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ABSTRACT

Exploring muscle architecture in vivo and estimating the number of MUs in the human anconeus muscle have important implications related to the neuromuscular function of this muscle as a model for study in health and disease. The two studies presented in this thesis investigate the functional anatomy of the anconeus in 10 healthy young men (25±3y).

Ultrasound imaging has facilitated the measure of the architectural variables, fascicle length ($L_F$) and pennation angle (PA), in many human skeletal muscles in vivo. However, the functional anatomy of the anconeus has been investigated mainly from cadavers exclusively. Thus, the purpose of Chapter 2 was to evaluate, using ultrasonography, the degree of change in architectural features, $L_F$ and PA, of the anconeus at rest, across the full range of motion for the elbow joint. The protocol involved imaging the anconeus at 135°, 120°, 90°, 45°, and 0° of elbow flexion. The results indicate that anconeus muscle architecture is dynamic, with $L_F$ and PA decreasing and increasing, respectively, with extension of the elbow. The values obtained here are more representative of architectural changes at various elbow joint positions than those reported in cadaveric studies.

Motor unit number estimates (MUNE) can be determined electrophysiologically using decomposition-enhanced spike-triggered averaging. To provide the most representative MUNE, muscle activation should equal or exceed the upper limit of MU recruitment to activate the majority of the MU pool. A limitation of muscles studied to date, using DE-STA, is an inability to obtain reliable MUNEs at forces higher than ~30% of a maximum voluntary contraction. Unique features of the anconeus muscle may permit MUNEs at higher muscle activation levels. Thus, the purpose of Chapter 3 was to estimate the number of functional MUs in the anconeus, using DE-STA, at low (10%), moderate (30%), and higher (50%) relative muscle activation...
levels (root-mean-square of maximum voluntary contraction (RMS\textsubscript{MVC})), to determine the effect of muscle activation on MUNE\textsubscript{s} in this muscle. Low average MUNE\textsubscript{s} of 58, 38, and 25 were found for the low, moderate, and higher muscle activations, respectively. A histogram of the distribution of surface-detected MU potentials and elbow extensor force-EMG relationship suggest the most representative MUNE was obtained at 50\%RMS\textsubscript{MVC}.

The main findings of this thesis are that; 1) anconeus muscle architecture is dynamic, 2) anconeus allows for a more representative MUNE derived at higher muscle activation levels, and 3) the high signal-to-noise ratio that has made the anconeus a choice model in the study of MU properties, is more likely attributed to a relatively low number of MUs than minimal absolute change in its muscle architecture with elbow excursion.
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1.0 GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.1 MUSCLE ARCHITECTURE

Skeletal muscle architecture is defined as “the arrangement of muscle fibers within a muscle relative to the axis of force generation” (Lieber, 1992). Architectural variability between muscles can explain a substantial degree of differences in muscle force production (Lieber and Friden, 2000).

Two key measures are often reported when assessing skeletal muscle architecture as it might pertain to muscle function. Fascicle length ($L_f$), which is an estimate of muscle fiber length, is defined as the length of a line coincident with the fascicle between the deep and superficial aponeurosis. Fascicle length indicates the range of lengths over which the muscle is capable of actively producing force, known as the excursion potential (Lieber and Friden, 2000). Fascicle length during submaximal isometric contraction has also been shown to influence MU recruitment and discharge rates in human tibialis anterior (Pasquet et al., 2005). Pennation angle (PA) represents the angle of the muscle fibers that comprise a muscle fascicle, relative to the force-generating axis, and directly affects both the force production and the excursion (Gans and De Vree, 1987) (See Figure 3, Page 26). Together, these architectural parameters can be used to calculate the physiological cross-sectional area (PCSA), a measure that is directly proportional to the maximum force generated by a muscle (Lieber and Friden, 2000).

