

Application of statistical parametric mapping for comparison of scapular kinematics and EMG

Type of Article: short communication

Kotono Kobayashi^{1*}, Jun Umehara^{1,2}, Todd C Pataky¹, Masahide Yagi¹, Tetsuya Hirono^{1,3,4}, Yasuyuki Ueda^{1,5},

Noriaki Ichihashi¹

1. Human Health Sciences, Graduate School of Medicine, Kyoto University, 53 Kawahara-cho, Shogoin, Sakyo-ku, Kyoto, 606-8507, Japan

2. Faculty of Rehabilitation, Kansai Medical University, 18-89 Uyama Higashimachi, Hirakata, Osaka 573-1136, Japan

3. School of Health and Sport Science, Chukyo University, 101 Tokodachi, Kaizu-cho, Toyota, Aichi, 470-0393, Japan

4. Research Fellow of Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, Kojimachi Business Center Building, 5-3-1 Kojimachi, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, 102-0083, Japan

5. Department of Physical Therapy, Faculty of Health Science, Takarazuka University of Medical and Healthcare, 1 Hanayashiki-Midorigaoka, Takarazuka, Hyogo, 666-0162, Japan

*Corresponding author

Kotono KOBAYASHI

20 Human Health Sciences, Graduate School of Medicine, Kyoto University,

21 53, Kawahara-cho, Shogoin, Sakyo-ku, Kyoto, 606-8507, Japan

22 Phone: +81-75-751-3951

23 Fax: +81-75-751-3951

24 E-mail: kobayashi.kotono.y84@kyoto-u.jp

25

26 Keywords: Statistical parametric mapping; shoulder; scapular kinematics; EMG; load

27

28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

ABSTRACT (249words)

Scapular kinematics and EMG are frequently measured as a functional assessment of the shoulder. Previous studies have compared interval averaging for these time series data, but it is not clear whether this method exactly captures the dynamics of scapular kinematics and muscle activity. Statistical parametric mapping (SPM) can be used to compare time series data. The purpose of this study was to investigate whether there is a difference between the results of SPM and interval averaging (every 10° or 30°) in comparing scapular kinematics, EMG, and EMG ratio. Scapular kinematics and EMG of the upper trapezius (UT), middle trapezius (MT), and lower trapezius (LT) and serratus anterior (SA) were measured in 21 healthy males. Tasks included arm raising and lowering with or without load, and we compared scapular kinematics, EMG, and EMG ratio in the loaded and unloaded conditions. Results suggest disagreement between SPM and interval averaging. Characteristic results are that for scapular kinematics during lowering SPM showed a decrease in upward rotation in only the regions 113-65° and 42-30°, while interval averaging showed a decrease in all range. For EMG during lowering, SPM results were not significantly different in SA over 50-48 and 45-30°, while interval averaging suggested increased activity in all ranges. For EMG ratio during raising, SPM showed no significant difference, while interval averaging showed a decrease in UT/LT during the latter period. These results indicate that SPM provides better resolution regarding effect regions than interval averaging, and suggest that SPM may improve shoulder function assessment accuracy.

45 **1 Introduction**

46 The evaluation of scapular kinematics and electromyography (EMG) of scapulothoracic muscles can indicate
47 pathological state and can also be useful in subsequent appropriate treatment. When comparing scapular kinematics
48 almost all previous studies have compared measurements using interval averaging (e.g., humeral elevation 31-60,
49 61-90, and 91-120°) as a representative value (Ludewig and Cook, 2000; Michener et al., 2016). However, since
50 scapular kinematics and EMG change continuously in time, interval averaging may provide inadequate temporal
51 resolution (Zdravkovic et al., 2020). Statistical parametric mapping (SPM) has been attracting attention recently,
52 because does not require *a priori* time series reduction, and can be used to control both Type I and Type II errors at
53 the entire time series level (Pataky et al., 2013; Robinson et al., 2021). In this study, we compared scapular kinematics
54 and EMG under loaded and unloaded conditions using SPM and interval averaging. A loaded condition was included
55 because even low-to-moderate loads are known to produce substantial changes in shoulder dynamics (Antony and
56 Keir, 2010; Reed et al., 2016).

