

Are Accelerometer-based Functional Outcome Assessments Feasible and Valid After Treatment for Lower Extremity Sarcomas?

Running title: Balance and Gait Assessment in Sarcoma

Sherron Furtado PhD, MSc, BPTH, Alan Godfrey PhD, Silvia Del Din PhD, Lynn Rochester PhD, Craig Gerrand MBChB, FRCSEd, MD, MBA

S. Furtado

North of England Bone and Soft Tissue Tumor Service, Department of Orthopaedics, Freeman Hospital, Newcastle Upon Tyne, United Kingdom

A. Godfrey

Computer and Information Science Department, Northumbria University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK

S. Del Din, L. Rochester

Institute of Neuroscience/Newcastle University Institute for Ageing, Clinical Aging Research Unit, Campus for Ageing and Vitality, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK

L. Rochester

Newcastle upon Tyne Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK

C. Gerrand

The London Sarcoma Service, Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital NHS Trust, Stanmore, UK

The institution of one or more of the authors (AG, LR) has received, during the study period, funding from the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Newcastle Biomedical Research Centre and Unit based at Newcastle upon Tyne Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust and Newcastle University. The institution of one or more of the authors (AG, SDD, LR) has received, during the study period, funding from the NIHR Newcastle Clinical Research Faculty infrastructure funding. The institution of one or more of the authors (CG, SF) has received, during the study period, funding from the Children with Cancer UK Charity, Sarcoma UK Charity, and Shear's Foundation and Research and Capability (RCF).

All ICMJE Conflict of Interest Forms for authors and *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research*[®] editors and board members are on file with the publication and can be viewed on request.

Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research[®] neither advocates nor endorses the use of any treatment, drug, or device. Readers are encouraged to always seek additional information, including FDA approval status, of any drug or device before clinical use.

Each author certifies that his or her institution approved the human protocol for this investigation and that all investigations were conducted in conformity with ethical principles of research.

This work was performed at the major clinic sites and Human Movement Room at the North of England Bone and Soft Tissue Tumor Service, Newcastle Upon Tyne Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, UK.

S. Furtado ☒
Therapies, JRU Sarcoma Unit
Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital NHS Trust
Brockley Hill Stanmore
Middlesex
HA7 4LP
United Kingdom
Email: sherron.furtado@nhs.net

1 **Abstract**

2 *Background* Aspects of physical functioning, including balance and gait, are affected after
3 surgery for lower limb musculoskeletal tumors. These are not routinely measured but likely
4 are related to how well patients function after resection or amputation for a bone or soft tissue
5 sarcoma. Small, inexpensive portable accelerometers are available that might be clinically
6 useful to assess balance and gait in these patients, but they have not been well studied.

7 *Questions/purposes* In patients treated for lower extremity musculoskeletal tumors, we asked:

8 (1) Are accelerometer-based body-worn monitor assessments of balance, gait, and timed up
9 and go tests (TUG) feasible and acceptable? (2) Do these accelerometer-based body-worn
10 monitor assessments produce clinically useful data (face validity), distinguish between
11 patients and controls (discriminant validity), reflect findings obtained using existing clinical
12 measures (convergent validity) and standard manual techniques in clinic (concurrent
13 validity)?

14 *Methods* This was a prospective cross-sectional study. Out of 97 patients approached, 34
15 adult patients treated for tumors in the femur/thigh (19), pelvis/hip (3), tibia/leg (9), or
16 ankle/foot (3) were included in this study. Twenty-seven had limb-sparing surgery and seven
17 underwent amputation. Patients performed standard activities while wearing a body-worn
18 monitor on the lower back, including standing, walking, and TUG tests. Summary measures
19 of balance (area [ellipsis], magnitude [Root Mean Square (RMS)], jerkiness [jerk], frequency
20 of postural sway below which 95% of power of acceleration power spectrum is observed [f95
21 of postural sway], gait [temporal outcomes, step length and velocity], and TUG time were
22 derived. Body-worn monitor assessments were evaluated for feasibility by investigating data
23 loss and patient-reported acceptability and comfort. In addition, outcomes in patients were
24 compared with datasets of healthy controls collected in parallel studies using identical
25 methods as in this study to assess discriminant validity. Body-worn monitor assessments

26 were also investigated for their relationships with routine clinical scales [Musculoskeletal
27 Tumour Society Scoring system (MSTS), Toronto Extremity Salvage Score (TESS), Quality
28 of life-Cancer survivors [QoL-CS)] to assess convergent validity and their agreement with
29 standard manual techniques (video and stopwatch) to assess concurrent validity.

30 *Results* Although this was a small patient group, there were initial indications that body-worn
31 monitor assessments were well-tolerated, feasible to perform, acceptable to patients who
32 responded (19 of 20 [95%] found the body-worn monitor acceptable and comfortable and 17
33 of 20 [85%] found it user-friendly), and produced clinically useful data comparable to the
34 evidence. Balance and gait measures distinguished patients and controls (discriminant
35 validity), for instance balance outcome (ellipsis) in patients (0.0475; 95% confidence interval
36 [CI] 0.0251–0.0810 m²/s⁴) was affected compared with controls (0.0007; 95% CI, 0.0003–
37 0.0502 m²/s⁴; p = 0.001). Similarly gait outcome (step time) was affected in patients (0.483;
38 95% CI, 0.451–0.512 seconds (s)) compared with controls (0.541; 95% CI, 0.496–0.573 s; p <
39 0.001). Moreover, body-worn monitor assessments showed significant relationships with
40 existing clinical scales (convergent validity), for instance ellipsis with MSTS (r = -0.393; p =
41 0.024). Similarly, manual techniques showed excellent agreement with body-worn monitor
42 assessments (concurrent validity), for instance stopwatch time 22.28 +/- 6.93 s with iTUG time
43 21.18 +/- 6.23 s (ICC agreement = 0.933; p < 0.001). P < 0.05 was considered statistically
44 significant.

45 *Conclusions* Although we had a small, heterogeneous study patient population, this pilot
46 study suggests that body-worn monitors might be useful clinically to quantify physical
47 functioning in patients treated for lower extremity tumors. Balance and gait relate to
48 disability and quality of life. These measurements could provide clinicians with useful novel
49 information on balance and gait, which in turn can guide rehabilitation strategies.

50 *Level of Evidence* Level III, diagnostic study.

51 **Introduction**

52 Surgical resection or amputation, chemotherapy, and radiotherapy for musculoskeletal tumors
53 in the pelvis and lower extremity have a detrimental impact on the locomotor system [5]. The
54 impaired balance and gait that result [9, 11] often lead to reduced mobility, lack of
55 confidence, loss of adaptive mechanisms to maintain the body in space, and falls [45, 57].

