On the structural identifiability of joint parameters from motion capture data
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Abstract—To identify the joint parameters (e.g. the position of the joint center for a spherical joint, the position and the orientation of the joint axis for a revolute joint, etc.) from motion capture data, existing provably-correct algorithms require that at least three markers be attached to either of the two links adjacent to the joint. However, as shown in this article, it turns out that the identification of the joint parameters requires, for most types of joints, strictly less than three markers on any link. More precisely, we prove the structural identifiability of joint parameters in the following cases: (a) a spherical joint with two markers attached to each of the two adjacent links; (b) a revolute joint with two markers attached to one of the two links, and one marker attached to the other. We provide a practical algorithm to do the identification in case (a). Finally, we show that identification cannot be achieved with strictly fewer markers than listed in (a) and (b).

I. INTRODUCTION

Recent applications of motion capture technology, such as musculo-skeletal modeling (see e.g. [7] and references therein) or computer animation (see e.g. [8] and references therein), require the mapping of motion capture data (usually the 3D positions of optical markers) onto an animated skeletal model of the captured subject. A skeletal model usually consists of a certain number of rigid links connected to each other by mechanical joints: e.g. the hip, which connects the trunk and the thigh in the manner of a spherical – or ball – joint, or the knee, which connects the thigh and the Shank in the manner of a revolute – or hinge – joint. Since usually the markers cannot be attached directly to the critical locations on the joint (the joint center in a spherical joint, the joint axis in a revolute joint, etc.), an essential task in motion capture analysis consists of determining the joint parameters indirectly from the recorded positions of the markers attached to its adjacent links.

In the case of spherical joints, if one link is held stationary or if three markers are attached to one of the two adjacent links, efficient algorithms (see a review in [2]) have been proposed to determine the position of the joint centers. However, in many applications, the links are non-stationary and the total number of markers is limited – sometimes to as few as 16 markers in a full-body setting – making the aforementioned algorithms inapplicable. One way to overcome this difficulty consists of hand-adjusting the positions of the joint centers, but this method is time-consuming and provides no guarantee as for the correctness of the so-determined positions. Other methods consist of solving a very large nonlinear optimization problem [6], but such methods typically suffer from the problem of local minima and usually involve extra penalty costs (e.g. the distance penalty in [6], solely intended to guarantee the convergence of the algorithm to sensible values).

In fact, as shown in this article, the identification of joint parameters requires strictly less than three markers on any link. More precisely, we propose to prove the structural identifiability [1] of the joint parameters in the following cases: (a) a spherical joint with two markers attached to each of the adjacent links; (b) a revolute joint with two markers attached to one of the two links, and one marker attached to the other. By structural identifiability, we mean that the joints and links are supposed to be strictly rigid (the distance of a marker to the joint center or axis is strictly constant) and that there is no measurement noise. Structural identifiability is a necessary condition for actual identifiability: if a system is non structurally identifiable, then no algorithm can achieve reliable identification in practice. Note however that the converse is not true in general. Here, in addition to the structural identifiability results, we also present a practical algorithm to achieve reliable identification in case (a) and compare the performance of this algorithm with those of existing algorithms [2, 3, 6]. Finally, we show that structural identification cannot be achieved with strictly fewer markers than listed in (a) and (b), establishing thereby the minimum numbers of markers required for parameter identification of spherical and revolute joints.

II. GEOMETRIC RELATIONS BETWEEN TWO RIGID LINKS

A. General considerations

Consider two rigid links \( \mathcal{A} \) and \( \mathcal{B} \), which are connected together by a joint (prismatic, revolute, spherical, etc.), whose position and orientation, both in space and with respect to \( \mathcal{A} \) and \( \mathcal{B} \), are unknown. A certain number of markers are attached to each link, say \( p \) markers \( A_1, \ldots, A_p \) on \( \mathcal{A} \) and \( q \) markers \( B_1, \ldots, B_q \) on \( \mathcal{B} \). Without loss of generality, we can suppose \( p \geq q \) and subsequently place ourselves in a reference frame \( \mathcal{F} \) where the \( p \) markers of \( \mathcal{A} \) are fixed. Remark that, if \( p \geq 3 \), link \( \mathcal{A} \) is fixed in \( \mathcal{F} \), whereas, if \( p = 2 \), the position and orientation of \( \mathcal{A} \) is only determined up to a rotation around the axis formed by the two markers at hand.