57 The purpose of this study was to elucidate differences between the results of SPM and interval averaging
58 in scapular kinematics and EMG ratio during arm raising and lowering with or without load.

59

60 **2 Materials and methods**

61 **2.1 Participants**

62 Twenty-one healthy males (age, 24.3 ± 3.5 years; height, 171.1 ± 4.9 cm; mass, 62.6 ± 10.2 kg) volunteered for this
63 study. We chose this sample size based on pilot studies which showed that SPM was sufficiently sensitive to identify

64 differences in samples of this size (Aliaj et al., 2021, 2022; Gaudet et al., 2018a; Ribeiro et al., 2017). We did not
65 conduct formal power analysis because the primary goal was to compare different analysis methods, and it is
66 generally not possible to calculate a single sample size that yields equivalent power across all methods. Exclusion
67 criteria included: upper limb orthopedic or nervous system abnormalities. Written informed consents were obtained
68 from participants prior to the experiment. All study procedures were approved by the Ethics Committee of Kyoto
69 University Graduate School of Medicine (approval number: R1347-2).

70

71 **2.2 Experimental procedures**

72 In the standing position, participants performed sagittal plane upper limb raising and lowering along a bar under
73 loaded (3 kg) and unloaded conditions (Fig.1). The non-dominant limb was measured because the dominant hand is
74 often used in daily life, and individual characteristics are greatly expressed in scapula kinematics and EMG, then
75 natural change with load may not occur. The preferred throwing limb was defined as the ‘dominant’ limb. The
76 participants elevated then lowered their upper limb, each over 4 s, following a metronome at 60 beats/min for three
77 consecutive cycles (24 s). Participants practiced with and without load before measurements were made.

78

79 **2.3 Measurement of scapular kinematics**

80 The measurement of scapular kinematics followed (Umehara et al., 2018). We measured scapula and humerus motion
81 using a 6-degrees-of-freedom electromagnetic tracker (Liberty, Polhemus, Colchester, VT, USA) at 120 Hz. The
82 device consists of a transmitter, receiver, and digitizing stylus. Each sensor was attached to the scapular acromion,

83 the midpoint of the humerus (attached over a thermoplastic cuff wrapped), and the sternum using adhesive tape. The
84 bony landmarks of the scapula, humerus, and sternum were palpated and digitized using the stylus to form segments
85 and local coordinate systems. Coordinate system definitions followed International Society of Biomechanics
86 recommendations (Wu et al., 2005).

87

88 **2.4 Measurement of EMG**

89 We measured muscle activity using surface EMG (TeleMyo 2400; Noraxon, Scottsdale, AZ, USA) at 1500 Hz. The
90 in-phase signal removal ratio, impedance and gain were >100 dB, >100 dMohm and 500 dB, respectively. Sub-
91 electrode skin was shaved and cleaned using scrub gel and alcohol. Disposable pregelled Ag-AgCl electrodes (Blue
92 Sensor; Medicotest, Olstykke, Denmark) were applied to the upper trapezius muscle (UT), middle trapezius muscle
93 (MT), lower trapezius muscle (LT), and serratus anterior muscle (SA). The inter-electrode distance was 20 mm.
94 Electrode locations followed the previous study (Umehara et al., 2021). Based on a previous study (Yamauchi et
95 al., 2015), we measured the EMG of each muscle during maximal voluntary contraction for amplitude normalization
96 purposes. EMG was normalized by the EMG during maximal voluntary contraction and presented as a percent
97 (%MVC). The EMG during maximal voluntary contraction was measured once for three seconds in each muscle after
98 practicing several times and making sure they could exert all their strength.

99

100 **2.5 Data processing**

101 During each raising and lowering phase, scapular angles relative to the thorax were calculated for every 1° of humeral

102 elevation from 30 to 120°, and the averages across three measurements were used for statistical analysis. We analyzed
103 scapular kinematics in humeral elevation only up to 120°, because previous studies (Karduna et al., 2001) have shown
104 that measurement error increases beyond 120°. The scapular angle at the nearest neighbor value of the measured
105 humeral elevation angle was used for integer values from 30 to 120°. We processed the raw EMG signals using zero-
106 phase-lag filter. In addition, raw EMG signals were processed using a band-pass filter (10-450 Hz; 4-order;
107 Butterworth) and low-pass 5-Hz filter to remove noise (Gaudet et al., 2018c, 2018b). Mean values over three seconds
108 were used as representative values. EMG and kinematic data were synchronized using the spike trigger at the
109 beginning of the measurement. The EMG data were calculated every 1° at the humeral elevation angle from 30 to
110 120° in each raising and lowering phase EMG means over about 22 ms were used for each 1°.