1.2 MOTOR UNIT

The motor unit (MU), as defined by Liddell and Sherrington (1925), is the smallest functional unit of the neuromuscular system, and is comprised of an anterior horn cell (motor neuron), including its dendrites and axon, together with the muscle
fibers it innervates. The number of muscle fibers innervated by the single motor neuron, known as the innervation ratio, varies across motor unit types and muscles (Enoka, 1995). Muscles are characterized by their MU number and by the differences in their MUs, such as innervation ratio, size of soma, distribution of muscle fibers, and cross-sectional area of the muscle fibers (Enoka, 1995). Activation of a MU (MU recruitment) occurs when the motor neuron is excited and discharges a train of action potentials, which in turn activates the innervated muscle fibers. Motor unit recruitment is dependent upon the ease at which the motor neuron can be discharged synaptically, a function of MU size, with the largest cells requiring higher amounts of excitatory inputs (Henneman, 1957). Once recruited, the intensity of activity of each MU can be varied by modulating the rate and pattern at which it discharges action potentials. By this arrangement, the nervous system can increase muscle force gradually and smoothly by varying the combinations of MU recruitment and modulating MU discharge rate (Adrian and Bonk, 1929; Gilson and Mills, 1943).

1.3 ANCONeus

1.3.1 Anatomy and Function of the Anconeus

The anconeus is a small (total area = ~2,000mm$^2$), primarily type I (60-67%) (Hwang et al., 2004) muscle, innervated by a branch of the radial nerve, that originates on the dorsal aspect of the lateral epicondyle of the humerus and inserts along the proximal third of the posterior face of the ulna (Coriolano et al., 2009; Molinier et al., 2011). At the point of origin, a tendinous expansion (aponeurosis) arises and extends along the lateral inferior border of the muscle, towards the proximal and middle third of the ulna. At the superficial surface, muscle fibers arise obliquely from the aponeurosis and insert
on the posterior face of the ulna, with fibers arising more obliquely at the proximal end than those more distal (Coriolano et al., 2009; Pereira, 2013; Molinier et al., 2011; Bergin et al., 2013), whereas at the deep surface, muscle fibers fan out from a tendon-like structure at the apex of the muscle (Pereira, 2013). The anconeus muscle is also strongly adhered to the lateral joint capsule of the humeroulnar joint, which may potentially compensate for the absence of a posterior bundle on the lateral collateral ligament, suggesting a major role of the anconeus is to actively stabilize the elbow during extension (Basmajian and Griffin, 1972; Molinier et al., 2011; Pereira, 2013) (see Appendix A).

The anconeus also functions to extend the elbow, contributing less than ~15% to maximum elbow extension torque (Zhang and Nuber, 2000), and abduct the ulna during resisted pronation (Gleason et al., 1985; Travill, 1962). These various functions at the elbow and forearm may be attributed to anatomically distinct regions of the anconeus (Bergin et al., 2013).

1.3.2 EMG Studies of the Anconeus

A study examining muscle activity of the extensor apparatus of the forearm was likely the first to investigate the human anconeus muscle using electromyography (EMG) (Travill, 1962). Needle EMG was recorded from the three heads of the triceps brachii (TB) and anconeus during unloaded and loaded slow dynamic forearm extensions, while at various degrees of shoulder flexion, and during free and resisted pronation and supination of the forearm with the elbow flexed 90°. Travill (1962) concluded that the triceps brachii and anconeus can be activated independently of one another, and that regardless of shoulder position or load, the anconeus remained active, demonstrating ‘slight’ activity at no loads and progressing to ‘moderate’ and ‘marked’ as load was
increased. Furthermore, the anconeus was found to be also active during resisted pronation and supination.

Further studies have examined the anconeus in more detail. Harwood et al. (2011) investigated motor unit (MU) discharge rates of the anconeus during loaded velocity-dependent elbow extensions due to its easily accessible location for needle EMG recordings compared with other limb muscles (Pasquet et al., 2006; Abellaneda et al., 2009). Loaded (25% of maximum voluntary contraction (MVC)) elbow extension velocities were performed over a 120° range of motion (ROM) at five target velocities (0%, 25%, 50%, 75%, and 100% of maximum velocity at 25%MVC). Motor unit discharge rates increased as a function of velocity, entering a secondary range of firing as the velocity approached maximum. As a result of successful MU recordings during fast dynamic contractions, attributed to a high signal-to-noise ratio, Harwood and Rice (2012) investigated whether anconeus MU recruitment thresholds, during the torque production phase preceding movement, were affected by the resultant peak velocity. Isotonic dynamic elbow extensions were performed at velocities ranging from 64-500°/s with a constant resistance of 25%MVC. The results were variable, with only 7 of 17 MUs displaying a significant negative MU recruitment threshold-velocity relationship (Harwood and Rice, 2012).

