Physiological in vitro sacroiliac joint motion: a study on three-dimensional posterior pelvic ring kinematics
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Abstract

The sacroiliac joint (SIJ) is a well-known source of low back and pelvic pain, of increasing interest for both conservative and surgical treatment. Alterations in the kinematics of the pelvis have been hypothesized as a major cause of SIJ-related pain. However, definitions of both the range and the extent of physiological movement are controversial, and there are no clear baseline data for pathological alterations. The present study combined a novel biomechanical setup allowing for physiological motion of the lumbosacral transition and pelvis without restricting the SIJ movement in vitro, combined with optical image correlation. Six fresh human pelvises (81 ± 10 years, three females, three males) were tested, with bodyweight-adapted loading applied to the fifth lumbar vertebra and both acetabula. Deformation at the lumbopelvises was determined computationally from three-dimensional image correlation data. Sacroiliac joint motion under the loading of 100% bodyweight primarily consisted of a z-axis rotation (0.16°) and an inferior translation of the sacrum relative to the ilium (0.32 mm). Sacroiliac joint flexion-extension rotations were minute (< 0.02°). Corresponding movements of the SIJ were found at the lumbosacral transition, with an anterior translation of L5 relative to the sacrum of 0.97 mm and an inferior translation of 0.11 mm, respectively. Moreover, a flexion of 1.82° was observed at the lumbosacral transition. Within the innominate bone and at the pubic symphysis, small complementary rotations were seen around a vertical axis, accounting for −0.10° and 0.11°, respectively. Other motions were minute and accompanied by large interindividual variation. The present study provides evidence of different SIJ motions than reported previously when exerted by physiological loading. Sacroiliac joint kinematics were in the sub-degree and sub-millimeter range, in line with previous in vivo and in vitro findings, largely limited to the sagittal rotation and an inferior translation of the sacrum relative to the ilium. This given physiological loading scenario underlines the relevance of the lumbosacral transition when considering the overall motion of the lumbopelvis, and how relatively little the other segments contribute to overall motion.
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Introduction

The sacroiliac joint (SIJ) is known to be both a site of load transmission between the spine and lower extremities, and an important contributor to low back and posterior pelvic girdle pain (Schwarzer et al. 1995; Robert et al. 1998; Fortin et al. 1999; Cohen, 2005; Forst et al. 2006; Szadek et al. 2009; Laplante et al. 2012; Cohen et al. 2013; Visser et al. 2013). In recent years, a number of non-surgical (Dussault...

The movement of the SIJ, the so-called nutation, has been described to consist mainly of flexion-extension rotation (medial-lateral axis) and an anterior-inferior translation of the sacrum relative to the ilium (Kapandji, 2009) in the direction of the lesser pelvis. Though a number of qualitative data exist on SIJ nutation (Weisl, 1955; Kissling et al. 1990; Kissling & Jacob, 1996; Kapandji, 2009), the lack of methods to assess deformation accurately, hampers quantification. Studies on SIJ motion vary largely, comparing in vivo (Lavignolle et al. 1983; Sturesson et al. 1999, 2000a, b; Kibsgård et al. 2014a) to in vitro (Frigerio et al. 1974; Vleeming et al. 1989, 1992b; Simonian et al. 1994b; Miller & Routt, 2012) and numeric (Ivanov et al. 2009; Sichting et al. 2014) approaches. Moreover, previous clinical studies used bone markers and were largely limited to one or two axes (Frigerio et al. 1974; Egund et al. 1978; Lavignolle et al. 1983; Kissling et al. 1990; Jacob & Kissling, 1995; Kissling & Jacob, 1996; Sturesson et al. 2000a) or planes (Fessler, 1894; Weisl, 1955). The resulting measurement uncertainty of the SIJ impacts on what can be defined a physiological range of movement, especially in vitro, and if SIJ pathology is at all related to increased or decreased overall motion.