56 Despite this, balance and gait assessments are not part of routine clinical practice [19].

57 Balance and gait can be clinically assessed by visual examination or patient-completed scales
58 [20, 52]. However, these methods are subjective, may not detect subtle abnormalities, and
59 some have ceiling effects [25]. Furthermore, difficulties in interpreting results can complicate
60 rehabilitation delivery [25]. Objective functional assessments are therefore potentially useful
61 after sarcoma treatment [19]. Simple tests of balance, gait, or other composite measures, such
62 as the timed up and go (TUG) test, may reflect objective physical capability and fall risk [29,
63 37, 56].

64 Despite this, there remains a deficit of valid and reliable objective balance and gait
65 assessments for these patients [19]. A low-cost, accelerometer-based, body-worn monitor has
66 been able to provide valid objective balance and gait data in other patient cohorts [13, 23, 27,
67 42] and could be of value for monitoring and guiding rehabilitation of sarcoma patients.

68 Different outcome measures are often used to capture outcomes, however, good measures are
69 those that demonstrate accuracy and validity [34, 47, 51]. Body-worn monitors have been
70 sensitive to disability and could detect mild balance differences between patients and controls
71 in diabetic neuropathy [54] and untreated Parkinsonism [37]. Hence, these could be
72 particularly useful in patients treated for a musculoskeletal tumor with mild function
73 abnormalities. Furthermore, it is key to understand whether body-worn monitors are able to
74 satisfy other indicators of validity [34, 47, 51], for example provide clinically useful data,

75 distinguish sarcoma patients from controls, capture disease-specific outcomes and agree with
76 standard clinic assessments.

77 Therefore, in patients treated for lower extremity musculoskeletal tumors, we investigated:

78 (1) Are accelerometer-based body-worn monitor assessments of balance, gait, and timed up
79 and go tests (TUG) feasible to use and acceptable? (2) Do these accelerometer-based body-
80 worn monitor assessments produce clinically useful data (face validity), distinguish between
81 patients and controls (discriminant validity), reflect findings obtained using existing clinical
82 measures (convergent validity) and standard manual techniques in clinic (concurrent
83 validity)?

84 **Patients and Methods**

85 The study was approved by the National Research Ethics committee (NREC) (Reference:
86 13/NE/0296) and the Newcastle upon Tyne Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Research and
87 Development department (Reference: 6801). The study was conducted according to Ethical
88 Standards of Helsinki declaration and good clinical practice guidelines.

89 *The Patient Group*

90 We recruited a convenience sample of 34 adult patients (age ≥ 18 years) from the North of
91 England Bone and Soft Tissue Tumor Service, which is located in Newcastle upon Tyne
92 Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust. A convenience sampling of patients was performed to
93 enroll patients who were treated for lower extremity sarcomas. We used this type of sampling
94 in this study to establish proof of concept of the use of body-worn assessments in this clinical
95 group. We included patients if they had undergone treatment, including limb-sparing surgery
96 or amputation and/or radiotherapy, for a lower extremity bone or soft tissue tumor at the iliac
97 crest or below. We excluded patients if they were undergoing active treatment, had benign
98 bone or soft tissue tumors, were unable to take part because of cognitive or physical
99 incapacity, or refused to participate (Fig. 1). All patients provided written informed consent.

100 We collected demographics and clinical characteristics, including diagnosis, treatments, and
101 time since surgery.

102 *Assessments Using Existing Clinic Measures*

103 Patients completed established measures of disability (Toronto Extremity Salvage Score
104 [TESS]) [8], impairment (Musculoskeletal Tumor Rating System [MSTS] [14, 15]), and
105 quality of life (Quality of life-Cancer survivors [QoL-CS] [16]) at their point of assessment
106 (Table 1).

107 *The Healthy Control Group*

108 Healthy controls from other parallel studies (NREC: 12/NE/0319 and NREC: 09-H0906-82/
109 08-H0906-147) provided age-matched references for comparison [33, 61]). Healthy control
110 data, collected by research staff using the same body-worn monitor assessments as our study
111 (described in sections below) were used to compare against the patient group. The healthy
112 control data was collected in the following parallel studies: (1) Pilot work exploring the
113 potential use of the XSens and Open Movement Sensor Device for the Assessment of
114 Osteoarthritis (Osteoarthritis study) which included young healthy control data (age, 19-35
115 years) (for balance and gait outcomes). (2) Incidence of Cognitive Impairment in Cohorts
116 with Longitudinal Evaluation—GAIT (ICICLE-GAIT) study. This study was a collaborative
117 project with ICICLE-PD, an incident cohort study (Incidence of Cognitive Impairment in
118 Cohorts with Longitudinal Evaluation — Parkinson’s disease) that was conducted between
119 June 2009 and December 2011 [33, 61]. It included middle-aged and elderly healthy control
120 data (age, 36-90 years) (for balance and gait outcomes).

121 To ensure unbiased comparisons, healthy controls were randomly selected from the control
122 datasets. The protocols for body-worn monitor assessment and data processing in patients and
123 controls were identical. We compared demographics such as age, gender, and BMI between

124 patient and control groups to ensure no differences were present between groups ($p > 0.05$).

125 This was performed to eliminate the confounding effect of demographics on outcomes.

126 *Assessment of Activities Using Manual Techniques*

127 *Stopwatch*

128 We assessed the amount of time it took patients to complete 7-meter TUG test with a manual
129 technique (stopwatch) [59]; this test was referred to as “Stopwatch TUG time.” We started
130 the stopwatch with the patient sitting upright on a chair and tracked the time it took for the
131 patient to complete five components: standing up, walking 7 meters, and turning around,
132 walking back 7 meters, and returning to a seated position in the chair. The subject wore their
133 usual footwear, and they could use their usual walking aids if required but could not be
134 assisted by another person.

135 *Video*

136 Step count from fast walk test was assessed using observational video analysis. This was
137 referred to as “Video step count.”

138 *Equipment*

139 Study participants were asked to wear a triaxial accelerometer-based, body-worn monitor
140 (Axivity AX3, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, UK; dimensions 23.0, 32.5 and 7.6 mm; weight: 11.0 g,
141 sampling frequency 100 Hz, range ± 8 g, Fig. 2A), which has been validated for human
142 movement analysis [6]. The sensor was located on the lower back (over the fifth lumbar
143 vertebrae) within the pocket of a lumbar belt (Fig. 2B). This is close to the center of mass,
144 where readings can quantify a range of physical functioning tasks [24]. The patients wore the
145 device in the clinic for approximately 2 hours and for 7 days in their homes. However, the 7-
146 day data is beyond the remit of this study article. No repeated measures were performed.

147 *Body-worn Monitor Protocol and Data Collection*

148 Participants wore the body-worn monitor in the clinic and underwent standard tests to assess
149 balance, gait, and timed up and go (TUG) outcomes (also referred to as body-worn monitor
150 outcomes).