More recently, fine wire EMG was utilized to investigate the MU mechanisms that modulate force during ramped contractions in the anconeus, and lateral and long heads of the TB (Harwood et al., 2013). Recruitment thresholds and corresponding MU discharge rates were tracked during 1s epochs over forces ranging from 0-75%MVC. The anconeus was consistent with its twitch contractile properties and fiber-type
composition, and had lower recruitment thresholds than both heads of the TB (Harwood et al., 2013).

Bergin et al. (2013) proposed that distinct anatomical regions of the anconeus muscle were more active during the performance of different functional tasks. Intramuscular and surface EMG recordings were obtained from two regions of the anconeus (longitudinal and transverse) during pronation-supination of the forearm, elbow flexion-extension while at pronated, supinated, and neutral forearm positions, and while gripping. The results suggest that the longitudinal region of the anconeus contributes to control of ulna abduction during forearm pronation, while both regions are active during elbow extension, the degree of which dependent upon forearm position (Bergin et al., 2013).

1.3.2.1 Anconeus as a Clinical Model

The accessibility of this muscle has been exploited in various clinical assessments of neuromuscular function. Kennett and Fawcett (1993) performed repetitive nerve stimulation of the radial nerve while recording surface EMG signals of the anconeus. After performing a maximal isometric elbow contraction, a bar electrode was used to stimulate the radial nerve at 3Hz, repeated at 5s, 30s, and 60s intervals for 5-6mins. Control studies showed the test to be reliable and well tolerated. For ocular myasthenia, myasthenia gravis, congenital myasthenia, and Lambert-Eaton myasthenic syndrome, repetitive nerve stimulation of the anconeus proved more sensitive than abductor digiti minimi stimulation, but equally sensitive as deltoid (Kennett and Fawcett, 1993). Maselli et al. (1991) examined diseases of neuromuscular transmission by recording intracellular miniature endplate potentials (MEPPs) and endplate potentials (EPPs) from in vitro
preparations of the anconeus using microelectrodes. Marked abnormalities were detected in the MEPPs and EPPs recorded from the anconeus muscle biopsies in all patients studied, and minimal surgical discomfort was reported (Maselli et al., 1991). As well, a clinical investigation of radial nerve lesions, electrically stimulated the radial nerve while recording nerve conduction velocity and distal latency values at the anconeus (Gassel and Diamantopoulos, 1964). By using the anconeus, a muscle innervated by a branch of the radial nerve, the authors were better able to diagnose the location of the lesion and follow the course of reinnervation.

1.4 ULTRASOUND

Ultrasound imaging has facilitated the measurement of muscle architectural features at rest, and during static and dynamic contractions, in many human skeletal muscles \textit{in vivo}. For example, $L_F$ and PA of the tibialis anterior (TA) were measured using ultrasonography at four ankle joint angles ($-15^\circ$, $0^\circ$, $15^\circ$, and $30^\circ$) at rest and during dorsiflexor MVC (Maganaris and Baltzopoulos, 1995). Results indicated that $L_F$ and PA decreased and increased, respectively, when contracted compared to at rest. Similarly, Simoneau et al. (2012) measured change in architectural variables of the TA during isometric dorsiflexion and plantar flexion, with the participant’s foot firmly secured in place at a neutral ankle joint position ($0^\circ$). Maximal isometric ramp contractions were performed for 5s, before slowly relaxing toward resting state. From the ultrasound images, it was determined that $L_F$ decreased and PA increased at higher isometric dorsiflexion contractile intensities. Fukunaga et al. (1997) also observed this relationship in the vastus lateralis (VL) when performing maximal isometric knee extensions at 12 different knee angles, ranging from flexion at $110^\circ$ to full extension ($0^\circ$). Furthermore,
Chleboun et al. (2001) demonstrated an inverse relationship between $L_F$ and PA of the human biceps femoris muscle in a relaxed state as a function of nine different hip and knee angles, and went on to show a decrease in $L_F$ for the TA and VL when measured during the swing phase of gait (Chleboun et al., 2007).