111

112 **2.6 Statistical analysis**

113 SPM1d version 0.4 (<http://www.spm1d.org>) (Pataky et al., 2013) was used for the statistical analysis of scapular
114 kinematics, EMG, and EMG ratio. Two-tailed paired SPM t-tests were used to test for load effects on scapular
115 kinematics. Similarly, EMG of UT, MT, LT, and SA and EMG ratios of UT/MT, UT/LT, and UT/SA were compared
116 between load and unload. We also conducted interval averaging analysis and qualitatively compared to the SPM
117 results. Mean humeral elevation angles were calculated over both 10° (Kai et al., 2016; Kon et al., 2008) and 30°
118 intervals (Camci et al., 2013; De Castro et al., 2014; Michener et al., 2016). A Type I error rate of 0.05 was used in
119 all tests. All analyses were performed using Matlab R2020a (Mathworks, Natick, MA, USA).

120

121 **3 Results**

122 **3.1 Scapular kinematics**

123 During raising, external rotation significantly increased, and posterior tilt significantly decreased when loaded.
124 During lowering, upward rotation and posterior tilt significantly decreased when loaded. SPM and interval averaging
125 results differed for posterior tilt (raising) and upward rotation (lowering) (Table1, Fig.2A-C).

126

127 **3.2 EMG**

128 EMG of all muscles significantly increased when loaded. SPM and interval averaging results differed for SA
129 (lowering) (Table1, Fig.3A-C).

130

131 **3.3 EMG ratio**

132 UT/MT and UT/LT significantly decreased when loaded. SPM and interval averaging results differed for both ratios
133 in both movement phases (Table1, Fig.4A-C).

134

135 **4 Discussion**

136 This study investigated the effects of load on scapular kinematics and EMG during arm raising and lowering,
137 separately using SPM and interval averaging. We then focused on identifying differences between the results of SPM
138 and interval averaging. Results suggest disagreement between SPM and interval averaging for several scapular
139 kinematics and EMG variables. This supports previous findings that interval averaging and other ad hoc time series

140 reduction techniques can distort or bias the underlying data (Pataky et al., 2013).

141 For scapular kinematics in the lowering phase, SPM showed a load-induced decrease in upward rotation in
142 the regions 113-65 and 42-30°, but interval averaging showed a decrease over the entire range (Fig.2). In addition,
143 the two different interval resolutions (10° and 30°) gave different results in external rotation and posterior tilt during
144 raising (Fig.2B, C). Interval averaging may therefore represent under-sampling. Supplementary results considering
145 other common metrics (root mean squared error and correlations) reinforced the observation that inadequate
146 resolution can distort the results (see Supplementary Material). These results suggest that resolution discrepancies
147 amongst previous studies could have caused the reported inconsistencies.

148 SPM showed no significant load effect for SA EMG at 50-48 and 45-30° (lowering). This contradicts
149 interval averaging's result which suggests significant increases over the entire range. SPM similarly exhibited
150 conflicting results for both UT/LT and UT/MT EMG ratios during raising. For variables like EMG ratio, which can
151 change greatly with each 1° of humeral elevation. Highly erratic variables like this may require increased resolution
152 in order to capture high-frequency content. Neither SPM nor interval testing should be used if the effective resolution
153 is insufficient to capture those changes.

