frac{V_m}{L_o}$$

where V_m is the muscle volume. This method is applicable in vivo at specific muscle lengths (joint angles) and tension levels.

Alexander and Vernon (1975) proposed correcting PCSA for pennate muscles by reconstructing the muscle as a parallelogram (Fig. 1b: parallelogram). The volume of the parallelogram (V_p) is the area multiplied by the muscle's depth (w), resulting in:

$$V_p = b \cdot w \cdot 2 L_o \sin(\theta) = V_m \cdot 2 \sin(\theta)$$

$$PCSA_{parallelogram} = \frac{V_m}{L_o} \cdot 2 \sin(\theta)$$

Although it is not the scope of this article, it is worth noting that this equation intriguingly suggests that PCSA decreases with a larger pennation angle, which contradicts our expectations, since pennated muscles should be stronger than muscles with parallel fibers.

Pennation angle

The magnitude of the force that a muscle can produce is unrelated to the pennation angle (θ). However, θ does influence the direction of the force and is needed to determine the force in the longitudinal direction, working on the tendon using the projection of PCSA (Fick, 1910). In line with previous publications, we will refer to this as the *functional* cross-sectional area (FCSA) (Powell et al., 1984; Rockenfeller et al., 2024):

Method 1b:

$$FCSA = \frac{M_m}{L_o \cdot \rho} \cdot \cos(\theta)$$

Method 2b:

$$FCSA = \frac{V_m}{L_o} \cdot \cos(\theta)$$

Correcting for the pennation angle isolates the force acting on the tendon, excluding lateral forces affecting muscle thickening and thinning. This correction is valuable in some applications, such as for determining effective strength between muscles (Brand et al., 1981). When using $PCSA_{parallelogram}$ for PCSA, note that PCSA is multiplied by $\cos(\theta) \cdot 2 \sin(\theta) = \sin(2\theta)$ instead of $\cos(\theta)$.

In musculoskeletal modeling, maximum isometric force (F_m^0) is a key parameter in the contractile element of Hill's muscle model, which includes a contractile element in series with an elastic spring (tendon) and a parallel elastic element (Fig. 1c). This model incorporates force-length and force-velocity relationship curves, adjusted by F_m^0 . The pennation angle (θ), though not part of the original model, converts the parallel elements into a force aligned with the tendon via $\cos(\theta)$ (Fig. 1c).

As the model inherently accounts for this force projection, $FCSA$ not be used for F_m^0 in musculoskeletal simulations. Instead, F_m^0 should be calculated using PCSA as outlined in Method 1 or 2. Since the 1980s, many studies have reported $FCSA$ are (e.g. L. Barber et al., 2011; L. E. Barber et al., 2011; Blazevich et al., 2009; Fukunaga et al., 1992, 1996; Narici et al., 1992; Son et al., 2024; Ward et al., 2009; Wickiewicz et al., 1983). Using these data directly for F_m^0 leads to an underestimation by a factor of $1/\cos(\theta)$. This error varies between muscles due to differences in pennation angles.

Separate from this discrepancy, is the ongoing debate about using the pennation angle in Hill-type models (Lieber, 2022). Static pennation angles do not accurately reflect dynamic muscle behavior during contraction, and even dynamic models fail to account for shear forces between muscle fibers.

In our results, we have included only those articles that reported the PCSA according to Method 1 and 2, or could be corrected to represent these methods.

PCSA measurements

Each approach to calculating PCSA requires specific muscle parameters. Initially, these were assessed through cadaver dissections, which continue today (Son et al., 2024a). Recently, newer datasets have emerged using advanced imaging techniques like MRI, US, and DTI. This section outlines current methods for measuring PCSA parameters. The measurement modality is shown in the graphical overviews for each study in Supplementary Material Tables 1-3.

Measuring Muscle mass (Mm) and muscle volume (Vm)

Muscle mass and volume have historically been assessed through cadaver dissection by submerging muscles in a known-volume cylinder and weighing them (Fick, 1910; Weber, 1851). Today, two main imaging techniques are used for muscle volume estimation. MRI estimates volume by approximating slices, with accuracy depending on muscle segmentation and inter-slice distance distance (Barnouin et al., 2015; Nordez et al., 2009). Ultrasound (US) is a faster, portable, and more affordable alternative to MRI, with fewer participant exclusion criteria (MacGillivray et al., 2009). However, US has limitations, including difficulty in identifying muscle boundaries, small field of view, ability to only image the more superficial muscles, and potential tissue deformation due to probe pressure (J. Charles et al., 2022) (Weide et al., 2020).

Measuring Optimal fiber length and initial pennation angle

Optimal fiber length and initial pennation angle are commonly estimated using cadaver dissections and imaging techniques. In dissection studies, researchers cut muscle fibers free and measure fiber length and pennation angle using rulers and goniometers under microscopes (Wickiewicz et al., 1983a). However, instead of determining optimal fiber length by positioning the limb in a joint configuration close to the optimal fascicle length, researchers typically normalize the measured fiber length from a neutral joint configuration using sarcomere length. The equation used for this is:

$$L_o = L_f = L'_f \cdot \frac{L_{Sopt}}{L_s}$$

where L_f indicates the normalized muscle fiber length, L'_f represents the measured (raw) fiber length, L_s stands for the measured sarcomere length within each fiber bundle and L_{Sopt} is the optimal sarcomere length for human muscle. Ward et al. (2009a) used an optimal sarcomere length for human muscle of 2.7 μm , based on the study of (Walker & Schrodt, 1974). Klein Horsman et al. (2007) and Ruggiero et al. (2016) used this same number, whereas Wickiewicz et al. (1983a) used 2.2 μm .

Typically, MSK model datasets measure fiber length from only 5-20 fibers per muscle bundle (Friederich & Brand, 1990; Klein Horsman et al., 2007; Ward et al., 2009a), despite muscles like the biceps brachii containing around 253,000 muscle fibers. This limited sample size assumes that a small subset of fiber measurements can adequately represent a muscle's architectural properties.