A recent systematic review tested the reliability and validity of ultrasound measurements of muscle $L_F$ and PA in humans (Kwah et al., 2013). Thirty-six reliability studies and six validity studies met the inclusion criteria. Data from these studies indicated that ultrasound measurements of $L_F$ and PA were reliable across a broad range of experimental conditions (static and dynamic contractions, and at rest). Based on a small number of validity studies, the limited evidence suggests ultrasound imaging of these architectural variables are valid, at least in the muscles tested, in a static and relaxed state (Kwah et al., 2013).

1.5 MOTOR UNIT NUMBER ESTIMATION

The direct assessment of MU numbers for any muscle or muscle group typically involves the cadaveric measurement of the number of $\alpha$ axons innervating a muscle. This approach requires nerve dissection, myelinated axon counts from a cross-sectional slice of the nerve, axon diameter measurement, and the identification of afferent and efferent axons (Enoka, 1995). Limitations in these cadaveric measurements, such as errors associated with distinguishing between small- and large-diameter axons and between afferent and efferent axons, have created uncertainty over the accuracy of cadaveric values (McComas et al., 1971; Duron et al., 1978; Boyd and Davey, 1968). Furthermore, this technique cannot be applied in vivo to study MU numbers in health, disease, and adult aging.
Since the advent of the original electrophysiological method for estimating the number of MUs *in vivo*, based on manual incremental stimulation of a motor nerve (McComas et al., 1971), many improved techniques have evolved and developed. One of these techniques, known as automatic quantitative EMG, utilized the availability of powerful digital signal processing software to decompose EMG signals into its constituent MU potential (MUP) trains (Dorfman and McGill, 1988). These MUP trains represent the firing times of a number of active MUs, and from it, a representative MUP train with standard morphological features, can be extracted. In addition, analysis of the firing times of the constituent MUPs provides information on MU recruitment and serve as a triggering source for identifying surface-detected MUPs (S-MUPs) (Doherty et al., 1995). From this, a motor unit number estimate (MUNE) can be derived. More recently, the development of a system of computer-based algorithms for EMG signal decomposition and quantitative analysis (DQEMG) (Stashuk, 1999) has allowed for faster data acquisition and processing, the ability to obtain MUPs from low and higher recruitment threshold MUs, and the ability to obtain S-MUPs and MU firing rate information (Doherty and Stashuk, 2003).

The same basic principle is utilized in all MUNE techniques: 1) elicitation of a compound muscle action potential (CMAP), representing the total mass action potential of the entire muscle, produced via supramaximal electrical stimulation of the motor nerve to a given muscle; 2) collection of a sample of S-MUPs, from which an average in their mean size is calculated; and 3) derivation of a MUNE by dividing the size-related parameter of the CMAP by that of the mean S-MUP. The difference between the current, various MUNE techniques, including incremental stimulation, multiple point stimulation,
statistical method, and spike-triggered averaging, is the way in which the sample of S-MUPs is collected (Boe et al., 2004). With respect to the method utilized in this thesis, MUNEs derived using decomposition-based spike-triggered averaging (DE-STA) are of interest. The DE-STA technique employs a selective intramuscular electrode and surface electrodes simultaneously to detect EMG signals during isometric contractions at low to moderate intensities. The needle-detected EMG signals are decomposed into individual MUPs using a series of algorithms (Stashuk, 1999), involving detection, initial clustering or classification, and supervised classification of the intramuscular signal (Doherty and Stashuk, 2003). The MUPs are then used as triggering sources, based on MUP shape and firing time, to select specific sections of the surface EMG signal, which are averaged to produce an S-MUP. The mean sizes of the representative S-MUPs are then used to derive a MUNE (Doherty et al., 1995). Regardless of technique, MUNEs cannot be obtained in all muscles, as electrically evoked estimates of single MU amplitudes and CMAP derivation require the electrical stimulation of the nerve innervating the specific muscle, making it difficult to apply these techniques to proximal muscles as they often have relatively inaccessible nerves (Shefner, 2001). Furthermore, because MUNEs derived using DE-STA are limited by the level of EMG signal interference (Boe et al., 2005; Conwit et al., 1997), muscles which undergo relatively large absolute changes in their muscle architecture or movement of the skin over the muscle during contraction are not ideal models, because even low contraction intensities could result in the physical displacement of the indwelling and surface recording electrodes, resulting in increased signal complexity. Despite these limitations, estimates of MU numbers in many limb muscles have proved to be a useful and valuable method in the study of health, disease,
and adult aging (Boe et al., 2005; McNeil et al., 2005; Allen et al., 2013; Dalton et al., 2008; Power et al., 2010; 2012).