154 Choosing analysis methods for scapular kinematics and EMG of scapulothoracic muscles should follow
155 the aim and data type. Each method has pros and cons. For example, the SPM avoids summary metric extraction
156 (Pataky et al., 2016a), but cannot assure single point/feature comparison and cannot avoid the normalization (i.e.,
157 time or angle) (Pataky et al., 2022). In contrast, scalar analysis (e.g., interval averaging or peak values) allows us to
158 compare single-point values such as peak, minimum, and median (Degraeve et al., 2020) but cannot avoid

159 continuum summary metric extraction (Pataky et al., 2016a). Furthermore, scalar analysis may increase the false
160 positive rate when continuous one-dimensional data is converted to zero-dimensional data (Pataky et al., 2016b).
161 This study also showed why different interval resolutions may be non-ideal. Given the pros and cons of each
162 method and our findings, it may be desirable to select analyses based on the purpose of the study or run multiple
163 analyses using multiple methods. When selecting the analysis, we would recommend using SPM if we want to
164 compare continuous data and scalar analysis if we want to compare features (e.g., interval averaging or peak
165 values). When combining analyses, insofar as the methods agree one can be reasonably confident in the detected
166 effect(s). If they disagree, then that disagreement ought to be explained. We believe this will enable us to assess
167 shoulder joint function more accurately and we can utilize it in clinical settings.

168 In conclusion, we investigated the effects of load on scapular kinematics and EMG during slow, cyclical
169 upper limb raising and lowering using SPM and interval averaging. SPM and interval averaging gave different results,
170 due predominantly to insufficient resolution and/or false positive rate in the latter. Using SPM in the comparison of
171 shoulder dynamics may avoid resolution-borne errors of conventional interval averaging methods, and may therefore
172 yield greater inter-study consistency and ultimately more accurate assessments of shoulder function.

173

174 **5 Authors' Contributions**

175 All authors conceived and designed the research. KK and JU performed the experiment and analyzed the data. All
176 authors interpreted the results. KK, JU, TP, MY, TH, and YU wrote the manuscript. JU, TP, MY, TH, YU, and NI
177 edited and revised the manuscript. All authors have approved the final version of the manuscript.

178

179 **Declaration of Competing Interest**

180 The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have
181 appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

182

Reference

- Aliaj, K., Foreman, K.B., Chalmers, P.N., Henninger, H.B., 2021. Beyond Euler/Cardan analysis: True glenohumeral axial rotation during arm elevation and rotation. *Gait Posture* 88, 28–36. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2021.05.004>
- Aliaj, K., Lawrence, R.L., Bo Foreman, K., Chalmers, P.N., Henninger, H.B., 2022. Kinematic coupling of the glenohumeral and scapulothoracic joints generates humeral axial rotation. *J. Biomech.* 136, 111059. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2022.111059>
- Antony, N.T., Keir, P.J., 2010. Effects of posture, movement and hand load on shoulder muscle activity. *J. Electromyogr. Kinesiol.* 20, 191–198. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jelekin.2009.04.010>
- Camci, E., Duzgun, I., Hayran, M., Baltaci, G., Karaduman, A., 2013. Scapular kinematics during shoulder elevation performed with and without elastic resistance in men without shoulder pathologies. *J. Orthop. Sports Phys. Ther.* 43, 735–743. <https://doi.org/10.2519/jospt.2013.4466>
- De Castro, M.P., Ribeiro, D.C., De C. Forte, F., De Toledo, J.M., Aldabe, D., Loss, J.F., 2014. Shoulder kinematics is not influenced by external load during elevation in the scapular plane. *J. Appl. Biomech.* 30, 66–74. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jab.2012-0083>
- Degrave, V., Verdugo, F., Pelletier, J., Traube, C., Begon, M., 2020. Time history of upper-limb muscle activity during isolated piano keystrokes. *J. Electromyogr. Kinesiol.* 54, 102459. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jelekin.2020.102459>
- Gaudet, S., Tremblay, J., Begon, M., 2018a. Muscle recruitment patterns of the subscapularis, serratus anterior and other shoulder girdle muscles during isokinetic internal and external rotations. *J. Sports Sci.* 36, 985–993. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2017.1347697>
- Gaudet, S., Tremblay, J., Begon, M., 2018b. Muscle recruitment patterns of the subscapularis, serratus anterior and other shoulder girdle muscles during isokinetic internal and external rotations. *J. Sports Sci.* 36, 985–993. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2017.1347697>
- Gaudet, S., Tremblay, J., Dal Maso, F., 2018c. Evolution of muscular fatigue in periscapular and rotator cuff muscles during isokinetic shoulder rotations. *J. Sports Sci.* 36, 2121–2128. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2018.1440513>
- Kai, Y., Gotoh, M., Takei, K., Madokoro, K., Imura, T., Murata, S., Morihara, T., Shiba, N., 2016. Analysis of scapular kinematics during active and passive arm elevation. *J. Phys. Ther. Sci.* 28, 1876–1882. <https://doi.org/10.1589/jpts.28.1876>
- Karduna, A.R., McClure, P.W., Michener, L.A., Sennett, B., 2001. Dynamic measurements of three-dimensional scapular kinematics: A validation study. *J. Biomech. Eng.* 123, 184–190. <https://doi.org/10.1115/1.1351892>
- Kon, Y., Nishinaka, N., Gamada, K., Tsutsui, H., Banks, S.A., 2008. The influence of handheld weight on the scapulohumeral rhythm. *J. Shoulder Elb. Surg.* 17, 943–946. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jse.2008.05.047>
- Ludewig, P.M., Cook, T.M., 2000. Alterations in shoulder kinematics and associated muscle activity in people with symptoms of shoulder impingement. *Phys. Ther.* 80, 276–291. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ptj/80.3.276>
- Michener, L.A., Sharma, S., Cools, A.M., Timmons, M.K., 2016. Relative scapular muscle activity ratios are altered in subacromial pain syndrome. *J. Shoulder Elb. Surg.* 25, 1861–1867. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jse.2016.04.010>
- Pataky, T.C., Robinson, M.A., Vanrenterghem, J., 2016a. Region-of-interest analyses of one-dimensional biomechanical trajectories: bridging 0D and 1D theory, augmenting statistical power. *PeerJ* 4, e2652.