Imaging techniques such as Diffusion Tensor Imaging (DTI) and ultrasound (US) are also used to measure fiber length and pennation angles. Ultrasound helps determine fascicle length and pennation angles at selected muscle locations (Bolsterlee et al., 2019), but when the fascicular path exceeds the field of view, missing portions are estimated through linear extrapolation of the fascicular path and aponeurosis (Balshaw et al., 2021; Reeves et al., 2004). DTI, on the other hand, offers three-dimensional measurements of whole-muscle architecture and may be more suitable for smaller muscles with simpler fiber structures (Bolsterlee et al., 2019) (J. P. Charles et al., 2019a). Newer DTI techniques and fiber tractography allow for the inclusion of more fibers in fascicle length determination, providing more accurate estimates (Fouré et al. (2020) João et al. (2022)).

A significant limitation of these imaging techniques is their inability to directly determine optimal fiber length. Particularly with DTI, positioning a limb in a joint configuration near the optimal fascicle length is challenging inside a scanner. As a result, several studies have used regression models, measuring muscle length via dissection or imaging and applying an average optimal fiber length-to-muscle length ratio from prior research to estimate the optimal fiber length (Ward et al., 2009a). This equation is expressed as:

$$L_f = ratio \cdot L_{muscle}$$

where L_{muscle} is the muscle length. However, a recent study has shown that optimal fiber length does not scale in direct proportion to segment length or muscle length, challenging the accuracy of this scaling method (Son et al., 2024a).

Sex-differences

Relative and Absolute muscle mass

Males had significantly higher Mm in muscles compared to females, except for LG, Gmin, and Piri, where the differences were not statistically significant (Figure 2). In one muscle, MG, the Mm age groups differed significantly in mean age (females: 71 years, males: 53 years).

While males had higher absolute Mm, these differences mostly disappeared when considering %Mm. However, males had significantly higher %Mm in RF ($p = 0.028$) and SM ($p = 0.026$), indicating a greater proportion of muscle mass in these biarticular muscles compared to females (RF = 5.5%, SM = 6% in males vs. RF = 4.9%, SM = 5.2% in females). Conversely, females showed higher %Mm in pelvic muscles gluteus maximus (Gmax: F = 26%, M = 21.7%, $p = 0.031$) and gluteus (Gmed: F =

12.6% , M = 9.7%, p = 0.015), as well as in ankle muscles tibialis anterior (TA: F = 3.7%, M = 3.2%, p = 0.006), tibialis posterior (TP: F = 2.7%, M = 2.3%, p = 0.038), and extensor digitorum longus (EDL: F = 1.9%, M = 1.6%, p = 0.032). Piri and QdF were also higher in female, but small sample sizes limit conclusions. There were no significant %Mm differences across age groups.

Comparison generic open-source MSK models

Comparing Mm in the musculoskeletal models with experimental data, Models R and L showed the most consistent representation, generally exceeding male Mm means and best representing male absolute muscle mass, with a few exceptions. Model A mostly fell between male and female means, suggesting it could represent a strong female or a weaker male. Models G and D fluctuated widely, with some muscles exceeding male means and others falling in the low female range, making them inconsistent.

Models G and D fell outside experimental ranges for multiple muscles, inconsistently representing muscle mass distribution for either sex. Models A, L, and R were within experimental ranges. For muscles with significant sex differences in %Mm, Models L and R matched male distribution. Model A aligned with the female distribution for RF, EDL, and Gmed, and the male distribution for TA, TP, and Gmax.

Age-differences

Relative and Absolute muscle mass

There were insufficient experimental data for Pect, QdF, Piri, TFL, and Gmin in the elderly group (n=2) for age-group comparison, and for BFSH, BFLH, LG, Ps, and FDL in the young group (n<5), but enough for the combined BIC and GAS. In muscles where data were available, the elderly had significantly less Mm than the young, except for ST (p=0.072), VL (p=0.076), VI (p=0.087), PerB (p=0.066), Gmax (p=0.156), and Gmed (p=0.987). These non-significant differences still showed a trend of a lower mean Mm in the elderly, except for Gmed, where the means were similar. Adults also showed significantly lower Mm than the young in 14 muscles (Figure 4). Only FHL had a significantly lower mean in the elderly compared to adults.

Most age differences disappeared in the %Mm comparison (Figure 5), excluding muscles with fewer than five samples per group. Young individuals had significantly higher %Mm compared to adults and the elderly for RF (YA=6.1%, AD=5.2%, EL=5%, p=0.007), GAS (YA=10.2%, AD=8.5%, EL=7.8%, p<0.001), and MG (YA=7.9%, AD=5.5%, EL=4.9%, p=0.001). A significant age × sex interaction was found for GAS (p=0.005), with young individuals having higher %Mm compared to the elderly for FHL (YA=2.5%, EL=1.7%, p=0.042). Gmed was significantly *higher* in the elderly than in the young (YA=7.6%, EL=12%, p=0.042). However, the data for young individuals, especially females (Gmed: F/M = 1/4), were limited. A main effect of age was observed for SM, but post hoc analysis did not show significant differences between groups.

Comparison generic open-source MSK models

Model A is the most suitable for representing the elderly, with both Mm and %Mm closely matching the elderly group mean across all muscles. Model R best reflects young adults' Mm, except for ST, which aligns more with elderly values. For %Mm, Model R is mostly consistent with adults across several muscles, making it the best option for non-elderly populations. Model L generally exhibits higher Mm, making it representative of young adults. However, for %Mm, it better reflects the elderly,

particularly for muscles like Gmed, FHL, and GAS, which have significant age-related differences. Model G is inconsistent, with Mm and %Mm fluctuating between young and elderly across muscles, making it unrepresentative of any specific age group. Model D aligns with the elderly for Mm but fluctuates in %Mm across age groups, with some muscles falling outside expected ranges.

Age-sex differences

PCSA comparison generic open-source MSK models

The rules governing the scaling of optimal fiber length based on sex, age, and size remain unclear, and therefore there is no direct translation from Mm to PCSA from the experimental data (Son et al., 2024a). Due to the limited availability of comprehensive lower limb PCSA data, we can only assess differences in PCSA, not %PCSA. However, the results indicate that conclusions derived from muscle mass (Mm) comparisons are also relevant to physiological cross-sectional area (PCSA) regarding the representation of age and sex in generic musculoskeletal (MSK) models (Supplementary Material Tables 1-3).