Let us next denote the coordinates of \( B_1, \ldots, B_q \) in \( \mathcal{F} \) by \( \Omega = (x_1, y_1, z_1, \ldots, x_q, y_q, z_q) \), which we call the output of the system. The set of all possible outputs corresponding to all possible values of the joint is denoted by \( \mathcal{S} \). For each frame \( i \) of the motion capture data, we thus have one sample output
Let \(\Pi\) denote a tuple of (unknown) parameters that describes the position and orientation of the joint in \(\mathcal{F}\). For instance, for a spherical joint, \(\Pi\) can be the Cartesian coordinates \((x, y, z)\) or the cylindrical coordinates \((d, r, \theta)\) of the joint center \(J\) in \(\mathcal{F}\) (see Fig. 1). Following the remark of the previous paragraph, if \(p \geq 3\), then \((x, y, z)\) or \((d, r, \theta)\) are constant across the frames. By contrast, if \(p = 2\), then \((x, y, z)\) and \((d, r, \theta)\) are not constant. More precisely, if the axis of the cylindrical coordinate system coincides with the axis formed by the two markers of \(\mathcal{A}\), then \((d, r)\) are constant across the frames and \(\theta\) is variable. We then denote by \(\Pi_c\) the tuple of constant parameters and \(\Pi_v\) the tuples of variable parameters. Similarly, we denote by \(\Sigma_c\), \(\Sigma_v\) the tuples of (unknown) constant and variable parameters that describe the positions and orientations of \(B_1 \ldots B_3\) with respect to the joint. For instance, again in the case of spherical joint and \(q = 1\), \(\Sigma_c\) can consist of the distance \(\rho\) between the joint to the marker and \(\Sigma_v\) can consist of the azimuth and inclination angles \((\phi, \psi)\) (see Fig. 1).
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Fig. 1. Example of a spherical joint \(J\) connecting two rigid links. Two markers \(A_1, A_2\) are attached to link \(\mathcal{A}\) and one marker \(B_1\) is attached to link \(\mathcal{B}\). Note that the constant parameters \((d, r, \rho)\), in blue, are the same for all samples \(B^{(i)}\), whereas the variable parameters \((\theta, \phi, \psi)\), in red, change for each \(B^{(i)}\).

Finally, let \(f\) be the function that relates these parameters to the output as follows

\[
\Omega = f(\Pi_c, \Pi_v, \Sigma_c, \Sigma_v).
\]

Note that this function \(f\) can be computed beforehand for each type of joint. For instance, again in the case of a spherical joint and \(p = 2\), \(q = 1\), we have \(\Omega = (x_1, y_1, z_1)\), \(\Pi_c = (d, r)\), \(\Pi_v = \theta\), \(\Sigma_c = \rho\), \(\Sigma_v = (\phi, \psi)\) and \(f\) is given by

\[
\begin{align*}
x_1 &= r \cos \theta + \rho \cos \phi \sin \psi \\
y_1 &= r \sin \theta + \rho \sin \phi \sin \psi \\
z_1 &= d + \rho \cos \psi.
\end{align*}
\]

B. Problem definition

Suppose that we have at our disposal a \(N\)-sample \((\Omega^{(1)}, \ldots, \Omega^{(N)})\). By construction, the actual joint parameters \((\Pi_c, \Pi_v^{(1)}, \ldots, \Pi_v^{(N)}, \Sigma_c^{(1)}, \ldots, \Sigma_v^{(1)}, \ldots, \Sigma_v^{(N)})\) are solutions of the following system of equations in the unknowns \((X, X^1, \ldots, X^N, Y, Y^1, \ldots, Y^N)\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\Omega^{(1)} &= f(X, X^1, Y, Y^1) \\
& \vdots \\
\Omega^{(N)} &= f(X, X^N, Y, Y^N).
\end{align*}
\]

The goal of the present article – identifying the position and orientation of the joint – can then be formulated through the following questions:

1) Is the tuple \((\Pi_c, \Pi_v^{(1)}, \ldots, \Pi_v^{(N)})\) unique? That is, if \((\Pi_c', \Pi_v'^{(1)}, \ldots, \Pi_v'^{(N)}, \Sigma_c^{(1)}, \ldots, \Sigma_v^{(1)}, \ldots, \Sigma_v^{(N)})\) is also solution of (1), do we necessarily have \((\Pi_c', \Pi_v'^{(1)}, \ldots, \Pi_v'^{(N)}) = (\Pi_c, \Pi_v^{(1)}, \ldots, \Pi_v^{(N)})\)?