Another important consideration in SIJ biomechanics is the involvement of kinematic chains (Vleeming et al. 1996). The SIJ is not an isolated joint at the posterior pelvis. Both SIJs work conjointly with the pubic symphysis joint in a horizontal chain of motion segments. Additionally, the sacrum with both adjacent SIJs forms a second, vertical chain, situated between the lumbosacral transition and the hip joints, embedded in a number of muscles that act as active stabilizers (Panjabi, 1992a,b). This complex interplay maintains both form and force closure at the pelvis, but makes it impossible to examine the SIJ independently, as the overall motion is multi-segmental. Previous studies limiting this multi-segmental motion may therefore lack in interpretability (Simonian et al. 1994b; Wang & Dumas, 1998; Bruna-Rosso, 2014; Lindsey et al. 2014).

The aim of the present study was to establish and trial a novel biomechanical setup to examine the in vitro SIJ deformation as a part of the human pelvic ring. The setup included a physiological load application via the fifth lumbar vertebra (L5) and both hip joints using spherical stamp components, allowing for a similar load distribution as in vivo. It was hypothesized that motion in the SIJ would be markedly smaller than reported previously and in line with our recent finite elements study (Sichting et al. 2014).

This kinematic study confirmed consistent but minute SIJ nutation movements under physiological loading, mainly consisting of a translation of the ilium relative to the sacrum in the coronal plane. Moreover, a second rotation was observed about the z-axis. The experiments have also provided strong evidence towards the lumbosacral transition being a major contributor to lumbopelvic mobility, with movements outnumbering the other movements at the pelvic ring. These kinematic findings provide new insights into load distribution in the posterior pelvis, potentially with an impact on contemporary treatment strategies.

Materials and methods

Preparation of the human tissues

The given experiments were carried out with six human cadaveric lumbo-pelvises (mean age 81.3 ± 10.0 years, range 65-96 years; Table 1). Being part of the body donor program was regulated by the Saxonian Death and Funeral Act of 1994, and institutional approval for the use of the postmortem tissues of human body donors was obtained from the Institute of Anatomy, University of Leipzig. The authors declare that all experiments have been conducted according to the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki. Inclusion criteria of the tissues were a postmortem delay of 48 h or less and the absence of cancer or chronic diseases with potential impact onto the musculoskeletal system. All tissues were processed in a fresh condition to exclude alterations in the mechanical properties of the bones (Hammer et al. 2014) and the ligaments (Steinke et al. 2012). The pelvises were retrieved in a similar manner as described previously (Steinke et al. 2014; Höch et al. 2017), and gross removal of soft tissues was carried out quickly to minimize autolysis. The resulting pelvises included the innominate bones, the sacrum and L5 vertebra with all adjacent ligaments remaining intact. Metal pins were inserted into the L5 and reinforced by means of RENCAST FC52 Isocyanate/FC52 Polyol/Ceramic Powder (RenShape solutions, Huntsman International LLC, Salt Lake City, UT, USA). The metal pins served as a mount for an indentation plate to be linked with the material testing machine. Additionally, adjustable titanium plates were mounted onto the iliac crest bilaterally and fixed with AO standard screws of individual lengths to fit into the iliac bones.

Mechanical testing and optical image correlation

A double-leg stance setup was used to apply loads via L5 with a uniaxial material testing machine (DYNA-MESS, Aachen, Germany). Steel wires mounted to the titanium plates at the iliac crest were used to simulate muscle traction of the erector spinae and the abdominal wall muscles. Load application was carried...
out in a physiological manner via a spherical stamp component connected to the material testing machine. Match-sized femoral head components were used to mount both acetabula to the bottom plates of the testing machine (Fig. 1). Preconditioning (20 cycles, 100 N s⁻¹) was performed with a load range varying between 0 N and 20% of the individual’s bodyweight. The load-deformation tests were carried out with 100% of the donors’ bodyweight in 12 cycles with a constant velocity of 150 N s⁻¹. In a final cycle, each pelvis was loaded until failure. Synchronous digital optical image correlation (DiC) data were recorded (Limess, Krefeld, Germany) with 2.0 megapixels at 5 fps (Schleifenbaum et al. 2016). For this purpose, speckle patterns were added at predefined locations of the pelvis, including L5, the sacral promontory, sacral and iliac alae, iliac wings and the superior pubic rami. The testing duration depended on the maximum force applied to the pelvices, capturing 1400-2400 images for each pelvis. The precision of the three-dimensional movement recording was 0.01 pixel, or 1 μm. Using the DIC software (Istra4D, Dantec, Skovlund, Denmark), movements of the following sites were exported:

- Sacroiliac joint: sacral ala relative to iliac ala, bilaterally
- Lumbosacral transition: L5 relative to sacrum,
- Innominate bone – superior pubic ramus versus iliac ala, bilaterally, pubis relative to ilium
- Pubic symphysis: right relative to left superior pubic ramus

### Data evaluation

A MATLAB routine (version 2017a, MathWorks, Inc., Natick, MA, USA) was used to import the coordinates of marked triangle points together with the corresponding displacements corrected for rigid body movement at each time step (rigid body motion removal, RBMR). The raw data was first noise-filtered over time allowing for an offset correction. Means and standard deviations referenced to the previous preloaded (50 N-) step, bodyweight-dependent displacements as RBMR functions for the SIJ, the lumbosacral transition, the innominate bones and the pubic symphysis. Additionally, for each pair of triangles A and B, rotation of B around the centroid of A was calculated. For this purpose, the center of the Cartesian coordinate system was identified with the centroid of A. The points of B were then registered for each time step to step 0 using the iterative closest point (ICP) algorithm implemented in MATLAB (pcregigid). The transformation matrix was decomposed to obtain rotations around the x-, y- and z-axes. The axes have been defined as follows: x-axis – medial-lateral, y-axis – anterior-posterior, z-axis – posterior anterior (Fig. 1), and Euler angles were reported. Both translations and rotations were solved from the rotation matrix in the order Z-Y-X.

The deformation curves were then scanned and evaluated via a second MATLAB routine. Movements of the corresponding regions were retrieved from the 12 load cycles. Load cycles were evaluated as relative changes at a preload (50 N) = 0, 20, 40, 60, 80 and 100% of the cadavers’ bodyweight and as absolute changes at a preload (50 N), 100 N, 200 N, 300 N, 400 N and 500 N. To prevent influences of setting phenomena in the deformation data, each individual load cycle was referenced to the previous preloaded (50 N) step, allowing for an offset correction. Means and standard deviations were calculated from the sampled points for every single region.

The minimum threshold for motions of the pelvis to be recognized was 0.1-mm translation, or 0.1° rotation, between 0 and 100% of the bodyweight.

### Statistical analyses

Data processing and statistical comparisons were carried out using Microsoft Excel version 16.12 (Redmond, WA, USA) and Prism (GraphPad Software, Inc., La Jolla, CA, USA).

### Table 1: Characteristics of the donor tissues and the mechanical setup.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age (years)</th>
<th>Body weight (kg)</th>
<th>Cause of death</th>
<th>Pelvis mass (g)</th>
<th>Preconditioning load (N)</th>
<th>Load testing failure load (N)</th>
<th>Ultimate failure load (N)</th>
<th>Failure site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69–13</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Mesenterial infarction</td>
<td>2656</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>2495</td>
<td>L5 fracture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71–13</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Acute renal failure</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>SIJ dislocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101–14</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Pneumonia</td>
<td>2464</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>Sacral fracture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121–14</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Malignant neoplasm of the stomach</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>SIJ dislocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03–15</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Malignant neoplasm of the biliary duct</td>
<td>2744</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>SIJ dislocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–15</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Chronic hypertrophic heart failure</td>
<td>2116</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>SIJ dislocation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mean ± SD | 81.3 ± 10.0 | 73.7 ± 15.6 | 2537.8 ± 946.8 |

SIJ, sacroiliac joint.
The weight of the pelvis was considered when calculating preconditioning and testing loads.
Results