Figure 2: Sex-related differences in absolute muscles mass (M_m) between females (F) and males (M). The colours in the dots indicate the age-groups (Young, Adult, Elderly). The title is coloured blue if a significant difference was found ($p < 0.05$). The horizontal lines indicate the muscle mass levels of the OpenSim opensource models. Some muscles were not incorporated in the musculoskeletal models (e.g. Pect, QdF). The number below the violin plots indicate the number of specimens included, this differs between muscles depending on the available data from the sources. In brackets is the average age, an asterisk indicates that there is a significant difference in age between the groups.





Figure 3: Sex-related differences in relative muscle mass (%Mm) between females (F) and males (M). The colours in the dots indicate the age-groups (Young, Adult, Elderly). The title is coloured blue if a significant difference was found ($p < 0.05$). The horizontal lines indicate the muscle mass levels of the OpenSim opensource models. Some muscles were not incorporated in the musculoskeletal models (e.g. Pect, QdF). The number below the violin plots indicate the number of specimens included, this differs between muscles depending on the available data from the sources. In brackets is the average age, an asterisk indicates that there is a significant difference in age between the groups.





Figure 4: Age-related differences in absolute muscles mass (M_m) between young (Y), adults (A), and elderly (E). The colours in the dots indicate the sex groups (Female, Male). The title is coloured blue if a significant difference was found ($p < 0.05$). The horizontal lines indicate the muscle mass levels of the OpenSim opensource models. Some muscles were not incorporated in the musculoskeletal models (e.g. Pect, QdF). The number below the violin plots indicate the number of specimens included within brackets the number of females in the group, this differs between muscles depending on the available data from the sources.






Figure 5: Age-related differences in relative muscles mass between young (YA), adults (AD), and elderly (EL). The colours in the dots indicate the sex groups (Female, Male). The title is coloured blue if a significant difference was found ($p < 0.05$). The horizontal lines indicate the muscle mass levels of the OpenSim opensource models. Some muscles were not incorporated in the musculoskeletal models (e.g. Pect, QdF). The number below the violin plots indicate the number of specimens included, this differs between muscles depending on the available data from the sources.

Males > Females (%Mm)




%Mm = relative muscle mass estimated by dividing the mass of each muscle by total lower limb muscle mass

$$\% \frac{\%Mm_{male} - \%Mm_{female}}{\%Mm_{female}} \cdot 100\%$$


$$\% \frac{\%Mm_{female} - \%Mm_{male}}{\%Mm_{male}} \cdot 100\%$$

$$\% \frac{\%Mm_{young} - \%Mm_{elderly}}{\%Mm_{elderly}} \cdot 100\%$$


Females > Males (%Mm)



Young > Adults & Elderly (%Mm)



Young > Elderly



Elderly > Young



Figure 6: Graphic summary of the muscles that had significant differences in %Mm between male and female, and young, adults, and elderly. In the circles, we indicated the percentual differences between the %Mm of groups. Females also had higher %Mm for the Piri and QF muscles compared to men, but due to the limited samples for these muscles we did not include them in this overview.

Discussion

The purpose of this meta-analysis was to use the literature to understand how lower limb muscle PCSA, and thus, maximum isometric force, should be scaled relative to sex and age. Our results show that isometric scaling of maximum isometric force fails to account for age- and sex-related significant differences in relative muscle mass distribution. Current musculoskeletal models show varied representations for age and sex in absolute and relative distribution of muscle mass.

Sex-related differences

Males exhibited significantly higher absolute muscle mass compared to females, but these differences largely disappeared when examining the relative distribution of muscle mass across the leg, with a few exceptions (Figure 6). Males showed significantly higher %Mm in RF and SM, indicating a greater proportion of muscle mass in these biarticular muscles. Conversely, females had much higher %Mm in pelvic muscles (Gmax and Gmed) and several ankle muscles (TA, TP, EDL), along with Piri and QF muscles, though limited samples for the latter two preclude definitive conclusions.

The increased %Mm in pelvic muscles among females may be attributed to anatomical differences in pelvic shape. Females typically have a wider pelvis, resulting in a larger insertion area for gluteal muscles, which likely increases relative muscle mass in this region. Additionally, differences in hip joint geometry between sexes lead to sex-related variations in moment arms (Cueto Fernandez et al., 2024), significantly correlated with Gmed volume (Preininger et al., 2011). In contrast, RF attaches to the iliac spine, which is positioned relatively further from the distal insertion in males due to their taller pelvic shape. This results in a longer RF muscle in males compared to other lower limb muscles, which may lead to greater %Mm. It is important to note that optimal fiber length does not directly scale with muscle length (L_m) ($\frac{L_o}{L_m} = 0.22 \pm 0.04$, (Son et al., 2024a)). Thus, a higher %Mm resulting from longer muscle length may lead to a higher %PCSA, as supported by our analysis of the limited %PCSA data (*Supplementary Material 3*).

Age-related differences

The elderly exhibited significantly less absolute muscle mass compared to young individuals for most muscles, with exceptions ST, VL, VI, PerB, and Gmax, which showed non-significant differences but lower means in the elderly. Gmed mass appeared unaffected by age, consistent with findings by Preininger et al. (2011), which indicated no correlation between age and Gmed volume in 102 older patients. Most age-related differences diminished in %Mm comparisons, except for a few muscles. The young had significantly higher relative muscle mass in RF, MG, and GAS compared to adults and the elderly, and higher relative mass for FHL compared to the elderly. Notably, the elderly showed significantly higher relative muscle mass in Gmed compared to the young. Gmed's primary role in maintaining balance and stabilizing the pelvis contrasts with GAS and RF, which are more involved in dynamic activities like gait. This redistribution of muscle mass may reflect age-related changes in behavior and/or lifestyle. This observation aligns with reported findings in older adults. In daily life activities, there is a proximal redistribution of joint work, possibly linked to an uneven decline in muscle mass (Amiridis et al., 2003; Buddhadev & Martin, 2016; Horak, 2006; McGibbon & Krebs, 1999; Miller et al., 2024).