2) If the \((\Pi_c, \Pi_v^{(1)}, \ldots, \Pi_v^{(N)})\) is unique, can we determine it from the \(N\)-sample at our disposal?

If the answers to the above two questions are positive, then we say that the \(N\)-sample at our disposal is identifying. In the opposite case, we say that the \(N\)-sample is non-identifying. We can now state the following definition of identifiability

**Definition 1** We say that the case \((p, q)\) – when \(p\) markers are attached to \(\mathcal{A}\) and \(q\) markers are attached to \(\mathcal{B}\) – is \(N\)-identifiable if the set of non-identifying \(N\)-samples has measure 0 in \(\mathcal{S}\). If there is no such \(N\) such that \((p, q)\) is \(N\)-identifiable, then the case \((p, q)\) is said to be non-identifiable.

The practical meaning of Definition 1 is clear. If the case \((p, q)\) is \(N\)-identifiable then, given \(N\) random samples, almost surely, one can determine unambiguously the joint position and orientation in each frame. By contrast, if the case \((p, q)\) is non-identifiable, then no matter how many samples we have at our disposal, we can never determine with certainty and unambiguously the position and orientation of the joint.

**Remark 1** Clearly, if the case \((p, q)\) is \(N\)-identifiable then so are the case \((q, p)\) and the cases \((p', q)\) for all \(p' \geq p\). Similarly, if the case \((p, q)\) is non-identifiable then so are the case \((q, p)\) and the cases \((p', q)\) for all \(p' \leq p\).

**Remark 2** Why identifiability can be achieved for only almost all and not for all \(N\)-samples? This is because of degenerate cases when the \(N\)-samples do not excite all the degrees of freedom of the joint. For a concrete example, see section IV-A.

Note that the notion of identifiability studied in this article is not the same as the homonymous notion in control theory. The problem of joint parameters identification is formulated here in purely geometric terms and the actual identification – when possible – requires only a finite number of samples. On the other hand, this problem may also be formulated as the identification of the parameters of a control system if one uses the continuous time series of the positions of the markers. However, in such a formulation, one would need to take time derivatives, which would amplify the effect of measurement noise.

III. IDENTIFIABILITY RESULTS FOR REVOLUTE JOINTS

**A. The (2,1) case is 5-identifiable**

To describe the position and orientation of the revolute joint axis – which is basically a line – in \(\mathcal{F}\), we use the Denavit-Hartenberg convention (see Fig. 2, left). Following the notation convention of section II-A, one can note \(\Pi_c = (d, r, \alpha)\), \(\Pi_v = \theta\), \(\Sigma_c = (l, \rho)\), \(\Sigma_v = \beta\). The key here is to first obtain an equation relating \(\Omega\) to the constant parameters \(\Pi_c, \Sigma_c\), by eliminating the variable parameters \(\Pi_v, \Sigma_v\).
1) Eliminating the variable parameters: The Denavit-Hartenberg matrix is given by

\[
D = \begin{pmatrix}
\cos \theta & -\sin \theta \cos \alpha & \sin \theta \sin \alpha & r \cos \theta \\
\sin \theta & \cos \theta \cos \alpha & -\cos \theta \sin \alpha & r \sin \theta \\
0 & \sin \alpha & \cos \alpha & d \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

Thus, the coordinates of \(O_B\) in \(F\) is given by

\[
D(0,0,l,1)^\top = \begin{pmatrix}
l \sin \theta \sin \alpha + r \cos \theta \\
-l \cos \theta \sin \alpha + r \sin \theta \\
l \cos \alpha + d \\
1
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