151 *Test 1: Standing (Balance) Test*

152 Participants were asked to stand upright on a level surface wearing their own footwear, feet
153 slightly apart, hands by their side and eyes open [41] for 120 seconds [38].

154 *Test 2: Intermittent Fast Walk (Gait) Test*

155 Participants were asked to complete three intermittent fast walks; they were instructed to
156 walk as fast as possible without running along a 7-meter walkway [17].

157 *Test 3: 7-meter Instrumented Timed Up and Go (iTUG) (Physical Capability) Test*

158 This test involved standing up from a chair, walking 7 meters at a regular pace, turning
159 around, walking back to the chair and sitting down [62]; participants repeated this test three
160 times. Participants completed feedback forms about acceptability, comfort and user-
161 friendliness of monitors at the end of the assessment.

162 *Data Processing Using an Established Algorithm*

163 Raw data downloaded from the body-worn monitor (using the OMGUI 1.0 Configuration and
164 Analysis software; Axivity, OpenMovement) were processed using established algorithms
165 [12, 13, 24] (Fig. 2C) to derive balance (Supplemental Fig. 1; supplemental materials are
166 available with the online version of *CORR*[®]), gait (Supplemental Fig. 2; supplemental
167 materials are available with the online version of *CORR*[®]) and iTUG outcomes
168 (Supplemental Figs. 3; supplemental materials are available with the online version of
169 *CORR*[®]) using MATLAB[®] (R2012a, Mathworks, Cambridge, UK).

170 *Algorithm 1# Derivation of Balance Outcomes*

171 We used raw acceleration signals in the AP and mediolateral planes to assess standing balance

172 in these directions [12, 37, 38]. We captured four balance measures in this study; area,
173 magnitude, jerk and f95 (the highest frequency of sway comprising 95% of the power) of
174 postural sway [12] (Table 1). Area refers to the amount of postural sway, including 95 % AP
175 and ML direction of the acceleration trajectories, and is measured using ellipsis (an elliptical
176 area of postural sway). An ellipsis calculates the scatter of center of mass data and represents
177 the extent to which an individual sways during upright standing. Magnitude of postural sway
178 refers to the root mean square (RMS) of the acceleration signal and is positively related to the
179 metabolic energy cost during upright standing [31]. A low magnitude of postural sway and
180 therefore a low metabolic cost is an optimisation criterion used to set postural control [31].
181 Jerk, on the hand refers to the ‘smoothness of sway’ and highlights the postural control of an
182 individual to maintain their balance in an upright position. It is calculated as the rate of change
183 of acceleration signals over time, essentially a time derivative of acceleration. The fourth
184 balance outcome, frequency of sway refers to how often an individual sways in space (number
185 of postural oscillations) whilst in upright standing. f95 is defined as the frequency below which
186 95% of power of acceleration power spectrum is observed (f95%) [37]. Balance outcomes were
187 normalized over time (120 seconds) for comparison with controls.

188 *Algorithm 2# Derivation of Fast Gait (Gait) Outcomes*

189 Initial contact/final contact events identified from the body-worn monitor vertical
190 acceleration were used to extract gait measures: (1) temporal characteristics, which included
191 individual step, stride (combined left and right step), stance and swing time to complete a fast
192 walk (total gait time) [40] (2) spatial characteristics, such as step length, which were
193 estimated using the inverted pendulum model [63] and (3) spatiotemporal characteristic step
194 velocity calculated as step length/step time. The other gait outcome captured using a body-
195 worn monitor adopting existing algorithms [22] was “step count,” also referred to as “body-
196 worn monitor step count” [22].

197 *Algorithm 3# Derivation of iTUG Outcome*

198 Time taken to complete the 7-meter iTUG time was the primary outcome, estimated from raw
199 accelerometer signals using established algorithms [4].

200 *Clinical Interpretation of Normal Versus Impaired Body-worn Monitor Outcomes*

201 Using support from previous evidence, we classified patients with a very high postural sway
202 compared with healthy controls as impaired (poor function) [9] and those with lower values
203 or comparable to healthy controls as unimpaired (good function) (Fig. 3A-D). We classified
204 patients with high temporal values of gait, small step length and reduced step velocity as
205 impaired. Low iTUG time indicated better function (unimpaired) while high iTUG time
206 suggested poorer function (impaired) [62].

207 **Study Outcomes**

208 Our primary study outcome was to investigate whether accelerometer-based, body-worn
209 monitor assessments of balance, gait, and timed up and go tests (TUG) were feasible to use
210 and acceptable. The primary study outcome was evaluated by assessing the number of
211 datasets successfully obtained from patients, data loss during data processing, and
212 acceptability collected through feedback forms. Our secondary outcomes were to study
213 whether accelerometer-based, body-worn monitor assessments showed indicators of face
214 validity, discriminant validity, convergent validity and concurrent validity. The secondary
215 outcomes were assessed by comparing body-worn monitor outcomes to reference values in
216 the evidence, between patients and healthy controls to assess discriminant validity, body-
217 worn monitor outcomes to established clinical scales data to assess convergent validity, and
218 body-worn monitor outcomes to standard manual techniques to assess concurrent validity,
219 respectively.

220 **Statistical Analysis**

221 Parametric data were expressed using means and SDs (min–max) and nonparametric data
222 using medians with interquartile ranges (IQR). Body-worn monitor outcomes were compared
223 between patients and controls, and tumor subgroups using independent t or Mann-Whitney U
224 tests (to assess convergent validity). Bonferroni correction was used to address correction for
225 multiple measures for the between group comparisons. For the related gait variables (step
226 time, step length and step velocity) as the three tests were undertaken, the Bonferroni
227 correction was applied and alpha level was set at $0.05/3 = 0.016$. Only those tests showing
228 p values less than 0.016 for the three tests were considered as a significant difference.
229 Pearson's and Spearman's rho correlations were used to assess relationships between body-
230 worn monitor outcomes and clinic measures (for convergent validity). Correlations were
231 classified as strong (-1.0 to -0.5 or 0.5–1.0), moderate (-0.5 to -0.3 or 0.3–0.5) or weak (-0.3
232 to -0.1 or 0.1–0.3). Significance was defined at .05 level. ICC agreement and Bland Altman
233 analysis tested agreement between body-worn monitor measures and standard manual
234 techniques (for concurrent validity). ICC agreements were interpreted as: poor (< 0.5),
235 moderate (between 0.5 and 0.75), good (0.75 to 0.9) and excellent (> 0.9) [35, 46].

236 **Results**

237 In all, 34 adults with a mean age 43 ± 20 years participated (Fig. 1). Recruited patients
238 included those who were treated for bone (21) or soft tissue tumors (13) in the femur/thigh
239 (19), pelvis/hip (3), tibia/leg (9), or ankle/foot (3). Twenty-seven had limb-sparing surgery
240 and seven patients underwent amputation and median time from surgery was 79 months
241 (minimum – maximum, 33–108 months). Fifteen of 34 patients received chemotherapy, and
242 13 of 34 received radiotherapy (Table 2). Details of Individual patients are presented in Table
243 3.