Representation of age and sex in opensource musculoskeletal models

The age and sex differences in muscle strength distribution are generally not well represented in current opensource MSK models. In particular, Model G inconsistently matched muscle mass distribution for either sex, and fluctuated between young and elderly muscle mass, making it unrepresentative of both groups. This inconsistency probably arises because Model G applied additional strength scaling to Model D to align with joint torque-angle relationships in living subjects (Anderson & Pandy, 1999; Carhart, 2000). Despite attempts to maintain a consistent scaling factor, different factors were ultimately used, especially for bi-articular muscles.

For age representation, Model A was most aligned with the elderly group mean for both Mm and %Mm. Regarding sex representation, it displayed Mm slightly above the female mean and below the male mean across all muscles. For muscles with sex-related differences in %Mm, the model represented females in RF, EDL, and Gmed, and males in TA, TP, and Gmax. Consequently, it does not adequately account for relevant sex differences.

Models R and L were representative of males for both Mm and %Mm, being the only two models demonstrating sex consistency. None of the models adequately represented females for %Mm. Model R is also representative for Mm in the young and for %Mm in adults, making it the best choice for male non-elderly populations.

Although we expected Model L's PCSA and Mm values to align with those typical of the elderly demographic, as it was based on a single elderly male, our results revealed that Model L exhibits higher PCSA and Mm across most muscles, aligning more closely with young male adults. The cadaver was selected for its higher muscularity compared to typical older cadavers, potentially accounting for this inconsistency. However, for %Mm, Model L is more representative of the elderly muscle mass distribution, particularly for muscles with significant age differences: Gmed, FHL, and GAS. This indicates that, while Mm values are elevated, the %Mm remains representative for the elderly age group. Translating PCSA into maximum isometric forces, Model L has a specific tension of 37 N/cm², which is lower than that of other open-source models (60/61 N/cm²), resulting in lower maximum isometric forces compared to these models. Persad et al. (2024) suggest, based on an extensive review of human literature, that the appropriate value for human muscle-specific tension is 26.8 N/cm², indicating that specific tension values used in all models may still be subject to debate.

Limitations

- We assumed that %Mm is a reliable proxy for identifying age- and sex-related differences in %PCSA. However, the rules governing the scaling of optimal fiber length based on sex and size remain unclear. Son et al. (2024a) demonstrated that while muscle mass scales with body mass, fiber length does not. This indicates that PCSA is unlikely to scale isometrically (to the 0.66 power) either. Due to the limited experimental data on these variations, we are unable to draw definitive conclusions at this time.
- We compiled a dataset of lower limb muscle mass from various sources, with records dating back to 1884, when life expectancy was significantly lower (42 years for males and 44 years for females). Determining whether muscles experienced accelerated aging during that period is challenging. However, a comparison between the data from Theile (1884) and Son et al. (2024) reveals no apparent differences in adult muscle measurements. We do not expect that today's longer life expectancy correlates with better muscle health, as evidenced by the increasing prevalence of mobility issues in an aging society. Moreover, modern lifestyles are likely more sedentary. Thus, we have treated these groups as comparable in age while remaining aware of potential differences.

- A scarcity of PCSA data was identified, particularly considering the various methods used for calculation and the lack of data for specific groups, such as adults, young females, elderly males, children, and athletes. Muscle volume data are more prevalent, as this does not require determining optimal fiber length. A more extensive dataset could have been constructed by integrating muscle volume data with muscle architecture from different sources Rajagopal et al. (2016). We chose not to include this method due to potential discrepancies among variables and sources.
- The statistical analysis was performed on data from dissection studies. Note that muscle volumes, and thus PCSA, appear to shrink post-mortem and may underestimate living PCSA (Friederich & Brand, 1990).
- The genetic background of participants is not always explicitly mentioned. Therefore, the current state-of-the-art may not be inclusive of all groups or may be biased toward a particular genetic background.
- This review specified four age groups. However, there is no consensus on the age boundaries per group, and one might argue that the adult group is too broad, losing individuality.

Conclusion

- Isometric scaling of maximum isometric forces in musculoskeletal models fails to account for significant age- and sex-related differences in muscle ratios (%Mm).
- Males have a higher proportion of muscle mass in the rectus femoris and semimembranosus compared to females, reflecting greater distribution toward these biarticular muscles in the lower limb. In contrast, females exhibit higher relative muscle mass in pelvic muscles (gluteus maximus and gluteus medius) and ankle muscles (tibialis anterior, tibialis posterior, and extensor digitorum longus).
- Older adults have a higher relative muscle mass in the gluteus medius than younger individuals, whereas young adults have greater relative muscle mass in the rectus femoris, (medial) gastrocnemius, and flexor hallucis longus.
- Current open-source musculoskeletal (MSK) models exhibit inconsistencies in representing age and sex in terms of absolute and relative muscle mass, with none accurately depicting female muscle mass distribution.
- There is a lack of sufficient data on the physiological cross-sectional area (PCSA), especially to determine %PCSA, which requires measurements on a complete leg to provide these data for the lower limb.