To eliminate the variable parameter \(\beta\), remark that, a point \((x,y,z)\) is on the circle of radius \(\rho\), centered at \(O_\theta\), and orthogonal to the joint axis \((z_0)\) if and only if

\[
\begin{align*}
x - l \sin \theta \sin \alpha - r \cos \theta &= \rho^2, \\
y + l \cos \theta \sin \alpha - r \sin \theta &= 0,
\end{align*}
\]

and

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
x - l \sin \theta \sin \alpha - r \cos \theta \\
y + l \cos \theta \sin \alpha - r \sin \theta \\
z - l \cos \alpha - d
\end{pmatrix}^\top
\begin{pmatrix}
\sin \theta \sin \alpha \\
-\cos \theta \sin \alpha \\
\cos \alpha
\end{pmatrix} = 0.
\]

Developing condition (3) yields

\[
x \cos \theta = \frac{l + d \cos \alpha - z \cos \alpha}{\sin \alpha}.
\]

Developing next condition (2) yields, after rearrangements,

\[
x^2 + y^2 + z^2 + l^2 + r^2 + d^2 - \rho^2 +
\]

\[
2l d \cos \alpha - 2 z (l \cos \alpha + d) - 2 l \sin \alpha A - 2 r B = 0,
\]

where \(A = x \sin \theta - y \cos \theta\) and \(B = x \cos \theta + y \sin \theta\). Substituting \(A\) by the expression of equation (4) and regrouping terms then lead to

\[
R^2 + Q - 2zd = 2r B,
\]

where \(R^2 = x^2 + y^2 + z^2\) and \(Q = r^2 + d^2 - l^2 - \rho^2\). Remark next that, by the definitions of \(A\) and \(B\), one has \(A^2 + B^2 = x^2 + y^2\). Equation (5) is then equivalent to

\[
R^2 + Q - 2zd = 2r \sqrt{x^2 + y^2 - \frac{(l + d \cos \alpha - z \cos \alpha)^2}{\sin \alpha}}.
\]

Squaring the two sides of (6) and rearranging the terms then gives

\[
(M_1 \ldots M_5)(Y_1 \ldots Y_5)^\top = K,
\]

where

\[
\begin{align*}
M_1 &= -4 R^2 z \\
M_2 &= 2 R^2 \\
M_3 &= -4 z \\
M_4 &= 1 \\
M_5 &= 4 z^2
\end{align*}
\]

and

\[
K = -R^4.
\]

Remark that, because of the squaring operation, equation (7) is only a necessary (but not sufficient) condition for \(\Omega = f(\Pi_c, \Pi_v, \Sigma_c, \Sigma_v)\). This point will be relevant later on.

2) Obtaining a linear system: Given now a 5-sample \(\{(x^{(1)}, y^{(1)}, z^{(1)}), \ldots, (x^{(5)}, y^{(5)}, z^{(5)})\}\), one can construct 5 equations similar to (7). Grouping these equations together, one obtains the matrix identity

\[
MY = K,
\]

where \(Y = (Y_1 \ldots Y_5)^\top\) and \(M\) and \(K\) are respectively a \(5 \times 5\) matrix and a \(5 \times 1\) vector constructed from the \(x^{(1)}, y^{(1)}, z^{(1)}, \ldots, x^{(5)}, y^{(5)}, z^{(5)}\).

Consider next the linear system of equations in the unknown \(Z\)

\[
MZ = K.
\]

By construction, this equation has at least one solution \(\hat{Z} = \hat{Y}\). This solution is unique if \(\det(M) \neq 0\).

3) The set of zeros of \(\det(M)\): Developing \(\det(M)\) and replacing the \(R^{(i)}\) by their expressions in terms of \((x^{(i)}, y^{(i)}, z^{(i)})\) lead to

\[
\det(M) = P(x^{(1)}, y^{(1)}, z^{(1)}, \ldots, x^{(5)}, y^{(5)}, z^{(5)}),
\]

where \(P\) is a polynomial in 15 variables.