244 *Feasibility, Data Loss and Acceptability of a Body-worn Monitor in the Clinic*

245 The body-worn monitor was feasible to use and quick to set up. Data downloading,
246 processing and derivation of outcomes took approximately 10 minutes. However, it took an
247 additional 10 to 20 minutes to tackle problems if they were encountered during data
248 processing. Of 34 adults who attended the laboratory assessment, one who was wheelchair
249 bound, reported a high level of disability and was unable to participate in any of the
250 laboratory tests, as this patient could not stand and perform transfers. We obtained balance
251 and iTUG data from the remaining 33 adult patients. Three adult patients did not participate
252 in the intermittent fast walk test due to fatigue or lack of time, leaving 30 gait patients for
253 analysis. In addition, one patient's step length outcome could not be calculated as the height
254 of the sensor from the floor was not available. There was minimal data loss; of 34 adult
255 assessments, 33 balance, 29 gait and 33 iTUG datasets were available for final analysis. A
256 larger data loss was seen due to patient not completing the test as opposed to the data been
257 lost during analysis process. Of 20 participants who returned feedback forms, 19 of 20 (95%)
258 found the body-worn monitor acceptable and comfortable, and 17 of 20 (85%) found it user-
259 friendly.

260

261 *Indicators of Face Validity, Discriminant Validity, Convergent Validity, and Concurrent*
262 *Validity by Accelerometer-based Body-worn Monitor Assessments*

263 *Body-worn Monitor Balance, Gait and iTUG Outcomes in Patients Versus Healthy Controls*
264 *and Tumor Subgroups*

265 Patients demonstrated alterations of balance and gait compared with controls. Patients
266 presented with higher ellipsis, RMS, and jerk than controls ($p < 0.05$), but with the numbers
267 available, we could not show a difference in frequency of sway ($p > 0.05$) (Table 4). For
268 instance, when comparing patients with controls, ellipsis was 0.0475 (95% CI, 0.0251–0.0810)
269 m^2/s^4 versus 0.0007 (95% CI, 0.0003–0.0502) m^2/s^4 ($p = 0.001$), RMS was 0.0020 (95% CI,
270 0.0016–0.0036) m/s^2 versus 0.0010 (95% CI, 0.0007–0.0042) m/s^2 ($p = 0.009$) and jerk was
271 0.0910 m^2/s^5 versus 0.0513 m^2/s^5 ($p = 0.004$). A p value is < 0.05 was considered statistically
272 significant. Patients presented with a large spread of in the above knee tumour groups, showed
273 trends towards a higher ellipsis and jerk (Fig. 4 A-B), compared to the below knee tumour
274 groups.

275 Patients also presented with higher step time, stance time, swing time, shorter step length and
276 lower step velocity than controls ($p < 0.05$) (Table 4). For instance, on comparing patients with
277 controls; step time was 0.483 (0.451–0.512) seconds (s) versus 0.541 (0.496–0.573) s; $p <$
278 0.001), stance time was 0.630 (0.576–0.672) s versus 0.680 (0.630–0.724) s ($p = 0.001$), swing
279 time was 0.328 (0.311–0.365) s versus 0.383 (0.348–0.424) s; $p < 0.001$), step length was 0.695
280 +/- 0.106 m versus 0.641 +/- 0.092 m; $p=0.044$, not significant after Bonferroni correction for
281 multiple measures was applied; step velocity 1.468 +/- 0.242 m/s versus 1.196+/-0.189; $p <$
282 0.001. There was also a wide spread of patients' gait values; in step time and step velocity
283 variables (Fig. 5 A-B) (With the numbers available, we could not detect a difference between
284 tumor subgroups ($p > 0.05$) (Table 4).

285 Patients had a mean iTUG time of 19.49 s (16.61–24.28). No differences were seen between
286 groups; those in the BT group showed values for iTUG time (19.82 s [95% CI, 16.93–24.95])
287 and the STS group (17.97s [95% CI, 15.86–24.03]) [p value = 0.889]. Patients in the limb-
288 sparing surgery group showed values of iTUG time (19.48 s [95% CI, 16.45 - 24.37]) and the
289 amputation group (19.34 s [95% CI, 16.52–23.79]) [p value = 0.203].

290 *Relationships Between Body-worn Monitor Balance, Gait and iTUG Outcomes and Existing* 291 *Clinical Scales*

292 Median TESS score was 83.6 (IQR, 62.1–93.8; range, 8.3–100.0), mean MSTS score 24.5 (SD
293 7.9; range, 5.0–35.0), median 3-meter TUG time 10.8 seconds (IQR, 8.5–12.7; range, 7.9–32.3)
294 s and median QoL-CS total score 7.1 (IQR, 6.1–7.8; range, 2.7–9.1).

295 Strong or moderate negative correlations were observed between MSTS, TESS, QoL-CS and
296 postural sway (Table 5), for instance ellipsis with MSTS ($r = -0.393$; $p = 0.024$), between MSTS
297 and total gait time ($r = -0.424$; $p = 0.022$) and MSTS and step velocity ($r = 0.424$; $p = 0.022$)
298 and between MSTS, TESS, and iTUG time ($p < 0.05$) (Table 5). This indicates that more
299 structural impairment is associated with impaired balance, gait, and reduced physical
300 capability. A p value < 0.05 was considered significant.

301 *Agreement of Body-worn monitor Measures with Manual Techniques*

302 Gait (Total Steps Measured by Body-worn monitor Versus Gold Standard Video): ICC showed
303 excellent agreement between techniques ($p < 0.05$) (Table 6), for instance stopwatch time 22.28
304 +/- 6.93 s with iTUG time 21.18 +/- 6.23 s (ICC agreement = 0.933; $p < 0.001$). Similarly step
305 counts recorded by body-worn monitors 13 +/- 3 showed an excellent agreement with step
306 count recorded by video 14 +/- 3 (ICC agreement 0.909; $p < 0.001$). Bland-Altman analysis
307 (Fig. 6) indicated that the body-worn monitor under-estimated step counts by 2 to 5 steps in
308 five patients. Bland-Altman analysis (Fig. 6) confirmed that in a small number of patients, poor

309 agreement was seen, predominantly in elderly patients who used their hands as support during
310 “sit to stand” and “stand to sit.”

311 **Discussion**

312 Assessing patients treated for a bone or soft tissue tumors of the lower extremity is difficult
313 and often subjective. Gait labs can provide some useful information, but they are not
314 commonly available and not used routinely even for research investigations of tumor patients.
315 We therefore wanted to test a body-worn device to assess its potential value and relationship
316 to known clinical assessments of patients with lower extremity sarcomas. This is the first
317 study to our knowledge investigating body-worn monitor assessments of balance and gait
318 after sarcoma treatments. We showed that we could measure several parameters of gait and
319 function with this device and that it could discriminate between different patient groups.