Acknowledgements

This study was funded by NWO-TTW VENI Grant 18145(2021). The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript

References

- Amiridis, I. G., Hatzitaki, V., & Arabatzi, F. (2003). Age-induced modifications of static postural control in humans. *Neuroscience Letters*, *350*(3), 137–140.
- Anderson, F. C., & Pandy, M. G. (1999). A dynamic optimization solution for vertical jumping in three dimensions. *Computer Methods in Biomechanics and Biomedical Engineering*, *2*(3), 201–231.
- Arnold, E. M., Ward, S. R., Lieber, R. L., & Delp, S. L. (2010). A Model of the Lower Limb for Analysis of Human Movement. *Annals of Biomedical Engineering*, *38*(2), 269–279. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10439-009-9852-5>
- Balshaw, T. G., Maden-Wilkinson, T. M., Massey, G. J., & Folland, J. P. (2021). The Human Muscle Size and Strength Relationship: Effects of Architecture, Muscle Force, and Measurement Location. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*, *53*(10), 2140. <https://doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0000000000002691>
- Barber, L., Barrett, R., & Lichtwark, G. (2011). Passive muscle mechanical properties of the medial gastrocnemius in young adults with spastic cerebral palsy. *Journal of Biomechanics*, *44*(13), 2496–2500.
- Barber, L. E. E., HASTINGS-ISON, T., Baker, R., Barrett, R. O. D., & Lichtwark, G. (2011). Medial gastrocnemius muscle volume and fascicle length in children aged 2 to 5 years with cerebral palsy. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology*, *53*(6), 543–548.
- Barnouin, Y., Butler-Browne, G., Moraux, A., Reversat, D., Leroux, G., Béhin, A., McPhee, J. S., Voit, T., & Hogrel, J.-Y. (2015). Comparison of different methods to estimate the volume of the quadriceps femoris muscles using MRI. *Journal of Medical Imaging and Health Informatics*, *5*(6), 1201–1207. <https://doi.org/10.1166/jmihi.2015.1506>
- Blazevich, A. J., Coleman, D. R., Horne, S., & Cannavan, D. (2009). Anatomical predictors of maximum isometric and concentric knee extensor moment. *European Journal of Applied Physiology*, *105*, 869–878.
- Bodine, S. C., Garfinkel, A., Roy, R. R., & Edgerton, V. R. (1988). Spatial distribution of motor unit fibers in the cat soleus and tibialis anterior muscles: local interactions. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *8*(6), 2142–2152.
- Bodine, S., Roy, R. R., Eldred, E., & Edgerton, V. R. (1987). Maximal force as a function of anatomical features of motor units in the cat tibialis anterior. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, *57*(6), 1730–1745.
- Bolsterlee, B., D'Souza, A., & Herbert, R. D. (2019). Reliability and robustness of muscle architecture measurements obtained using diffusion tensor imaging with anatomically constrained tractography. *Journal of Biomechanics*, *86*, 71–78. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2019.01.043>
- Brand, P. W., Beach, R. B., & Thompson, D. E. (1981). Relative tension and potential excursion of muscles in the forearm and hand. *The Journal of Hand Surgery*, *6*(3), 209–219.
- Buddhadev, H. H., & Martin, P. E. (2016). Effects of age and physical activity status on redistribution of joint work during walking. *Gait & Posture*, *50*, 131–136.

- Carhart, M. R. (2000). *Biomechanical analysis of compensatory stepping: implications for paraplegics standing via FNS*. Arizona State University.
- Charles, J., Kissane, R., Hoehfurtner, T., & Bates, K. T. (2022). From fibre to function: are we accurately representing muscle architecture and performance? *Biological Reviews*, 97(4), 1640–1676. <https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12856>
- Charles, J. P., Moon, C.-H., & Anderst, W. J. (2019a). Determining Subject-Specific Lower-Limb Muscle Architecture Data for Musculoskeletal Models Using Diffusion Tensor Imaging. *Journal of Biomechanical Engineering*, 141(6), 60905. <https://doi.org/10.1115/1.4040946>
- Charles, J. P., Moon, C.-H., & Anderst, W. J. (2019b). Determining subject-specific lower-limb muscle architecture data for musculoskeletal models using diffusion tensor imaging. *Journal of Biomechanical Engineering*, 141(6). <https://doi.org/10.1115/1.4040946>
- Cueto Fernandez, J., Seth, A., Harlaar, J., & van der Kruk, E. (2024). DOES DIVERSITY IN MUSCULOSKELETAL MODELS MATTER? *European Society of Biomechanics*.
- Delp, S. L., Loan, J. P., Hoy, M. G., Zajac, F. E., Topp, E. L., & Rosen, J. M. (1990). An interactive graphics-based model of the lower extremity to study orthopaedic surgical procedures. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, 37(8), 757–767. <https://doi.org/10.1109/10.102791>
- Fick, R. (1910). *HANDBUCH DER ANATOMIE UND MECHANIK DER GELENKE UNTER BERÜCKSICHTIGUNG DER BEWEGENDEN MUSKELN* (Vol. 2).
- Fouré, A., Ogier, A. C., Guye, M., Gondin, J., & Bendahan, D. (2020). Muscle alterations induced by electrostimulation are lower at short quadriceps femoris length. *European Journal of Applied Physiology*, 120(2), 325–335. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00421-019-04277-5>
- Friederich, J. A., & Brand, R. A. (1990). Muscle fiber architecture in the human lower limb. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 23(1), 91–95. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9290\(90\)90373-B](https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9290(90)90373-B)
- Fukunaga, T., Roy, R. R., Shellock, F. G., Hodgson, J. A., Day, M. K., Lee, P. L., Kwong-Fu, H., & Edgerton, V. R. (1992). Physiological cross-sectional area of human leg muscles based on magnetic resonance imaging. *Journal of Orthopaedic Research*, 10(6), 926–934.
- Fukunaga, T., Roy, R. R., Shellock, F. G., Hodgson, J. A., & Edgerton, V. R. (1996). Specific tension of human plantar flexors and dorsiflexors. *Journal of Applied Physiology*, 80(1), 158–165.
- Handsfield, G. G., Meyer, C. H., Hart, J. M., Abel, M. F., & Blemker, S. S. (2014). Relationships of 35 lower limb muscles to height and body mass quantified using MRI. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 47(3), 631–638. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2013.12.002>
- Heinen, F., Lund, M. E., Rasmussen, J., & de Zee, M. (2016). Muscle–tendon unit scaling methods of Hill-type musculoskeletal models: An overview. *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part H: Journal of Engineering in Medicine*, 230(10), 976–984.
- Horak, F. B. (2006). Postural orientation and equilibrium: what do we need to know about neural control of balance to prevent falls? *Age and Ageing*, 35(suppl_2), ii7–ii11.
- Horsman, M. D. K. (2007). *The Twente lower extremity model. Consistent dynamic simulation of the human locomotor apparatus*. <https://research.utwente.nl/en/publications/the-twente-lower-extremity-model-consistent-dynamic-simulation-of>