Let us have closer look at \(S\). By definition, \(S\) is the set of all \((x,y,z)\) that satisfy equation (6). Solving equation (6) in \(z\) then gives \(z\) as an algebraic function (with possibly zero or multiple values) of \(x, y\)

\[
z = g(x,y).
\]

Replacing now \(z^{(i)}\) by \(g(x^{(i)}, y^{(i)})\) in (11) then gives the following identity

\[
\det(M) = h(x^{(1)}, y^{(1)}, \ldots, x^{(5)}, y^{(5)}),
\]

where \(h\) is an algebraic functions (with possibly zero or multiple values) in 10 variables. Furthermore, \(h\) is not the zero function (we have verified this by computing the value of \(h\) for a particular 5-sample). Therefore, by a well-known result on algebraic functions, the set of zeros of \(h\) has measure 0 in \(\mathbb{R}^{10}\). As a consequence, the
set of \((x^{(1)}, y^{(1)}, z^{(1)}), \ldots, (x^{(5)}, y^{(5)}, z^{(5)})\) in \(S^5\) such that \(\det(M) = 0\) also has measure 0.

4) Determining the joint parameters: Given now a 5-sample \(\{(x^{(1)}, y^{(1)}, z^{(1)}), \ldots, (x^{(5)}, y^{(5)}, z^{(5)})\}\) such that \(\det(M) \neq 0\), one can solve system (10) to obtain a unique \(\mathbf{Z}\). Letting \(\mathbf{Z} = (Z_1, \ldots, Z_5)^T\), one has to solve the following systems to recover \(\Pi_c\) and \(\Sigma_c\):

\[
\begin{align*}
\begin{cases}
    d - 2r^2 &= Z_1 \\
    Qd - 2r^2 \cos \alpha (1 + \cos \alpha) &= Z_2 \\
    Q^2 + 4r^2 (1 + \cos \alpha)^2 &= Z_3 \\
    d^2 + 4r^2 \sin^2 \alpha &= Z_4 \\
    d^2 + a^2 &= Z_5
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]

(12)

The first equation of the system gives \(d = Z_1\). Solving the remaining equations of the system by substitution leads to the following third-degree polynomial equation in \(Q\):

\[-Q^3 + aQ^2 + bQ + c = 0,\]  

(13)

where \(a = 2(Z_0^2 - Z_1^2) + Z_2 + 2Z_1^2, b = -4Z_1Z_3 + Z_4, c = 2Z_0^2 - Z_4(2Z_0^2 - Z_1^2) + Z_2^2)\).

Equation (13) has 3 solutions (including possibly non-real solutions) \(Q_1, Q_2, Q_3\). For each \(k = 1, 2, 3\), one can next compute

\[
\begin{align*}
    r_k &= \sqrt{\frac{Q_k + Z_0}{2}} \\
    \alpha_k &= \arcsin \left(\sqrt{\frac{Z_2 + Q_k d}{2r_k^2 - d^2}}\right) \\
    l_k &= \frac{Z_0^2 - d^2 \cos \alpha_k}{r_k^2 + d^2 - l_k^2 - Q_k} \\
    \rho_k &= \sqrt{r_k^2 + d^2} - l_k - Q_k
\end{align*}
\]

Remark that one of the \(Q_k\) corresponds to the extraneous solution added when squaring (5). This solution can be easily discarded by checking whether (5) is true for all samples. Next, a second \(Q_k\) is usually associated with non-real values for \(r_k, \alpha_k, l_k, \rho_k\), and can also be discarded. Thus, there remains a unique \(Q_k\), associated with unique values of \(r, \alpha, l, \rho\).

Finally, for each sample \(i\), one can recover a unique \(\theta^{(i)}\) by solving (4), and next a unique \(\beta^{(i)}\) by a similar procedure.

B. The (1,1) case is non-identifiable

Here, \(\Pi_c\) consists of a single parameter \(r\), which is the distance between the joint axis and the marker of \(\mathcal{A}\) (see Fig. 2, right). Likewise, \(\Sigma_c\) consists of a single parameter \(\rho\), the distance between the joint axis and the marker of \(\mathcal{B}\).

Assume that we are given \(r, \rho\), whose associated set of outputs is denoted \(S\). Our aim is to show that there exists \(r', \rho'\) with \(r' \neq r\) such that \(S' \cap S\) has measure 0, where \(S'\) is the set of outputs associated with \(r', \rho'\).