1.5.1 DE-STA and MUNE

Decomposition-enhanced spike-triggered averaging has proven to be a reliable and valid technique for estimating the number of MUs in a muscle group (Boe et al., 2004; Doherty et al., 2009). However, DE-STA can be affected by muscle activation level and contractile force. For example, when applied to the vastus medialis during 5%, 10%, 20%, and 30%MVC isometric knee extensions, average S-MUP amplitude was found to increase with force, suggesting that low levels of contraction may result in a biased sampling and small average S-MUP amplitude (Conwit et al., 1997). Boe et al. (2005) examined the effect of force on the physiological characteristics of MUPs and S-MUPs, and the subsequent MUNE obtained from the first dorsal interosseous. Intramuscular and surface-detected EMG signals were collected simultaneously during 30s voluntary isometric contractions performed at 10%, 20%, 30%, 40%, and 50%MVC. Results indicated that with increased levels of contraction, S-MUP amplitude increased, resulting in a subsequent decrease in MUNE (Boe et al., 2005). Similarly, the effect of contraction intensity on MUNE was measured in the TA during isometric dorsiflexion contractions (threshold, 10%, 20%, 30%, and 40%MVC) (McNeil et al., 2005). The authors reported a significant and progressive decline in MUNE with increased contraction intensity, and suggested an ensemble MUNE collected at 25%MVC provided the most representative MU number in the TA, using an average S-MUP based on a sample of both low- and high-threshold MUs.
1.6 PURPOSES

Exploring muscle architecture *in vivo* and estimating the number of MUs in the human anconeus muscle have important implications related to the neuromuscular function of this muscle. The anconeus has proved to be a valuable model in the study of MU properties due to high intramuscular EMG signal clarity over the full range of dynamic elbow extensions (Harwood et al., 2011; 2012a). This could be explained by; 1) minimal physical displacement of the recording electrode due to relatively small absolute changes in its muscle architecture, or 2) MU number estimates of the anconeus are relatively low, manifesting as less electrical interference from adjacent MUs and a less dense signal. Thus, the purpose of Chapter 2 was to evaluate, using ultrasonography, the degree of change in architectural features, $L_F$ and $PA$, of the anconeus at rest for various static positions across the full ROM (135°) of the elbow joint. Accordingly, Chapter 3 aims to estimate the number of functional MUs in the anconeus, using DE-STA, at low (10%), moderate (30%), and higher (50%) relative muscle activation levels, to determine the effect of varying levels of muscle activation on MUNEIs in this muscle.
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2.0 STUDY 1: Muscle Architectural Properties of the Anconeus

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Muscle architecture, together with fiber type composition and distribution, is an important determinant of muscle contractile properties (Edgerton et al., 1975; Lieber and Bodine-Fowler, 1993; Kellis et al., 2012; Gerling et al., 2013). Muscle architecture has been classically studied using cadaver tissue. However, the applicability of measurements obtained from cadavers is limited by the age of the tissue, and can only be described at the angle for which the joint is fixed (Narici et al., 1996; Fukunaga et al., 1997). Alternatively, ultrasonography has facilitated the reliable measure of architectural variables at rest, and during static and dynamic contractions, in many human skeletal muscles in vivo (Narici et al., 1996; Fukunaga et al., 1997; Kawakami et al., 1998; Chleboun et al., 2001; Chleboun et al., 2007, Power et al., 2013; Kwah et al., 2013).