- João, F., Alves, S., Secca, M., Noseworthy, M., & Veloso, A. (2022). Fatigue Effects on the Lower Leg Muscle Architecture Using Diffusion Tensor MRI. *Applied Sciences (Switzerland)*, 12(19). <https://doi.org/10.3390/app12199767>
- Klein Horsman, M. D., Koopman, H. F. J. M., van der Helm, F. C. T., Prosé, L. P., & Veeger, H. E. J. (2007). Morphological muscle and joint parameters for musculoskeletal modelling of the lower extremity. *Clinical Biomechanics (Bristol, Avon)*, 22(2), 239–247. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2006.10.003>
- Lieber, R. L. (2022). Can we just forget about pennation angle? *Journal of Biomechanics*, 132, 110954.
- Lieber, R. L., & Fridén, J. (2000). Functional and clinical significance of skeletal muscle architecture. *Muscle and Nerve*, 23(11), 1647–1666. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-4598\(200011\)23:11<1647::AID-MUS1>3.0.CO;2-M](https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-4598(200011)23:11<1647::AID-MUS1>3.0.CO;2-M)
- MacGillivray, T. J., Ross, E., Simpson, H. A. H. R. W., & Greig, C. A. (2009). 3D Freehand Ultrasound for in vivo Determination of Human Skeletal Muscle Volume. *Ultrasound in Medicine & Biology*, 35(6), 928–935. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ultrasmedbio.2008.11.013>
- McGibbon, C. A., & Krebs, D. E. (1999). Effects of age and functional limitation on leg joint power and work during stance phase of gait. *Journal of Rehabilitation Research and Development*, 36(3), 173–182.
- Méndez, J. (1960). Density and composition of mammalian muscle. *Metabolism*, 9, 184–188.
- Miller, M. F., van der Kruk, E., & Silverman, A. K. (2024). Age and initial position affect movement biomechanics in sit to walk transitions: Whole body balance and trunk control. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 175, 112256.
- Modenese, L., Phillips, A. T. M., & Bull, A. M. J. (2011). An open source lower limb model: Hip joint validation. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 44(12), 2185–2193.
- Narici, M. V, Landoni, L., & Minetti, A. E. (1992). Assessment of human knee extensor muscles stress from in vivo physiological cross-sectional area and strength measurements. *European Journal of Applied Physiology and Occupational Physiology*, 65, 438–444.
- Nordez, A., Jolivet, E., Südhoff, I., Bonneau, D., de Guise, J. A., & Skalli, W. (2009). Comparison of methods to assess quadriceps muscle volume using magnetic resonance imaging. *Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging*, 30(5), 1116–1123. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jmri.21867>
- OpenSim. (n.d.). *London Lower Limb Model*. https://Simtk.Org/Projects/Low_limb_london. .
- OpenSim Confluence. (2024a). *Gait 2392 and 2354 Models*. <https://Opensimconfluence.Atlassian.Net/Wiki/Spaces/OpenSim/Pages/53086215/Gait+2392+and+2354+Models>.
- OpenSim Confluence. (2024b, February). *How Scaling Works - OpenSim Documentation - Global Site*.
- Persad, L. S., Wang, Z., Pino, P. A., Binder-Markey, B. I., Kaufman, K. R., & Lieber, R. L. (2024). Specific Tension of Human Muscle In Vivo: A Systematic Review. *Journal of Applied Physiology*.

- Pfuhl, W. (1937). Die gefiederten Muskeln, ihre Form und ihre Wirkungsweise. *Zeitschrift Für Anatomie Und Entwicklungsgeschichte*, 106(6), 749–769.
- Powell, P. L., Roy, R. R., Kanim, P., Bello, M. A., & Edgerton, V. R. (1984). Predictability of skeletal muscle tension from architectural determinations in guinea pig hindlimbs. *Journal of Applied Physiology*, 57(6), 1715–1721.
- Preininger, B., Schmorl, K., von Roth, P., Winkler, T., Schlattmann, P., Matziolis, G., Perka, C., & Tohtz, S. (2011). A formula to predict patients' gluteus medius muscle volume from hip joint geometry. *Manual Therapy*, 16(5), 447–451.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.math.2011.02.003>
- Rajagopal, A., Dembia, C. L., DeMers, M. S., Delp, D. D., Hicks, J. L., & Delp, S. L. (2016). Full-Body Musculoskeletal Model for Muscle-Driven Simulation of Human Gait. *IEEE Transactions on Bio-Medical Engineering*, 63(10), 2068–2079.
<https://doi.org/10.1109/TBME.2016.2586891>
- Reeves, N. D., Narici, M. V., & Maganaris, C. N. (2004). Effect of resistance training on skeletal muscle-specific force in elderly humans. *Journal of Applied Physiology*, 96(3), 885–892.
<https://doi.org/10.1152/jappphysiol.00688.2003>
- Rockenfeller, R., Günther, M., Clemente, C. J., & Dick, T. J. M. (2024). Rethinking the physiological cross-sectional area of skeletal muscle reveals the mechanical advantage of pennation. *Royal Society Open Science*, 11(9), 240037.
- Ruggiero, M., Cless, D., & Infantolino, B. (2016). Upper and lower limb muscle architecture of a 104 year-old cadaver. *PLoS ONE*, 11(12). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0162963>
- Seireg, A., & Arvikar, R. J. (1973). A mathematical model for evaluation of forces in lower extremities of the musculo-skeletal system. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 6(3), 313–326.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9290\(73\)90053-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9290(73)90053-5)
- Simtk. (2023, December 15). *Musculoskeletal Models - OpenSim Documentation - Global Site*.
- Son, J., Ward, S. R., & Lieber, R. L. (2024a). Scaling relationships between human leg muscle architectural properties and body size. *Journal of Experimental Biology*, 227(6), jeb246567.
<https://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.246567>
- Son, J., Ward, S. R., & Lieber, R. L. (2024b). Scaling relationships between human leg muscle architectural properties and body size. *Journal of Experimental Biology*, 227(6), jeb246567.
- Theile, F. W. (1884). Gewichtsbestimmungen zum Entwicklung des Muskelsystems und des Skelettes beim Menschen. (No Title).
- van der Kruk, E., Silverman, A. K., Koizia, L., Reilly, P., Fertleman, M., & Bull, A. M. J. (2021). Age-related compensation: Neuromusculoskeletal capacity, reserve & movement objectives. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 122, 110385.
- van der Kruk, E., Strutton, P., Koizia, L. J., Fertleman, M., Reilly, P., & Bull, A. M. J. (2022). Why do older adults stand-up differently to young adults?: investigation of compensatory movement strategies in sit-to-walk. *Npj Aging*, 8(1), 13.