320 *Limitations*

321 One major limitation of this study is that as a pilot study with multiple comparisons and a
322 small sample size the possibility of a Type 1 and Type 2 sampling error respectively, cannot
323 be eliminated. Bonferroni corrections could potentially be used as a solution to correct Type
324 1 sampling errors related to multiple comparisons [2]; however, these can increase the
325 chances of Type 2 errors [44]. Therefore, the sensitivity of measures to characterise outcomes
326 needs to be assessed in a larger study with a higher power. The heterogeneous sample also
327 makes it challenging to draw robust conclusions for distinct clinical subgroups. The use of
328 healthy controls recruited from different studies introduces potential sources of investigator
329 and selection bias, which are difficult to eliminate from the analysis. Body-worn monitor
330 clinic measures do not necessarily reflect behaviour in the real-world environment, and this
331 needs to be captured separately. Another key limitation is that although most responder
332 patients found this device acceptable; our response rate to the survey was low (59%). Further
333 larger studies are therefore needed.

334 *Feasibility, Data Loss and Acceptability of a Body-worn monitor in the Clinic*

335 We showed that body-worn monitors are feasible and straightforward to use, and at least in
336 those who answered our survey, were acceptable and user-friendly for patients. Clinically
337 useful outcomes could be obtained promptly, with minimal data loss. It was feasible to
338 capture postural control measures characterized by four relatively independent
339 characteristics: area, magnitude, frequency and jerk of sway; rhythm and pace domains of
340 gait and iTUG time. The feasibility of obtaining outcomes in a short time scale, minimal data
341 loss, acceptability, comfort in the clinic and user-friendliness of the device supports the
342 clinical usefulness of the device. As body-worn monitors are portable, functional evaluations
343 could also be performed at in the community, which may be helpful for remote patient
344 assessment. The strengths of the algorithms were that minimal data loss was encountered, and
345 they appeared effective across a range of age groups and functional characteristics [43, 60].

346 *Indicators of Face Validity, Discriminant Validity, Convergent Validity, and Concurrent*
347 *Validity by Accelerometer-based Body-worn Monitor Assessments*

348 *Body-worn Monitor Outcomes in Tumor Patients Versus Controls, Evidence and Across*
349 *Tumor Subgroups*

350 In our study, patients demonstrated altered balance and gait outcomes compared with healthy
351 individuals, which supports published studies [3, 9, 10]. These results contraindicated De
352 Visser et al. [9] in which no differences were detected between patients and controls by the
353 force platform for the standing (balance) test. This could be because our study included
354 patients after amputation; additionally, triaxial accelerometers may be more sensitive than
355 force platforms [39]. The increased step time, swing time, and reduced step velocity in
356 patients compared with controls also agrees with published reports [3, 10]; however, the
357 higher stance phase and shorter step length in our patients compared with controls contrasts
358 with published studies [10, 48]. This could be because our study used a combined value that

359 included the affected and unaffected limbs. Differences in step length in our study may also
360 reflect the inclusion of patients with limb-sparing surgery and amputation in different
361 anatomical locations, whereas Rompen et al. [48], only included patients with a femoral
362 endoprosthesis.

363 After resection of major bone and soft tissues for a lower extremity sarcoma, the loss of
364 sensory [58], motor [7], and proprioceptive [18] systems may disrupt physiological systems,
365 delaying the transmission of sensory data to the central nervous system. Therefore, an
366 appropriate timely response to activate postural muscle groups and maintain balance and
367 posture may not be formulated [28-30]. This might impact gait and performance tests (TUG),
368 explaining a higher iTUG time (poor physical capability) in our study patients [19.486s
369 (16.610 – 24.280)] compared with controls in the literature [14.3 ± 0.5 s] [62] although we do
370 not know if this is a true difference since we cannot directly compare. .

371 With the numbers we had, we could not detect a difference between BT and STS subgroups,
372 however, and more numbers of patients are needed to determine if our findings will support
373 the findings of others that BTs perform worse than STS and amputation patients perform
374 worse than limb-sparing surgery agrees with the evidence [1, 53]. It also makes clinical sense
375 because BT treatment generally needs more extensive surgery, including bone reconstruction;
376 and after amputation, major limb loss and disrupted sensory and proprioceptive input may
377 lead to poorer function [1, 36]. We could not demonstrate differences (for RMS_ML) until
378 categorized into homogenous groups, which highlights the importance of subgrouping in this
379 heterogeneous patient group.

380 *Body-worn Monitor Measures Against Existing Clinical Measures*

381 In our study, higher impairments (measured by MSTs) related to poor balance, gait, and
382 TUG outcomes. Furthermore, poor balance, gait, and TUG outcomes relate to greater
383 disability and reduced QoL (physical and social components). Relationships between balance

384 and QoL agree with findings in other clinical conditions [50, 55]. Therefore, simple clinic
385 tests can indicate which patients are at risk of higher disability and reduced QoL. When
386 outcomes in our study were mapped to the widely recognised International Classification of
387 Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF) framework [21], relationships were found to be
388 sensible between the body-worn monitor measures and existing clinic measures (an indicator
389 of convergent validity) and this information could be vital in informing rehabilitation.

390 *Agreement of Body-worn Monitor Measures with Manual Standard Techniques in Clinic*

391 Body-worn monitor measures demonstrated good or excellent agreement with standard
392 techniques, but some instances underestimated step counts. For example, in patients with
393 obvious gait deviations while walking, such as heel drag or low gait velocity (< 1.4 m/s),
394 some steps may not be detected. Slower gait speeds are known to cause step underestimation
395 [32, 49]; synchronization (communication of data) between devices at the start of assessment
396 might help.

397 Although an excellent agreement was observed between devices, stopwatch time was 1.1 s
398 higher than iTUG time, possibly due to errors in manual timing [26]. The body-worn monitor
399 time starts when the L5 monitor moves upwards during “sit to stand,” whereas the stopwatch
400 runs between the command “Go” and “Stop.” Poorest agreement appeared to be for slower
401 patients in whom the stopwatch had started before the body-worn monitor acceleration
402 threshold was reached, therefore showing body-worn monitor was late in capturing the initial
403 and final phases of the activity. Although the initial and final phases are important to capture,
404 a clear advantage of using a body-worn monitor is that a range of additional measures of
405 postural transitions and gait could be derived [62]. A single body-worn monitor can capture
406 multiple attributes of physical functioning quickly, which is advantageous in busy clinics.