The six pelvises completed the preconditioning and the 12 cycles in the described loading scenarios without demonstrating signs of premature mechanical failure and were included in the further evaluations. The mean failure load was 2538 ± 947 N (range 1650–4500 N; Table 1). Results from the absolute loading comparison (0–500 N) yielded similar translations and rotations relative to the bodyweight (Table 2, Supporting Information Tables S1 and S2). The accuracy of each motion is given in Supporting Information Table S3. Movements at 60% bodyweight or loads < 500 N were consistently lower than at 100% bodyweight or 500 N, respectively. The following considerations are therefore based on 100% bodyweight. Movements of the SIJs and the innominate bones were averaged from both sides, movements of the lumbosacral transition are given for L5 relative to S1, and movements of the pubic symphysis are given for the comparison of right relative to left.

The movement in double-leg stance in the SIJ combines a z-axis rotation of the ilium with an inferior (y-) translation of the sacrum

When the femoral load was changed from zero to 100% of the bodyweight there were small rotations detected in the z-axis of the SIJ with an average of $R_z = 0.16 ± 0.13°$ (mean ± SD), with the iliac crest innominate bone moving inwards to the cranial aspect of the sacrum (Fig. 2A, Supporting Information Figure 51A). The translation in the y-direction averaged $T_y = 0.32 ± 0.31$ mm, causing the innominate bone to move cranially relative to the sacrum (or, vice versa, the sacrum to move inferiorly). Increased loading consistently resulted in increased movement.

Movement at the lumbosacral transition in double-leg stance: (x-axis) flexion rotation combined with an inferior (y-) and anterior (z-) translation of L5

The rotation between the L5 and the sacrum in the x-axis was $R_x = 1.82 ± 1.04°$, an L5 flexion movement, the largest rotation of all segments of the lumbosacral transition and pelvis (Figs 2B and S1B). Translations were observed in the y-direction with $T_y = 0.97 ± 0.55$ mm and in the z-direction with $T_z = 0.11 ± 0.46$ mm, respectively; as a consequence of the rotation of the anterior aspect of L5 relative to the sacral promontory, this caused the anterior L5-S1 disk space to narrow. Increased loading consistently resulted in increased deformation.

Motion within the innominate bone and pubic symphysis: minute y-axis rotation

The dominating rotation within the innominate bone was $R_y = −0.10 ± 0.08°$, causing the pubic bone to rotate medially relative to the posterior pelvis (Figs 2C and S1C). Similar observations were made at the pubic symphysis, $R_y = −0.11 ± 0.05°$ (Figs 2D and S1D), continuous with the innominate bone rotation. These movements were, however, on the verge of measurement accuracy (Table S3). Though consistent increases in the other rotations and
translations were observed as the result of increased loading, these changes were minute—below the threshold defining a movement—and were accompanied by large variation.