- Veeger, H. E. J., Van Der Helm, F. C. T., Van Der Woude, L. H. V, Pronk, G. M., & Rozendal, R. H. (1991). Inertia and muscle contraction parameters for musculoskeletal modelling of the shoulder mechanism. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 24(7), 615–629.
- Walker, S. M., & Schrodt, G. R. (1974). I segment lengths and thin filament periods in skeletal muscle fibers of the Rhesus monkey and the human. *The Anatomical Record*, 178(1), 63–81.
- Ward, S. R., Eng, C. M., Smallwood, L. H., & Lieber, R. L. (2009a). Are Current Measurements of Lower Extremity Muscle Architecture Accurate? *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research*, 467(4), 1074–1082. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11999-008-0594-8>
- Ward, S. R., Eng, C. M., Smallwood, L. H., & Lieber, R. L. (2009b). Are current measurements of lower extremity muscle architecture accurate? *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research*, 467(4), 1074–1082.
- Weber, E. F. (1851). Ueber die Langenverhältnisse der Fleischfasern der Muskeln im allgemeinen. *Berichte Über Die Verhandlungen Der Königlich Sachsische Akademie Der Wissenschaften Zu Leipsig, Mathematisch-Physische Classe. Leipzig: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.*
- Wickiewicz, T. L., Roy, R. R., Powell, P. L., & Edgerton, V. R. (1983a). Muscle Architecture of the Human Lower Limb. *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research*®, 179, 275. https://journals.lww.com/clinorthop/Abstract/1983/10000/Muscle_Architecture_of_the_Human_Lower_Limb.42.aspx
- Wickiewicz, T. L., Roy, R. R., Powell, P. L., & Edgerton, V. R. (1983b). Muscle architecture of the human lower limb. *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research*®, 179, 275–283.
- Yamaguchi, G. T., & Zajac, F. E. (1989). A planar model of the knee joint to characterize the knee extensor mechanism. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 22(1), 1–10.

Supplementary Material 1 - Sensitivity of model outcomes to absolute and ratio of maximum isometric force levels

It is crucial to understand the sensitivity of published findings to PCSA values. In musculoskeletal modeling, muscle activations and forces are estimated using this equation:

$$\sum_{m=1}^n (a_m F_m^0) r_{m,j} = \tau_j \quad (\text{eq. 6})$$

where a_m is the muscle activation, $r_{m,j}$ is the muscle moment of muscle m around joint j , and τ_j is the torque around joint j . For our focus on estimating sensitivity of the outcomes within the same movement, the maximum force can be considered dependent only on F_m^0 .

Given the redundancy of the muscular system, an extra cost function is necessary to solve the overdetermined system. Most applications, like OpenSim, employed the minimization of muscle activation to estimate effort:

$$J = \sum_{m=1}^n (a_m)^p \quad (\text{eq. 7})$$

With $p = 2$ as default and the cubic function ($p = 3$) gaining more attention.

To assess the impact of a change in maximum isometric force ratio between muscles, we consider a sagittal 2-segment-model with a hinge joint actuated by two muscles acting in the same direction. The equation and cost function for this system are:

$$\tau = a_1 F_1^0 r_1 + a_2 F_2^0 r_2 \quad (\text{eq. 8})$$

$$J = a_1^2 + a_2^2 \quad (\text{eq. 9})$$

Based on this relationship, we can rewrite this as

$$a_1 = \frac{1}{F_1^0 r_1} (\tau - F_2^0 r_2 a_2) \quad (\text{eq. 10})$$

$$J = \left(\frac{\tau}{F_1^0 r_1} \right)^2 - 2\tau \frac{F_2^0 r_2}{(F_1^0 r_1)^2} a_2 + \left(\frac{(F_2^0 r_2)^2}{(F_1^0 r_1)^2} + 1 \right) a_2^2 \quad (\text{eq. 11})$$

To minimize this cost function, we take the derivative to obtain:

$$J' = -2\tau \frac{F_2^0 r_2}{(F_1^0 r_1)^2} + 2 \left(\frac{(F_2^0 r_2)^2}{(F_1^0 r_1)^2} + 1 \right) a_2 \quad (\text{eq. 12})$$

We can analytically solve this for a_2 and a_1 :

$$a_1 = \frac{\tau}{F_1^0 r_1} \left(1 - \frac{(F_2^0 r_2)^2}{(F_2^0 r_2)^2 + (F_1^0 r_1)^2} \right) \quad (\text{eq. 13})$$

$$a_2 = \tau \frac{F_2^0 r_2}{(F_2^0 r_2)^2 + (F_1^0 r_1)^2} \quad (\text{eq. 14})$$

Now we introduce ratios for the maximum isometric forces and moment arms, such that the equations can be rewritten as

$$R_{isoF} = \frac{F_2^0}{F_1^0} \quad (eq. 15)$$

$$R_{arm} = \frac{r_2}{r_1} \quad (eq. 16)$$

$$a_1 = \frac{\tau}{F_1^0 r_1} \left(1 - \frac{R_{isoF}^2 R_{arm}^2}{R_{isoF}^2 R_{arm}^2 + 1} \right), \quad 0 \leq a_1 \leq 1 \quad (eq. 17)$$

$$a_2 = \frac{\tau}{F_1^0 r_1} \frac{R_{isoF} R_{arm}}{R_{isoF}^2 R_{arm}^2 + 1}, \quad 0 \leq a_2 \leq 1 \quad (eq. 18)$$