407 **Conclusion**

408 This pilot study supports the feasibility, acceptability, and validity indicators for an

409 accelerometer-based BWM assessment of balance, gait, and iTUG outcomes in patients
410 treated for lower extremity musculoskeletal cancer. Structural impairments are associated
411 with poor balance, gait, and TUG outcomes, which in turn are associated with greater
412 disability and reduced QoL. Body-worn monitor measures demonstrated excellent agreement
413 between measurements, but in some instances, did not agree with standard techniques. In
414 summary, a laboratory assessment using a body-worn monitor can offer an alternative to
415 cumbersome systems for quantifying balance, gait, and iTUG outcomes.
416

417 **Acknowledgments**

418 We thank the staff of the North of England Bone and Soft Tissue Tumor Service for their
419 assistance in patient screening and recruitment, and in clinics, staff from the Orthopaedic
420 Research Unit for their support in data collection, as well as staff from C.A.R.U for their
421 technical and engineering input during data processing and analysis

422 **References**

- 423 1. Aksnes LH, Bauer HC, Jebsen NL, Folleras G, Allert C, Haugen GS, Hall KS. Limb-sparing surgery
 424 preserves more function than amputation: a Scandinavian sarcoma group study of 118
 425 patients. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* 2008;90:786-794.
- 426 2. Armstrong RA. When to use the Bonferroni correction. *Ophthalmic Physiol Opt.* 2014;34:502-
 427 508.
- 428 3. Beebe K, Song KJ, Ross E, Tuy B, Patterson F, Benevenia J. Functional Outcomes After Limb-
 429 Salvage Surgery and Endoprosthetic Reconstruction With an Expandable Prosthesis: A Report
 430 of 4 Cases. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2009;90:1039-1047.
- 431 4. Bidargaddi N, Klingbeil L, Sarela A, Boyle J, Cheung V, Yelland C, Karunanithi M, Gray L. Wavelet
 432 based approach for posture transition estimation using a waist worn accelerometer. *Conf Proc*
 433 *IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc.* 2007;2007:1884-1887.
- 434 5. Carty CP, Bennett MB, Dickinson IC, Steadman P. Electromyographic assessment of Gait
 435 function following limb salvage procedures for bone sarcoma. *J Electromyogr Kinesiol.*
 436 2010;20:502-507.
- 437 6. Clarke CL, Taylor J, Crighton LJ, Goodbrand JA, McMurdo MET, Witham MD. Validation of the
 438 AX3 triaxial accelerometer in older functionally impaired people. *Aging clinical and*
 439 *experimental research.* 2017;29:451-457.
- 440 7. Davis AM. Functional outcome in extremity soft tissue sarcoma. *Semin Radiat Oncol.*
 441 1999;9:360-368.
- 442 8. Davis AM, Wright JG, Williams JI, Bombardier C, Griffin A, Bell RS. Development of a measure
 443 of physical function for patients with bone and soft tissue sarcoma. *Qual Life Res.* 1996;5:508-
 444 516.
- 445 9. de Visser E, Deckers JA, Veth RP, Schreuder HW, Mulder TW, Duysens J. Deterioration of
 446 balance control after limb-saving surgery. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil.* 2001;80:358-365.
- 447 10. De Visser E, Mulder T, Schreuder HWB, Veth RPH, Duysens J. Gait and electromyographic
 448 analysis of patients recovering after limb-saving surgery. *Clin Biomech.* 2000;15:592-599.
- 449 11. de Visser E, Veth RP, Schreuder HW, Duysens J, Mulder T. Reorganization of gait after limb-
 450 saving surgery of the lower limb. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil.* 2003;82:825-831.
- 451 12. Del Din S, Godfrey A, Coleman S, Galna B, Lord S, Rochester L. Time-dependent changes in
 452 postural control in early Parkinson's disease: what are we missing? *Med Biol Eng Comput.*
 453 2016;54:401-410.
- 454 13. Del Din S, Godfrey A, Rochester L. Validation of an accelerometer to quantify a comprehensive
 455 battery of gait characteristics in healthy older adults and Parkinson's disease: toward clinical
 456 and at home use. *IEEE J Biomed Health Inform.* 2015.
- 457 14. Enneking WF. Limb Salvage in Musculoskeletal Oncology. New York (YK): Churchill Livingstone;
 458 Modification of the system for functional evaluation in the surgical management of
 459 musculoskeletal tumors. 1987:626-639.
- 460 15. Enneking WF, Dunham W, Gebhardt MC, Malawar M, Pritchard DJ. A system for the functional
 461 evaluation of reconstructive procedures after surgical treatment of tumors of the
 462 musculoskeletal system. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 1993:241-246.
- 463 16. Ferrell BR, Dow KH, Grant M. Measurement of the quality of life in cancer survivors. *Qual Life*
 464 *Res.* 1995;4:523-531.
- 465 17. Fitzpatrick AL, Buchanan CK, Nahin RL, Dekosky ST, Atkinson HH, Carlson MC, Williamson JD.
 466 Associations of gait speed and other measures of physical function with cognition in a healthy
 467 cohort of elderly persons. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci.* 2007;62:1244-1251.
- 468 18. Fukumothi DK, Pupo H, Reganin LA, Matte SRF, Lima BSd, Mattos CAd. Functional assessment
 469 of endoprosthesis in the treatment of bone tumors. *Revista Brasileira de Ortopedia.*
 470 2016;51:569-573.
- 471 19. Furtado S, Errington L, Godfrey A, Rochester L, Gerrand C. Objective clinical measurement of