**Discussion**

A number of studies have made attempts to describe SIJ movements both qualitatively and quantitatively (Weisl, 1955; Egund et al. 1978; Lavignolle et al. 1983; Miller et al. 1987; Rothkötter & Berner, 1988; Sturesson et al. 1989, 1999, 2000a,b; Vleeming et al. 1989, 1992a,b; Simonsen et al. 1994a; Jacob & Kissling, 1995; Kissling & Jacob, 1996; Wang & Dumas, 1998; Kibsgaard et al. 2012, 2014b; Lindsey et al. 2014). The common observation is that its overall movement is multi-dimensional and held within a small range, but to a highly variable extent among individuals. The complex anatomy of the SIJ forms an important part of the reasons behind the variability in movements, with the characteristics of synovial and syndesmotic joints (Le Blanche et al. 1996; Forst et al. 2006). The restricted movement is known to be the consequence of bone and cartilage geometry, dense ligaments and muscles, combining the posterior pelvis under the principles of force and form closure (Panjabi, 1992a,b; Arumugam et al. 2012; Vleeming et al. 2012). The given in vitro experiments have shown that the SIJ moves to a relatively small overall extent, consisting of a sub-degree rotation in the anterior-posterior (x-) axis and a sub-millimeter inferior (y-) translation. The global movement at the pelvis corresponded to the local movements at the SIJ, the lumbosacral transition, the innominate bone and the pubic symphysis. Whereas the rotations at the SIJ were small and mostly limited to the sagittal axis, major flexion-extension rotations were found at the lumbosacral transition, accompanied by an anterior-inferior translation of L5 relative to the sacrum. Both the innominate bone and the pubic symphysis moved multi-dimensionally, but to a varying (minute) extent, and predominantly around vertical axes. A particular finding was that the movements in the lumbosacral transition outweighed all of the other rotations and translations, underlining the relevance of this segment in load distribution. Failure loads of the given experiments were in line with the experiments of Rothkötter & Berner (1988) in younger cadavers.
Figure 2 Movement patterns at the pelvic ring, relative to bodyweight. Left, anterior view, right, lateral view onto the right hemipelvis. The arrows indicate the movements between the segments to the one another, appreciating that there are no truly fixed points in the system. a, anterior; cd, caudal; cr, cranial; l, left; p, posterior; r, right. (A) Sacroiliac joint, movement of the sacrum (S) relative to the ilium (I). (B) Lumbosacral transition, movement of the fifth lumbar vertebra (L5) relative to the sacrum (S). (C) Innominate bone, movement of the pubis (P) relative to the ilium (I). (D) Pubic symphysis, movement of the left relative to the right superior pubic ramus.
Table 3  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In vivo</th>
<th>Body position</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Age (years) mean ± SD, (range)</th>
<th>Measurement method</th>
<th>Rotation (degrees), mean ± SD, (range)</th>
<th>Translation (mm), mean ± SD, (range)</th>
<th>Accuracy (maximum possible error)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egund et al. (1978)</td>
<td>Different positions</td>
<td>4 patients</td>
<td>(20 to 50)</td>
<td>Stereophotogrammetry</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob &amp; Kissling (1995)</td>
<td>Upright, lumbar anteflexion</td>
<td>24 participants</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stereophotogrammetry, k wires</td>
<td>1.1 ± 0.78</td>
<td>0.83 ± 0.81</td>
<td>0.59 ± 0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kibsgard et al. (2012)</td>
<td>Standing</td>
<td>6 patients</td>
<td>(33 to 47)</td>
<td>Stereophotogrammetry</td>
<td>0.7*</td>
<td>0.2*</td>
<td>0.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kibsgard et al. (2014a, b)</td>
<td>One-leg standing</td>
<td>11 patients</td>
<td>(29 to 27)</td>
<td>Stereophotogrammetry</td>
<td>0.1 ± 0.2</td>
<td>0.1 ± 0.2</td>
<td>0.3 ± 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kissling &amp; Jacob (1996)</td>
<td>Standing</td>
<td>24 participants</td>
<td>(20 to 50)</td>
<td>Stereophotogrammetry, k wires</td>