221 <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.2652>

222 Pataky, T.C., Robinson, M.A., Vanrenterghem, J., 2013. Vector field statistical analysis of kinematic and force
 223 trajectories. *J. Biomech.* 46, 2394–2401. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2013.07.031>

224 Pataky, T.C., Robinson, M.A., Vanrenterghem, J., Donnelly, C.J.W., 2022. Simultaneously assessing amplitude and
 225 temporal effects in biomechanical trajectories using nonlinear registration and statistical nonparametric mapping. *J.*
 226 *Biomech.* 136, 111049. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2022.111049>

227 Pataky, T.C., Vanrenterghem, J., Robinson, M.A., 2016b. The probability of false positives in zero-dimensional analyses
 228 of one-dimensional kinematic, force and EMG trajectories. *J. Biomech.* 49, 1468–1476.
 229 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2016.03.032>

230 Reed, D., Cathers, I., Halaki, M., Ginn, K.A., 2016. Does load influence shoulder muscle recruitment patterns during
 231 scapular plane abduction? *J. Sci. Med. Sport* 19, 755–760. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsams.2015.10.007>

232 Ribeiro, D.C., Day, A., Dickerson, C.R., 2017. Grade-IV inferior glenohumeral mobilization does not immediately alter
 233 shoulder and scapular muscle activity: a repeated-measures study in asymptomatic individuals. *J. Man. Manip.*
 234 *Ther.* 25, 260–269. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10669817.2017.1290310>

235 Robinson, M.A., Vanrenterghem, J., Pataky, T.C., 2021. Sample size estimation for biomechanical waveforms: Current
 236 practice, recommendations and a comparison to discrete power analysis. *J. Biomech.* 122, 110451.
 237 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2021.110451>

238 Umehara, J., Kusano, K., Nakamura, M., Morishita, K., Nishishita, S., Tanaka, H., Shimizu, I., Ichihashi, N., 2018.
 239 Scapular kinematic and shoulder muscle activity alterations after serratus anterior muscle fatigue. *J. Shoulder Elb.*
 240 *Surg.* 27, 1205–1213. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jse.2018.01.009>

241 Umehara, J., Yagi, M., Hirono, T., Ueda, Y., Ichihashi, N., 2021. Quantification of muscle coordination underlying basic
 242 shoulder movements using muscle synergy extraction. *J. Biomech.* 120, 110358.
 243 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2021.110358>

244 Wu, G., Van Der Helm, F.C.T., Veegeer, H.E.J., Makhsous, M., Van Roy, P., Anglin, C., Nagels, J., Karduna, A.R.,
 245 McQuade, K., Wang, X., Werner, F.W., Buchholz, B., 2005. ISB recommendation on definitions of joint
 246 coordinate systems of various joints for the reporting of human joint motion - Part II: Shoulder, elbow, wrist and
 247 hand. *J. Biomech.* 38, 981–992. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2004.05.042>