Consider indeed \(r' = r - \delta, \rho' = \rho + \delta\) (for some small \(\delta > 0\)) and the set \(S_\Delta \subset S\) consisting of samples whose distance from \(A\) is larger than some \(\Delta > 0\). Note first that the measure of \(S_\Delta\) is \(> 0\). Consider next an arbitrary sample \(B \in S_\Delta\) and a line \(L\) such that \(d(B, L) = \rho\) and \(d(A, L) = r\), where \(d\) denotes the distance between a line and a point. Such a line exists because \(B \in S\). Based on Fig. 2, one can construct another line \(L'\), such that \(d(B, L') = \rho'\) and \(d(A, L') = r'\), proving thereby that \(B \in S'\). Since \(B\) was chosen arbitrarily in \(S_\Delta\), one has \(S_\Delta \subset S'\).

IV. IDENTIFIABILITY RESULTS FOR SPHERICAL JOINTS

A. The (3,1) case is 4-identifiable

Here, since three markers are attached to link \(\mathcal{A}\), it is fixed in the coordinate frame \(\mathcal{F}\), and so is the joint center \(J\). Thus, following the notation convention of section II-A, one has \(\Pi_c = \{(x, y, z, j)\}, \Sigma_c = \rho, \Sigma_c = (\phi, \psi)\) (see Fig. 3, left).

Remark that the set \(S\) of all possible outputs is actually a sphere of center \(J\) and of radius \(\rho\). Given now 4 random samples \(\{B^{(1)}, B^{(2)}, B^{(3)}, B^{(4)}\}\), the rotation center can be determined unambiguously. Right: A degeneracy arises when the samples are coplanar.

Degenerate cases A degeneracy arises when the 4 samples happen to be on the same plane (see Fig. 3, right). In such a case, any point \(J'\) belonging to the line perpendicular to this plane and going through \(J\) is equidistant from the samples and can thus play the role of a possible spherical joint. However, as remarked earlier, such a case occurs with probability 0 when the joint behaves as a real spherical joint, covering all the directions in space.

B. The (2,1) case is non-identifiable

As already detailed in section II-A, one has in this case \(\Omega = \{(x, y, z, j)\}, \Pi_c = \{(d, r), \Pi_c = \theta, \Sigma_c = \rho, \Sigma_c = (\phi, \psi)\}\) (see Fig. 1 and Fig. 4, left).

Assume that we are given \(d, r, \rho\), whose associated set of outputs is denoted \(S\). As in section III-B, our aim here is to show that there exist \(r', \rho'\) with \(r' \neq r\) such that \(S' \cap S\) has measure 0, where \(S'\) is the set of outputs associated with \(d, r', \rho'\).

Denote by \(\Gamma\) the circle of radius \(d\), perpendicular to the axis \((A_1, A_2)\) and of z-coordinate \(d\) (see Fig. 4). Let \(r', \rho'\) be defined as follows: \(r' = r - \delta, \rho' = \rho + \delta\) for some small \(\delta > 0\). Consider next an arbitrary \(B \in S\). By definition, there is a \(J\) on the circle \(\Gamma\) such that \(\|BJ\| = \rho\). One can then show that the circle \(\Gamma'\), of radius \(r'\) and z-coordinate \(d\), intersects
the sphere of center $B$ and radius $\rho'$ at least one point $J'$. This shows that $B \in S'$, and since $B$ was chosen arbitrarily in $S$, one has $S \cap S' = S$, which has measure > 0.

C. The (2, 2) case is 9-identifiable

Following the notation convention of section II-A, one has here (see Fig. 4, right) $\Pi_c = (d, r), \Pi_v = \theta, \Sigma_c = (\rho_1, \rho_2), \Sigma_v = (\phi, \psi, \xi)$, where the three angles $\phi, \psi, \xi$ describe the orientation of the segment $B_1B_2$ around $J$.