<td>1.8 M, 1.9 F, 2.2 L, 2.1 R</td>
<td>0.7 M, 0.9 F, 0.9 bilateral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavignolle et al. (1983)</td>
<td>Supine position</td>
<td>5 participants</td>
<td>&lt;25</td>
<td>x-ray</td>
<td>(0.7 to 4.4)</td>
<td>(10.0 to 12.0)</td>
<td>(0.3 to 1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturesson et al. (1989)</td>
<td>Supine to standing</td>
<td>25 patients</td>
<td>(18 to 45)</td>
<td>Stereophotogrammetry</td>
<td>−1.1 L, −1.2 R, 0.1 L, 0.3 R, 0.0 L, 0.1 R</td>
<td>0.4 L, 0.5 R</td>
<td>(−2.0 to 0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturesson et al. (1999)</td>
<td>Supine to standing</td>
<td>10 patients</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stereophotogrammetry</td>
<td>−1.1 median</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturesson et al. (2000a, b)</td>
<td>Supine to standing</td>
<td>6 patients</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stereophotogrammetry</td>
<td>−1.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weisl (1955)</td>
<td>Supine to standing</td>
<td>22 participants</td>
<td>(17 to 28)</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>(−2.5 to 0.5)</td>
<td>(0.0 to 1.6)</td>
<td>(−1.0 to 0.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F, female; L, left; M, male; R, right; SD, standard deviation.
*Values averaged from pre- and post-surgery.
Values are not given in the studies if they are not listed.
Table 4 *In vitro* deformation data of the sacroiliac joint.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cadaveric</th>
<th>Body position</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Age (years) mean ± SD, (range)</th>
<th>Measurement method</th>
<th>Rotation (degrees), mean ± SD, (range)</th>
<th>Translation (mm), mean ± SD, (range)</th>
<th>Accuracy (maximum possible error)**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frigerio et al. (1974)</td>
<td>Standing</td>
<td>1 pelvis (unclear if embalmed)</td>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>Stereophotogrammetry</td>
<td>2.27 ± 1.35</td>
<td>–3.2 to 4.6</td>
<td>0.2 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsey et al. (2014)</td>
<td>Standing</td>
<td>7 fresh lumbopelvises</td>
<td>59 ± 6.3</td>
<td>Axial (restrained) loading with 3.75–7.5 Nm maximum, metal markers</td>
<td>0.13 ± 0.23</td>
<td>0.8 to 2 mm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller et al. (1987)</td>
<td>Standing</td>
<td>8 fresh bilateral SIJ</td>
<td>59 to 74</td>
<td>Axial (restrained) loading 294 N, 42 Nm to S1 endplate</td>
<td>0.4 ± 0.2 at 500 N*</td>
<td>1.3 ± 1.0 at 2000 N*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rothkötter &amp; Berner (1988)</td>
<td>Standing</td>
<td>6 fresh pelvises</td>
<td>36.8 ± 15.1</td>
<td>Ventro-cranial (restrained) loading</td>
<td>0.5 ± 0.4</td>
<td>0.5 ± 0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simonian et al. (1994a,b)</td>
<td>Standing</td>
<td>4 fresh lumbopelvises with femora</td>
<td>79 (76 to 96)</td>
<td>Axial (restrained) loading</td>
<td>(0.1 to 1.4)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vleeming et al. (1989)</td>
<td>Standing</td>
<td>4 embalmed lumbopelvises</td>
<td>77 (73 to 83)</td>
<td>Axial loading, restrained pelvis</td>
<td>(0.1 to 4.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vleeming et al. (1992a)</td>
<td>Standing</td>
<td>6 embalmed lumbopelvises</td>
<td>76 to 97</td>
<td>Axial loading, restrained pelvis</td>
<td>(0.0 to 4.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vleeming et al. (1992b)</td>
<td>Standing</td>
<td>6 embalmed lumbopelvises</td>
<td>77 (73 to 83)</td>
<td>Axial loading, restrained pelvis</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.04*, 0.01 mm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang &amp; Dumas (1998)</td>
<td>Standing</td>
<td>4 fresh female pelvises</td>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>Axial (constrained) loading of sacrum, maximum load 300-490 N</td>
<td>–1.2 at 60% bodyweight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SD, standard deviation
*Estimated from the graphs
**Not given if not listed.
Posterior pelvis biomechanics revisited combining physiological loading with image correlation