248 Yamauchi, T., Hasegawa, S., Matsumura, A., Nakamura, M., Ibuki, S., Ichihashi, N., 2015. The effect of trunk rotation
 249 during shoulder exercises on the activity of the scapular muscle and scapular kinematics. *J. Shoulder Elb. Surg.* 24,
 250 955–964. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jse.2014.10.010>

251 Zdravkovic, V., Alexander, N., Wegener, R., Spross, C., Jost, B., 2020. How Do Scapulothoracic Kinematics During
 252 Shoulder Elevation Differ Between Adults With and Without Rotator Cuff Arthropathy? *Clin. Orthop. Relat. Res.*
 253 478, 2640–2649. <https://doi.org/10.1097/CORR.0000000000001406>

254

255

	Results of load compared with unload	humeral elevation angles with significances			Results of load compared with unload	humeral elevation angles with significances		
	Raising phase	SPM	10°	30°	Lowering phase	SPM	10°	30°
Scapular kinematics								
In/Ex Rot.	Increase in Ex	76-120°	70-79,80-89,90-99,100-109,110-120°	60-89,90-120°				
Down/Up Rot.					Decrease in Up	113-65,42-30°	all range	all range
Pos/Ant Tilt	Decrease in Pos	89-120°	30-39,80-89,90-99,100-109,110-120°	30-59,90-120°	Decrease in Pos	all range	all range	all range
EMG								
UT	Increase in UT	all range (except 120°)	all range	all range	Increase in UT	all range (except 46°)	all range	all range
MT	Increase in MT	all range	all range	all range	Increase in MT	all range	all range	all range
LT	Increase in LT	all range (except 120°)	all range	all range	Increase in LT	all range	all range	all range
SA	Increase in SA	all range	all range	all range	Increase in SA	all range (except 50-48,45-30°)	all range	all range
EMG ratio								
UT/MT	Decrease in UT/MT	36-39,44-84,86-90,94-98,105-110,112°	all range	all range	Decrease in UT/MT	88,60-53,48-40°	109-100,99-90,89-80,79-70,69-60,59-50,49-40,39-30°	all range
UT/LT	Decrease in UT/LT		70-79,80-89,90-99,100-109°	60-89,90-120°	Decrease in UT/LT	73-65,60-53,50-49,47-43°	all range	all range
UT/SA								

256 **Table1** Comparison of SPM and interval averaging results.

257 SPM: Statistical Parametric Mapping, 10°: interval averaging every 10°, 30°: interval averaging every 30°, In Rot.: internal rotation, Ex Rot.: external rotation, Down

258 Rot.: downward rotation, Up Rot.: upward rotation, Pos Tilt: posterior tilt, Ant Tilt: anterior tilt, UT: upper trapezius muscle, MT: middle trapezius muscle, LT: lower

259 trapezius muscle, SA: serratus anterior muscle

Figure Legend

Figure1 Measurements of scapular kinematics and EMG.

Figure2 Scapular kinematics in load and unload.

Unload is indicated by a blue line, load by a red line. Panel A shows the results of SPM, panel B shows the results of interval averaging every 10°, and panel C shows the results of interval averaging every 30°. The gray area in panel A and * in panel B and panel C indicate that there was a significant difference between load and unload. The scapula angle was defined as internal rotation (+) and external rotation (-), upward rotation (-) and downward rotation (+), and posterior tilt (+) and anterior tilt (-). The humeral angle was defined as elevation (+) and supination (-). In Rot.: internal rotation, Ex Rot.: external rotation, Down Rot.: downward rotation, Up Rot.: upward rotation, Pos Tilt: posterior tilt, Ant Tilt: anterior tilt

Figure3 EMG in load and unload.

Unload is indicated by a blue line, load by a red line. Panel A shows the results of SPM, panel B shows the results of interval averaging every 10°, and panel C shows the results of interval averaging every 30°. The gray area in panel A and * in panel B and panel C indicate that there was a significant difference between unload and load. UT: upper trapezius muscle, MT: middle trapezius muscle, LT: lower trapezius muscle, SA: serratus anterior muscle

Figure4 EMG ratio in load and unload.