Following the same line of reasoning as in section III-A, one first determines an equation relating $d, r, \rho_1, \rho_2$ and the outputs $B_1 = (x_1, y_1, z_1)$ and $B_2 = (x_2, y_2, z_2)$ as below

$$H^2(x_2^2 + y_2^2) + G^2(x_1^2 + y_1^2) - 2HG(x_1x_2 + y_1y_2) - r^2\delta^2 = 0, \quad (14)$$

where $\delta = x_1y_2 - x_2y_1$, and

$$\begin{cases} H = 1/2(x_1^2 + y_1^2 + (z_1 - d)^2 + r^2 - \rho_1^2) \\ G = 1/2(x_2^2 + y_2^2 + (z_2 - d)^2 + r^2 - \rho_2^2). \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

One can next transform equation (14) into a linear equation

$$(M_1 \ldots M_9)(Y_1 \ldots Y_9)^T = K, \quad (16)$$

where $M_1, \ldots, M_9, K$ are constructed from the $x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2$, and

$$\begin{cases} Y_1 = d^2 + r^2 - \rho_1^2 \\ Y_2 = d^2 + r^2 - \rho_2^2 \\ Y_3 = d \\ Y_4 = (d^2 + r^2 - \rho_1^2)(d^2 + r^2 - \rho_2^2) \\ Y_5 = (d^2 + r^2 - \rho_1^2)d \\ Y_6 = (d^2 + r^2 - \rho_2^2)d \\ Y_7 = (d^2 + r^2 - \rho_1^2)^2 \\ Y_8 = (d^2 + r^2 - \rho_2^2)^2 \\ Y_9 = r^2. \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

Finally, one can construct a linear system by grouping together 9 equations similar to (16) obtained from a 9-sample, and prove the 9-identifiability using the same arguments as in III-A.

V. ALGORITHMS AND DISCUSSION

A. Identifying the hip joint using two markers per link

In sections III-A and IV-C, we have established the structural identifiability respectively in the (2, 1) case for revolute joints and in the (2, 2) case for spherical joints. Here we present practical algorithms to do such identifications in concrete settings.

We focus on the hip joint in humans, which can be modeled by a spherical joint linking the trunk and the thigh. A human subject performed a jumping motion from the floor onto a horizontal platform at ~0.5m from the ground (see Fig. 5, right). Three markers were attached to the trunk: one on the fifth lumbar vertebra (L5: $A_1$), one on the left superior anterior iliac spine (LPELVIS: $A_2$) and one on the right superior anterior iliac spine (RPELVIS: $A_3$). Two markers were attached to the right thigh: one on the greater trochanter (RHIP: $B_1$) and one on the lateral epicondyle of the femur (RKNEE: $B_2$).

First, we extended the Gamage-Lasenby (GL) method [4, 2] to the case when both links are moving (the original GL algorithm assumes that one link is fixed in space). We used 22 frames taken every 95ms. In each frame $i$, we used the 3 trunk markers to compute an orthonormal reference frame $F_i$ as follows: the origin of $F_{iGL}$ was $A_1(i)$; the first two vectors of the basis ($u_{i1}, u_{i2}$) were obtained by orthonormalizing $\{A_2(i) - A_1(i), A_3(i) - A_1(i)\}$; the third vector of the basis was defined by $u_{i3} = u_{i1} \times u_{i2}$. Because of non strict rigidity and measurement noise, the positions $A_1, A_2, A_3$ were not completely fixed in $F_{iGL}$; instead, only $A_1$ was fixed, whereas $A_2$ and $A_3$ displayed some small variations. Next, we computed the coordinates of $B_{1(i)}, B_{2(i)}$ in $F_{iGL}$ and gave these coordinates as input to the GL algorithm as described in [4]. This algorithm outputted the positions $J_{iGL}$ of the joint center in each frame.

We now describe a new algorithm [S22: Spherical joint, (2, 2) case], which identifies the position of the joint center...
using only two markers per rigid link: \(A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2\). In each frame, we computed an orthonormal reference frame \(F_S^{(i)}\) as follows: the origin of \(F_S^{(i)}\) was still \(A_1^{(i)}\); the first two vectors of the basis \((u_1, u_2)\) were obtained by orthonormalizing \(\{A_2^{(i)} - A_1^{(i)}, v\}\), where \(v\) is a random vector non-collinear with \(A_2^{(i)} - A_1^{(i)}\); the third vector of the basis was still defined by \(u_3 = u_1 \times u_2\). Next, as in section IV-C, we place ourselves in the reference frame \(F_S^{(i)}\).