From this follows that

$$\frac{a_2}{a_1} = R_{isoF} R_{arm} \quad (eq. 19)$$

In summary, as long as none of the muscles reach their maximum activation levels, the muscle activation pattern is determined by the ratio of moment arms and maximum isometric forces. If all maximum isometric forces are uniformly increased, the activation patterns will be scaled inversely by the same factor while the resulting muscle forces will be the same. Conversely, a change in the ratio of maximum isometric forces between muscles will lead to a relative proportional change in muscle activation levels, irrespective of the joint moment levels, overall activation levels, or the absolute values of maximum isometric forces. This also holds for an n muscle model where the ratio between the muscles ($F_{iso-F,1} : F_{iso-F,2} : \dots : F_{iso-F,m}$) is the same as the activation ratios ($a_1 : a_2 : \dots : a_m$) when a quadratic cost function is used. If a cubic cost function is used, the ratios between the activations ($a_1 : a_2 : \dots : a_m$) is equal to $\sqrt{F_{isoF,1}} : \sqrt{F_{isoF,2}} : \dots : \sqrt{F_{isoF,m}}$.

Captions Supplementary Material Tables

Supplementary Material Table 1: Graphical Overviews of experimental PCSA values for the Hip Joint. Error bars with rounded ends represent 95% confidence interval, error bars with straight ends represent the range of PCSA values. Indicated are the studies that have used the mean fiber length () to estimate PCSA, and the studies that have used the optimal fiber length (**).*

Supplementary Material Table 2: Graphical Overviews of experimental PCSA values for the Knee Joint. Error bars with rounded ends represent 95% confidence interval, error bars with straight ends represent the range of PCSA values. Indicated are the studies that have used the mean fiber length () to estimate PCSA, and the studies that have used the optimal fiber length (**).*

Supplementary Material Table 3: Graphical Overviews of experimental PCSA values for the Ankle joint. Error bars with rounded ends represent 95% confidence interval, error bars with straight ends represent the range of PCSA values. Indicated are the studies that have used the mean fiber length () to estimate PCSA, and the studies that have used the optimal fiber length (**).*

Supplementary Material 2 – Data on lower limb muscles in adults based on dissection

	<u>women</u>	<u>men</u>	<u>Unknown</u>	<u>parameters</u>	<u>Body parts</u>
Theile (1884)	6 (22-44)	10 (26-57)		Muscle mass	Full body
Johnson, Polgar, Weightman, and Appleton (1973)		6 (17-30)		Distribution of Type I and Type II muscle fibers	Full body
Dostal and Andrews (1981)		1		Musculotendon origins and insertions	Pelvis & right femur
Wickiewicz, Roy, Powell, and Edgerton (1983)			3	Architectural features of the major knee flexors/extensors and ankle plantarflexors/dorsi flexors	Legs
White, Yack, and Winter (1989)			unknown	Musculotendon origins and insertions Scaled to model of 66.5 kg, 1.77m height	6 pelves, nine femurs, and combined tibia-fibula, one reconstructed skeletal foot, one cadaver foot
Seireg and Arvikar (1989)			Skeleton of average size and several approximately same size cadavers (171 cm 68 kg)	Musculotendon parameters and coordinate data	Full body
Friedrich & Brand (1990) Delp et al. (1990) based on this	1 (63)	1 (37)		Muscle length, pennation angle, muscle, volume, average fiber lengths, PCSA	Legs
Fukunaga (1992, 1996)			2	Fiber length	Soleus
Woodley and Mercer	3 (68-88)	3(68-88)		Musculotendon origins and insertions Muscle	Hamstring muscles

(2005)				<i>length, pennation angle, muscle, volume, PCSA, mass, tendon length, innervation</i>	
Klein Horsman (2007)		1 (77)		<i>Musculotendon origins and insertions Muscle length, pennation angle, muscle, volume, PCSA, mass, optimal fiber length, tendon length</i>	Right leg
Ward, Eng, Smallwood, & Lieber. (2009)	12 (83 ± 9)	9 (83 ± 9)		<i>Musculotendon origins and insertions Muscle length, pennation angle, muscle, volume, PCSA, mass, optimal fiber length, tendon length</i>	Lower extremity
Regev (2011)	7 (53±2)	7 (47 ±6.5)		<i>Musculotendon origins and insertions Muscle length, pennation angle, muscle, volume, PCSA, mass, tendon length, innervation</i>	<i>Psoas Major</i>
Barker (2014)	2 (54-90)	4 (54-90)		<i>Muscle length, Volume, PCSA</i>	<i>Gluteus maximus</i>
Takizawa (2014)			10 (75–91)	<i>Muscle length, muscle fiber length and PCSA of each portion of the muscles</i>	<i>adductor magnus, pectineus, adductor longus, and adductor brevis</i>
Ruggiero (2016)	1 (104)			<i>Musculotendon origins and insertions Muscle length, pennation angle, muscle, volume, PCSA, mass, optimal fiber length, tendon length</i>	Full body

Sopher (2017)		8 (80 ± 5)		Musculotendon origins and insertions Muscle length, pennation angle, muscle, volume, PCSA, mass, optimal fiber length, tendon length	Ankle muscles
Charles et al. (2019)	1 (22)	2 (36, 50)		Musculotendon origins and insertions Muscle length, pennation angle, muscle, volume, PCSA, mass, optimal fiber length, tendon length	Lower extremity
Wood (2020)	12 (75)	13 (76)		Muscle volume, muscle length, PCSA	structure of the popliteus and semimembranosus muscles
Takeda (2023)	8 (82.0±6.4)	8 (88.4±6.4)		Musculotendon origins and insertions, PCSA, muscle volume	Hamstring muscles
Son et al. (2024)	6 (49.7±5.7)	7 (49.7±5.7)		Muscle mass, muscle length, Optimal Fiber Length, PCSA	Lower extremity

Supplementary Material 3 - Sensitivity of model outcomes to absolute and ratio of maximum isometric force levels