- 472 physical functioning after treatment for lower extremity sarcoma; A systematic review. *Eur J*
 473 *Surg Oncol.* 2016;43:968-993.
- 474 20. Ganz DA, Bao Y, Shekelle PG, Rubenstein LZ. Will my patient fall? *Jama.* 2007;297:77-86.
- 475 21. Gilchrist LS, Galantino ML, Wampler M, Marchese VG, Morris GS, Ness KK. A framework for
 476 assessment in oncology rehabilitation. *Phys Ther.* 2009;89:286-306.
- 477 22. Godfrey A, Del Din S, Barry G, Mathers JC, Rochester L. Instrumenting gait with an
 478 accelerometer: A system and algorithm examination. *Medical Engineering & Physics.*
 479 2015;37:400-407.
- 480 23. Godfrey A, Din SD, Barry G, Mathers JC, Rochester L. Within trial validation and reliability of a
 481 single tri-axial accelerometer for gait assessment. Paper presented at: 2014 36th Annual
 482 International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society; 26-30 Aug.
 483 2014, 2014.
- 484 24. Godfrey A, Lara J, Munro CA, Wiuff C, Chowdhury SA, Del Din S, Hickey A, Mathers JC,
 485 Rochester L. Instrumented assessment of test battery for physical capability using an
 486 accelerometer: a feasibility study. *Physiol Meas.* 2015;36:N71-83.
- 487 25. Godi M, Franchignoni F, Caligari M, Giordano A, Turcato AM, Nardone A. Comparison of
 488 reliability, validity, and responsiveness of the mini-BESTest and Berg Balance Scale in patients
 489 with balance disorders. *Phys Ther.* 2013;93:158-167.
- 490 26. Hetzler RK, Stickley CD, Lundquist KM, Kimura IF. Reliability and accuracy of handheld
 491 stopwatches compared with electronic timing in measuring sprint performance. *J Strength*
 492 *Cond Res.* 2008;22:1969-1976.
- 493 27. Hickey A, Gunn E, Alcock L, Del Din S, Godfrey A, Rochester L, Galna B. Validity of a wearable
 494 accelerometer to quantify gait in spinocerebellar ataxia type 6. *Physiol Meas.* 2016;37:N105-
 495 n117.
- 496 28. Horak FB. Clinical measurement of postural control in adults. *Phys Ther.* 1987;67:1881-1885.
- 497 29. Horak FB. Clinical assessment of balance disorders. *Gait & Posture.* 1997;6:76-84.
- 498 30. Horak FB. Postural orientation and equilibrium: what do we need to know about neural
 499 control of balance to prevent falls? *Age Ageing.* 2006;35 Suppl 2:ii7-ii11.
- 500 31. Houdijk H, Brown SE, Dieën JHv. Relation between postural sway magnitude and metabolic
 501 energy cost during upright standing on a compliant surface. *Journal of Applied Physiology.*
 502 2015;119:696-703.
- 503 32. Johnson M. Activity Monitors Step Count Accuracy in Community-Dwelling Older Adults.
 504 *Gerontology and geriatric medicine.* 2015;1:2333721415601303.
- 505 33. Khoo TK, Yarnall AJ, Duncan GW, Coleman S, O'Brien JT, Brooks DJ, Barker RA, Burn DJ. The
 506 spectrum of nonmotor symptoms in early Parkinson disease. *Neurology.* 2013;80:276-281.
- 507 34. Kimberlin CL, Winterstein AG. Validity and reliability of measurement instruments used in
 508 research. *Am J Health Syst Pharm.* 2008;65:2276-2284.
- 509 35. Koo TK, Li MY. A Guideline of Selecting and Reporting Intraclass Correlation Coefficients for
 510 Reliability Research. *Journal of Chiropractic Medicine.* 2016;15:155-163.
- 511 36. Ku PX, Abu Osman NA, Wan Abas WA. Balance control in lower extremity amputees during
 512 quiet standing: a systematic review. *Gait Posture.* 2014;39:672-682.
- 513 37. Mancini M, Horak FB, Zampieri C, Carlson-Kuhta P, Nutt JG, Chiari L. Trunk accelerometry
 514 reveals postural instability in untreated Parkinson's disease. *Parkinsonism Relat Disord.*
 515 2011;17:557-562.
- 516 38. Mancini M, Salarian A, Carlson-Kuhta P, Zampieri C, King L, Chiari L, Horak FB. ISway: a
 517 sensitive, valid and reliable measure of postural control. *Journal of NeuroEngineering and*
 518 *Rehabilitation.* 2012;9:59-59.
- 519 39. Mayagoitia RE, Lotters JC, Veltink PH, Hermens H. Standing balance evaluation using a triaxial
 520 accelerometer. *Gait Posture.* 2002;16:55-59.
- 521 40. McCamley J, Donati M, Grimpampi E, Mazza C. An enhanced estimate of initial contact and
 522 final contact instants of time using lower trunk inertial sensor data. *Gait Posture.* 2012;36:316-

- 523 318.
- 524 41. Moghadam M, Ashayeri H, Salavati M, Sarafzadeh J, Taghipoor KD, Saeedi A, Salehi R.
525 Reliability of center of pressure measures of postural stability in healthy older adults: effects
526 of postural task difficulty and cognitive load. *Gait Posture*. 2011;33:651-655.
- 527 42. Moore SA, Hickey A, Lord S, Del Din S, Godfrey A, Rochester L. Comprehensive measurement
528 of stroke gait characteristics with a single accelerometer in the laboratory and community: a
529 feasibility, validity and reliability study. *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*.
530 2017;14:130.
- 531 43. Ostrosky KM, VanSwearingen JM, Burdett RG, Gee Z. A comparison of gait characteristics in
532 young and old subjects. *Phys Ther*. 1994;74:637-644; discussion 644-636.
- 533 44. Perneger TV. What's wrong with Bonferroni adjustments. *BMJ : British Medical Journal*.
534 1998;316:1236-1238.
- 535 45. Piirtola M, Era P. Force platform measurements as predictors of falls among older people - a
536 review. *Gerontology*. 2006;52:1-16.
- 537 46. Portney LG WMPH. *Foundations of clinical research: applications to practice*. New Jersey:
538 Pearson Education (US); 2000.
- 539 47. Roach KE. Measurement of Health Outcomes: Reliability, Validity and Responsiveness. *JPO:*
540 *Journal of Prosthetics and Orthotics*. 2006;18:P8-P12.
- 541 48. Rompen JC, Ham SJ, Halbertsma JP, van Horn JR. Gait and function in patients with a femoral
542 endoprosthesis after tumor resection: 18 patients evaluated 12 years after surgery. *Acta*
543 *Orthop Scand*. 2002;73:439-446.
- 544 49. Sandroff BM, Motl RW, Pilutti LA, Learmonth YC, Ensari I, Dlugonski D, Klaren RE, Balantrapu
545 S, Riskin BJ. Accuracy of StepWatch™ and ActiGraph Accelerometers for Measuring Steps
546 Taken among Persons with Multiple Sclerosis. *PLoS ONE*. 2014;9:e93511.
- 547 50. Schmid AA, Van Puymbroeck M, Altenburger PA, Miller KK, Combs SA, Page SJ. Balance is
548 associated with quality of life in chronic stroke. *Top Stroke Rehabil*. 2013;20:340-346.
- 549 51. Sim J, Arnell P. Measurement validity in physical therapy research. *Phys Ther*. 1993;73:102-
550 110; discussion 110-105.
- 551 52. Studenski S, Perera S, Wallace D, Chandler JM, Duncan PW, Rooney E, Fox M, Guralnik JM.
552 Physical performance measures in the clinical setting. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2003;51:314-322.
- 553 53. Sugiura H, Katagiri H, Yonekawa M, Sato K, Yamamura S, Iwata H. Walking ability and activities
554 of daily living after limb salvage operations for malignant bone and soft-tissue tumors of the
555 lower limbs. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg*. 2001;121:131-134.
- 556 54. Turcot K, Allet L, Golay A, Hoffmeyer P, Armand S. Investigation of standing balance in diabetic
557 patients with and without peripheral neuropathy using accelerometers. *Clinical Biomechanics*.
558 2009;24:716-721.
- 559 55. Tyson SF, Hanley M, Chillala J, Selley AB, Tallis RC. The relationship between balance, disability,
560 and recovery after stroke: predictive validity of the Brunel Balance Assessment. *Neurorehabil*
561 *Neural Repair*. 2007;21:341-346.
- 562 56. Vaught SL. Gait, Balance, and Fall Prevention. *The Ochsner Journal*. 2001;3:94-97.
- 563 57. Visser JE, Carpenter MG, van der Kooij H, Bloem BR. The clinical utility of posturography. *Clin*
564 *Neurophysiol*. 2008;119:2424-2436.
- 565 58. Wickramasinghe NR, Clement ND, Singh A, Porter DE. Sarcoma Excision and Pattern of
566 Complicating Sensory Neuropathy. *ISRN Oncology*. 2014;2014:168698.
- 567 59. Williams EN, Carroll SG, Reddihough DS, Phillips BA, Galea MP. Investigation of the timed 'up
568 & go' test in children. *Dev Med Child Neurol*. 2005;47:518-524.
- 569 60. Winter DA, Patla AE, Frank JS, Walt SE. Biomechanical walking pattern changes in the fit and
570 healthy elderly. *Phys Ther*. 1990;70:340-347.
- 571 61. Yarnall AJ, Breen DP, Duncan GW, Khoo TK, Coleman SY, Firbank MJ, Nombela C, Winder-
572 Rhodes S, Evans JR, Rowe JB. Characterizing mild cognitive impairment in incident Parkinson
573 disease: the ICICLE-PD study. *Neurology*. 2014;82.