The given experiments were the first attempt to identify the three-dimensional deformations occurring simultaneously at the SIJ and the surrounding osteoligamentous tissues, providing sound baseline data on its passive mobility. The setup allowed the application of optical image correlation to obtain highly accurate movements of the entire pelvis, with measurement errors lower than $0.02^\circ$ or $0.01$ mm, respectively – one magnitude lower than the threshold for identifying movements to be recognized. Moreover, using spherical joints in the L5 endplate and both hip joints allowed for a physiological load application similar to the situation in vivo. Moreover, an evaluation of the deformation related to both absolute loading (in N) and body-weight (in %) (Wang & Dumas, 1998) provided realistic data which can be used for reference or numerical validation purposes. Previous SIJ biomechanical setups were commonly limited to the sacrum and ilium, either isolated from the remaining pelvis (Miller et al. 1987; Rothkötter & Berner, 1988; Bechtel, 2001) or in a uniaxial loading setup with one of the joint partners firmly attached (Simonian et al. 1994b; Wang & Dumas, 1998; Bruna-Russo, 2014; Lindsey et al. 2014). This previous approach likely limited the interpretability of the movements, as, in vivo, both joint partners have a certain degree of freedom within the kinematic chain.

The SIJ and lumbosacral transition appear to have corresponding movements, limited to the sagittal plane in the functional pelvis

Studies examining the SIJ motion in living subjects (Lavignolle et al. 1983; Kissling & Jacob, 1996; Sturesson et al. 1999, 2000a; Kibsgård et al. 2014a; Table 3) tended to give higher motion values than cadaveric (Weisl, 1955; Kissling et al. 1990; Sturesson et al. 2000b; Kapandji, 2009; Table 4) and numerical studies (Ivanov et al. 2009; Sichting et al. 2014; Table 5), with rotations varying by up to two magnitudes. This might partially be related to vast individual variations, but more importantly a consequence of varying experimental setups, and the accuracy and the precision of the experiments. It has been stated previously that individuals with SIJ pain tend to have an increased range of motion (Snijders et al. 1993; Wang & Dumas, 1998; Mens et al. 2006). A brief literature review on existing in vivo studies on SIJ motion did not, however, provide clear evidence supporting this assumption (Table 3), or age (Brunner et al. 1991; Vleeming et al. 2012) or our findings in the present experiments with minute SIJ movements under physiological load.

Our results on SIJ flexion-extension rotation have been markedly different concerning translation compared with previous trials (Weisl, 1955; Egund et al. 1978; Miller et al. 1987; Sturesson et al. 1989, 1999, 2000a; Vleeming et al. 1989; Kissling et al. 1990; Simonian et al. 1994b; Jacob & Kissling, 1995; Kibsgård et al. 2012, 2014b). Especially, in vitro studies appear to overestimate the extent of motion (Vleeming et al. 1992a,b; Lindsey et al. 2014), potentially as a consequence of un-physiological loading or of limiting the multi-axial nutation of the SIJ to one or two planes with direct force application onto the sacral promontory. SIJ rotations beyond $2^\circ$ are unlikely to appear under physiological conditions according to our given experiments. Our hypothesis that SIJ movement is markedly smaller than reported previously can be accepted regarding flexion-extension rotation if the lumbosacral transition is included in the loading scenario.

A number of studies have also found rotations in the vertical and the anterior-posterior axis (Sturesson et al. 1989, 2000a; Jacob & Kissling, 1995; Kibsgård et al. 2012, 2014a) or have reported multi-axial (helical) rotations (Kissling et al. 1990; Sturesson et al. 1999, 2000a; Kibsgård et al. 2012). Our results confirm the existence of a rotation in the SIJ in the anterior-posterior axis under L5 loading, but only minute vertical rotations. Of importance, the lumbosacral transition appears to have a significant involvement in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In silico</th>
<th>Body position</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Age (years)</th>
<th>Measurement method</th>
<th>Rotation (degrees), mean ± SD, (range)</th>
<th>Translation (mm), mean ± SD, (range)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$x$</td>
<td>$y$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruna-Russo et al. (2016)</td>
<td>FE model, cadaveric study</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivanov et al. (2009)</td>
<td>FE model</td>
<td>0.45 at 400 N*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sichting et al. (2014)</td>
<td>FE model</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SD, standard deviation.
*Estimated from the graphs.
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movement patterns as seen in the SIJ under physiological loading, with flexion-extension rotations averaging 1.82° under 100% of the body loading. This was accompanied by an anterior-inferior translation of L5 relative to the sacrum, again larger than at the SIJ. These results provide evidence of the functional interrelation of the lumbosacrum and the SIJ, likely reinforced by the dense iliolumbar and sacroiliac ligaments (Hammer et al. 2009, 2010; Steinke et al. 2010).