Unload is indicated by a blue line, load by a red line. Panel A shows the results of SPM, panel B shows the results of interval averaging every 10°, and panel C shows the results of interval averaging every 30°. The gray area in panel A and * in panel B and panel C indicate that there was a significant difference between load and unload. UT: upper trapezius muscle, MT: middle trapezius muscle, LT: lower trapezius muscle, SA: serratus anterior muscle



Figure1 Measurements of scapular kinematics and EMG.




Figure2 Scapular kinematics in load and unload.






Figure3 EMG in load and unload.




Figure4 EMG ratio in load and unload.

Supplementary Material

Previous studies have compared scapular kinematics using RMSE (Root Mean Squared Error) and correlations as well as interval averaging. In this supplementary material, we show the results of RMSE and correlations of scapula kinematics and discuss them in the context of the main manuscript's SPM results.

1. RMSE

We considered two mean trajectories $y_A(q)$ and $y_B(q)$, where q indicates humeral elevation angle, and where there is a total of Q angle points. y_A and y_B indicate the loaded and unloaded conditions, respectively. We calculated RMSE as follows:

$$\text{RMSE} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{Q} \sum_{q=1}^Q (\overline{y_A}(q) - \overline{y_B}(q))^2}$$

where q indexes angle points.

Table S1 shows the results of RMSE. The results of RMSE and SPM differed. While RMSE produced a single value throughout the phase, the SPM can examine whether there is a difference between conditions at each humeral elevation angle.

We can compare the same units as the original data using RMSE and it is easy to calculate. However, RMSE has no time resolution. In addition, we should consider the results of RMSE showed effects (i.e., differences with respect to variability) and not just the differences between load and unload conditions.

Table S1. RMSE of scapular kinematics

	Ascending phase	Descending phase
	Mean	Mean
Scapula kinematics		
In/Ex Rot.	3.00	0.58
Down/Up Rot.	0.89	2.35
Pos/Ant Tilt	1.69	2.63


In Rot.: internal rotation, Ex Rot.: external rotation, Down Rot.: downward rotation, Up Rot.: upward rotation, Pos Tilt: posterior tilt, Ant Tilt: anterior tilt

2. Correlations

For each humeral elevation angle, we calculated Pearson coefficients (r-values) to quantify the linear correlation strength between loaded and unloaded conditions. Figure S1 shows the resulting r-values as trajectories, and --- as an illustration of the meaning of these r-values --- Figure S2 shows a scatterplot of loaded vs. unloaded conditions in downward/upward rotational angles at the instant of maximum absolute r-value (humeral elevation angle = 120° for the descending phase).


Correlation analysis allows us to investigate whether the loaded and unloaded conditions are related at each humeral elevation angle like SPM. While a critical r-value could be calculated, with SPM results presented like those in the main manuscript, r-values are not typically used in the SPM literature for two reasons. First, while t-values range an unbound (i.e., ranging from $-\infty$ to $+\infty$), r-values are bounded to the range $[-1, +1]$, so it is generally difficult to perceive r-value changes when correlations are strong. Second, typical r-value interpretations (e.g. $r = 0.6$ implies “moderately strong” correlation) do not hold for trajectory-level results because large r-values are expected to randomly occur with greater probability for trajectory data.

330 **Figure S1.** Scapular kinematics r-value trajectories for both ascending and descending movement phases.



331 The horizontal axis of each graph shows the humeral elevation angle, and the vertical axis shows the r-value
 332 (correlation between loaded and unloaded conditions) at each humeral elevation angle. The upper part shows the
 333 results of the internal/external rotation, the middle part shows the upward/downward rotation, and the lower part
 334 shows posterior/anterior tilt. The left side shows the raising phase and the right side showing the lowering phase. In
 335 Rot.: internal rotation, Ex Rot.: external rotation, Down Rot.: downward rotation, Up Rot.: upward rotation, Pos Tilt:
 336 posterior tilt, Ant Tilt: anterior tilt
 337

338 **Figure S2.** scatterplot of loaded vs. unloaded at the instant of maximum absolute r-value
339



340
341