- 574 62. Zampieri C, Salarian A, Carlson-Kuhta P, Aminian K, Nutt JG, Horak FB. The instrumented timed
575 up and go test: potential outcome measure for disease modifying therapies in Parkinson's
576 disease. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2010;81:171-176.
- 577 63. Zijlstra W, Hof AL. Assessment of spatio-temporal gait parameters from trunk accelerations
578 during human walking. *Gait Posture*. 2003;18:1-10.
- 579

580 **Legends**

581 **Fig. 1** Flowchart of recruitment

582 **Fig. 2** (A) Photograph of a body-worn monitor device, the Axivity AX3, a triaxial
 583 accelerometer that captures acceleration in vertical (X axis), mediolateral (Y axis) and AP (Z
 584 axis) directions. (B) Body-worn monitor on the low back at fifth lumbar vertebra (L5) level
 585 for laboratory testing. (C) Raw acceleration signal obtained from a body-worn monitor during
 586 an activity. The orange line is the acceleration signal measured in the AP direction, the
 587 yellow line is the acceleration signal measured in the mediolateral direction, and the blue line
 588 is the acceleration signal measured in the vertical direction.

589 **Fig. 3** Examples of normal balance outcome versus impaired balance outcomes in patients are
 590 shown here. (A) Normal ellipsis outcome in a 19-year-old male treated with above-knee
 591 limb-sparing surgery (excision plus proximal femoral reconstruction) for a bone tumor in the
 592 thigh demonstrates a low ellipsis = $0.0113 \text{ m}^2/\text{s}^4$, or a small area of postural sway. (B)
 593 Impaired ellipsis outcome in a 22-year-old male treated with an above-knee amputation for a
 594 bone tumor in the thigh demonstrates a high ellipsis = $0.5890 \text{ m}^2/\text{s}^4$, or a large area of
 595 postural sway. (C) Normal f95 outcome in a 19-year-old female in the above-knee limb-
 596 sparing surgery group (resection of adductor compartment of thigh for a soft tissue tumor)
 597 demonstrates a low frequency of sway in the mediolateral direction = 1.160 Hz. (D) Impaired
 598 outcome in a 22-year-old male treated with an above-knee amputation for a bone tumor in the
 599 thigh demonstrates a high frequency of sway in the mediolateral direction, with a f95_ML =
 600 3.140 Hz.

601 **Fig. 4** Jitter plots to show an increased postural sway in tumor patients compared with
 602 healthy controls ($p < 0.05$). (A) Higher ellipsis in patients compared with healthy controls. (B)
 603 Higher jerk in patients compared with healthy controls.

604 **Fig. 5** Jitter plots demonstrate an altered gait in tumor patients compared with healthy
605 controls ($p < 0.05$). (A) A higher step time is seen in patients compared with healthy controls.
606 (B) A lower step velocity is seen in patients compared with healthy controls.

607 **Fig. 6** Bland-Altman plots for body-worn monitor measures versus standard manual
608 techniques are shown here. (A) This figure shows the video step count versus body-worn
609 monitor step count. (B) The stopwatch TUG time versus the iTUG time is shown here.

610

611 **Supplemental Fig. 1**

612 This figure demonstrates the derivation of balance outcomes from the standing (balance) test
613 in a tumor patient. (A) Ellipsis derived from an accelerometer signal: On the y-z [(ML)-
614 (AP)] axis plane, the blue lines are the acceleration signal from BWM and red is the elliptical
615 area which includes 95 % acceleration trajectories in the AP and ML directions. The area of
616 sway was assessed using MATLAB® (R2012a) functions. (B) Frequency in mediolateral
617 direction (f95_ML) derived from an accelerometer signal. The power spectrum is represented
618 in red and final result below which 95% of the accelerations are present are represented by
619 the black dotted line. ML = mediolateral.

620 **Supplemental Fig. 2**

621 This image depicts the derivation of gait outcomes from the intermittent fast walk test in a
622 tumour patient. (A) The raw vertical acceleration signal during a fast walk trial is represented
623 by blue lines, which were used for data processing. (B) In this Zoomshot of initial contact
624 (IC) and final contact (FC) events, the pink diamond dots represent the initial contact and the
625 red dots represent the final contact and are used to derive temporal gait measures (step time,
626 stride time, stance time, swing time).
627 (C) We used the Inverted Pendulum Model to derive step length. The leg movement reflects
628 an inverted pendulum model, where l denotes the leg length, h denotes the vertical

629 displacement of L5 level, and step length is calculated. Reprinted with permission from
630 SAGE from Zhao Q, Zhang B, Wang J, Feng W, Jia W, Sun M. Improved method of step
631 length estimation based on inverted pendulum model. Int J Distrib Sens Netw. [Published
632 online ahead of print April 10, 2017]. doi: 10.1177/1550147717702914. Link to the article:
633 <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1550147717702914>

634 This figure can be distributed under the terms of the licence

635 <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

636

637 **Supplemental Fig. 3**

638 This figure shows the iTUG time from the iTUG test in a tumour patient and the method of
639 iTUG time calculation of iTUG time. The algorithm uses the vertical acceleration to detect
640 the first crest representing “sit to stand component” and last crest representing “stand to sit”
641 component. Duration taken to complete iTUG test, also termed as iTUG time was calculated
642 as the time between two crests.