Remark that, if a tuple \((d, r, \rho_1, \rho_2)\) is the correct answer and if there is no noise, the joint center would be given by the intersection of the circle \(\Gamma(d, r)\) and \(\Gamma'(B_1, B_2, \rho_1, \rho_2)\) (cf. section IV-C and Fig. 4, right). Following this remark, we computed, in each frame \(i\), the point \(J_{\text{opt}}^{(i)}\) that minimized the sum \(d(J, \Gamma(d, r)) + d(J, \Gamma'(B_1, B_2, \rho_1, \rho_2))\). Next, the cost associated with \((d, r, \rho_1, \rho_2)\) was defined by

\[
C(d, r, \rho_1, \rho_2) = \sum_{p=1,2,3} \text{var}(\|J_{\text{opt}} A_p\|) + \sum_{q=1,2} \text{var}(\|J_{\text{opt}} B_q\|),
\]

where \(\text{var}\) is the variance computed across the frames. Note that the index \(p\) runs only from 1 to 2 because \(A_3\) (RPELVIS) was excluded. Finally, we ran a global minimum search algorithm to find the optimal \((d, r, \rho_1, \rho_2)\), which in turn is associated with a certain position \(J_{S^{(i)}}\) of the joint center in each frame.

To assess the quality of this algorithm, we compare \(C_{S^{(i)}}\) and \(C_{\text{GL}}\), where the two measures were defined by

\[
C_{S^{(i)}} = \sum_{p=1,2,3} \text{var}(\|J_{S^{(i)}} A_p\|) + \sum_{q=1,2} \text{var}(\|J_{S^{(i)}} B_q\|)
\]

\[
C_{\text{GL}} = \sum_{p=1,2,3} \text{var}(\|J_{\text{GL}} A_p\|) + \sum_{q=1,2} \text{var}(\|J_{\text{GL}} B_q\|).
\]

Note that the index \(p\) runs from 1 to 3 in both measures.

For the jumping motion of Fig. 5, we found that \(\sqrt{C_{S^{(i)}}} = 9.18\text{mm}\) and that \(\sqrt{C_{\text{GL}}} = 9.65\text{mm}\), while the average distance across the frames between \(J_{S^{(i)}}\) and \(J_{\text{GL}}\) was 43.26mm. In other words, our algorithm using only two markers on each link outperformed the extension of the GL method using three markers on one link and two markers on the other. Note however that there may exist better ways to extend the GL method to the case of two moving links (based e.g. on [5]). Also, the GL method gives a closed-form solution while our method must rely on an iterative minimum search (the closed-form solution given by the formulae of section IV-C is too sensitive to noise and non strict rigidity). We are currently trying to find a robust closed-form solution based on the formulae of section IV-C.

In contrast with the optimization technique of [6], which uses a distance penalty unrelated to the problem at hand and solely intended to guarantee the convergence of the algorithm to sensible values, our method involves no such extra, arbitrary, constraint. Furthermore, the issue of local minima is considerably alleviated since the dimension of our optimization problem is 4 \((d, r, \rho_1, \rho_2)\), which is much smaller than that in [6], which is \(3N\), where \(N\) is the number of frames.

B. Joint parameter identification in full-body motion capture

Using the results just established, it is theoretically possible to identify all joint parameters in a 14-links, 31-dof, human model using just 16 markers as illustrated in Fig. 5, right panel.

One starts with 3 markers on the trunk, which allow determining completely the position and orientation of the trunk in space. Next, using the marker on the thigh, one can identify the position of the hip joint [spherical joint, (3,1) case]. The position of the hip joint together with the thigh marker thus provides two “markers” on the thigh. Next, using these two “markers” and the shank marker, one can identify the parameters of the knee joint [revolute joint, (2,1) case]. The position and orientation of the knee joint in turn gives the full position and orientation of the thigh and the shank. Finally, the parameters of the ankle joint can be determined using the shank full position and orientation together with the foot marker [spherical joint, (3,1) case]. The same procedure can be repeated for the remaining leg and the two arms. The neck joint parameters can finally be identified using the trunks markers and the head marker [spherical joint, (3,1) case].

C. Conclusion

We have studied the minimum number of markers that are necessary to identify the parameters of revolute and spherical joints and have presented a practical algorithm to do the identification in the case of a spherical joint with two markers attached to each of the adjacent link. Our current research focuses on the implementation of the identification of joint parameters using a minimum number of markers in a full-body setting.
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