The innominate bone and pubic symphysis appear to have minute but existing movements

Both the innominate bones and the pubic symphysis have shown small movements, composed mainly of rotations in the vertical axis. The superior pubic ramus rotated anteromedially relative to the ilium, and both pubic rami laterally, forming a counter movement. The observed motions may be responsible for the changes of the pelvic conjugate diameters (Klein, 1891; Weisl, 1955), and innominate bone movement appears to be the consequence of the long lever arms provided along the terminal line. Moreover, these minute movements may, to a certain degree, prevent stress fractures under peak loading.

The observed motions in the innominate bones and the pubic symphysis were accompanied by large variations, which may be related to sidedness and interindividual differences in the cadavers. Walheim & Selvik (1984) have determined in vivo global rotations on pubic symphysis mobility, accounting for 3° rotations and 2-mm translations, using roentgen stereophotogrammetric analysis, which are in the larger range of our combined pubic symphysis and innominate bone movements. Similar minute displacements were found in previous in vitro analyses (Giraldez-Sanchez et al. 2014; Gonzalvez et al. 2016).

Conclusions and clinical implications

The present study provides highly accurate three-dimensional insights into lumbopelvic ring motion, conforming to the natural condition under physiological loading via L5 and the acetabulum via ball joints, appreciating all degrees of freedom at the SIJ. Several clinical implications can be derived from the study, both relating to movement reduction of the posterior pelvis. It seems that the movement in the SIJ is limited, and this study supports earlier in vivo findings in this regard (Kibsgard et al. 2012, 2014b, 2017).

Existing surgical approaches to fuse the SIJ are to date based on the assumption that the SIJ movement itself is the main driver of the movement of the posterior pelvis (Ebraheim et al. 2010; Stark et al. 2011; Mason et al. 2013; Sturesson et al. 2016). Due to the small translations and rotations occurring at the SIJ, one may hypothesize that an isolated trans-sacroiliac fusion technique may reduce the small SIJ movement and consequently the compression forces of the SIJ by causing shifts in the peak loading cranially (L5) and laterally (innominate bones) of the implants (Sturesson et al. 1999). To date, sound anatomical and biomechanical evidence is lacking concerning pain originating from the SIJ exclusively, not from the adjacent segments (Szadek et al. 2010). The data presented here provide evidence of the lumbosacral transition being potentially of importance. This may not only have implications for the surgical treatment fusing the SIJ, but also for other methods of non-surgical treatment including pelvic orthoses, where movement patterns and their alterations have to date not been fully taken into account (Hammer et al. 2015; Soisson et al. 2015).

Limitations

A number of limitations apply for the given setup. First, the sample size is comparably small to investigate the effects of age, gender and sidedness. Secondly, the pelvises were freed from soft tissues such as muscles and pelvic viscera so that neither active nor passive mechanical properties are accounted for. This has partly been compensated by mimicking the main strains of erector spinae and the abdominal wall muscles, but is a simplification. Also, the old age of the cadavers limits the significance of the study, especially for younger populations, where different motion patterns might be possible.
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Supporting Information

Additional Supporting Information may be found in the online version of this article:

Fig. S1. Movement patterns at the pelvic ring, absolute loading in steps between 0 and 500 N. Left: anterior view, right lateral view onto the right hemipelvis. The arrows indicate the movements between the segments one to the other, appreciating that there are no truly fixed points in the system. a, anterior; cd, caudal; cr, cranial; l, left; p, posterior; r, right.

Fig. S1A. Sacroiliac joint, movement of the sacrum (S) relative to the ilium (I).

Fig. S1B. Lumbosacral transition, movement of the fifth lumbar vertebra (L5) relative to the sacrum (S).

Fig. S1C. Innominate bone, movement of the pubis (P) relative to the ilium (I).

Fig. S1D. Pubic symphysis, movement of the left relative to the right superior pubic ramus.

Table S1. Relative movement.

Table S2. Absolute movement.

Table S3. Precision of the measurements.