One small and seemingly insignificant muscle of the elbow joint, the anconeus, has been used frequently as a model in neuromuscular and anatomical investigations. The anconeus has been shown to provide high-quality recordings of motor unit (MU) properties during isometric and dynamic elbow extensions (Harwood et al., 2011; 2012a; Harwood and Rice, 2012; Stevens et al., 2013), has been used to record surface and intramuscular electromyography (EMG) to study synergistic elbow extensor activity (Le Bozec and Maton, 1982; Davidson and Rice, 2010; Harwood et al., 2013), and is often used clinically in the assessment of neuromuscular transmission disorders (Kennett and Fawcett, 1993; Maselli et al., 1991). One explanation for the high intramuscular signal clarity of anconeus intramuscular EMG recordings over the full range of dynamic elbow extensions (Harwood et al., 2011; 2012a) is that MU number estimates of the anconeus
are relatively low compared to other skeletal muscles, which manifests as less electrical interference from adjacent MUs and a less dense signal (Stevens et al., 2013). An alternative or complementary explanation for the high intramuscular EMG clarity of the anconeus may be that minimal physical displacement of the recording electrode during contractile shortening occurs due to smaller absolute changes in architectural features compared with other skeletal muscles. However, this hypothesis has not been substantiated in vivo.

Two architectural features are measured predominantly using ultrasonography: fascicle length ($L_F$) and pennation angle (PA). Fascicle length, which is an estimate of muscle fiber length, is defined as the length of a line coincident with the fascicle between the deep and superficial aponeuroses. Fascicle length indicates the range of lengths over which the muscle is capable of actively producing force, known as the excursion potential (Lieber and Friden, 2000). Pennation angle represents the angle of the muscle fibers that comprise a muscle fascicle relative to the force-generating axis, and directly affects both the force production and the excursion (Gans and De Vree, 1987); wherein larger angles of pennation limit the excursion potential. It is apparent from ultrasound imaging that these architectural variables are dynamic; changing in response to muscle length changes, or in response to a transition from rest to contraction (including isometric) (Narici et al., 1996; Fukunaga et al., 1997). For example, Chleboun et al. (2001) demonstrated a disordinal interaction between $L_F$ and PA of the human biceps femoris muscle in a relaxed state as a function of hip and knee angles. Similarly in the tibialis anterior, it has been shown that $L_F$ decreases and PA increases at higher isometric dorsiflexion contractile intensities (Maganaris et al, 1999, Simoneau et al., 2012). Alterations in $L_F$
and PA accommodate the shortening or lengthening of sarcomeres responding to variations in tendon slack and changes in physiological cross-sectional area (PCSA), and therefore have important functional relevance.

Except for one pilot study reported in abstract form (Harwood et al., 2010), the anconeus has not been studied in vivo using ultrasonography. Several cadaveric (Pereira, 2013; Ng et al., 2012; Molinier et al., 2011; Coriolano et al., 2009) and EMG (Basmajian et al., 1972; Le Bozec and Maton, 1982; Bergin et al., 2013) studies have described the gross anatomy of the anconeus, and largely defined its function. From these various independent anatomical and functional studies, the primary functions of the anconeus seem to be active stabilization of the elbow joint (Pereira, 2013; Molinier et al., 2011; Kendall et al., 1980), with an approximate 15% contribution to maximum elbow extension torque (Basmajian et al., 1972; Le Bozec and Maton, 1982; Zhang et al., 2000). Despite a description of in situ anatomy from cadavers, it is important to understand architectural features in vivo as these properties may affect the recruitment and rate coding patterns of individual MUs during various types of contractions (Pasquet et al., 2006; 2005). In addition, it is important to determine the degree to which the anconeus responds architecturally throughout the range of motion (ROM) to substantiate the value of this muscle for study during actively changing elbow joint angles. Thus, the purpose of this study was to evaluate, using ultrasonography, the degree of change in architectural features ($L_F$ and PA) of the anconeus at rest across the full ROM for the elbow joint. It is hypothesized that as elbow joint angle increases to full extension (0° of elbow flexion), $L_F$ and PA of the anconeus muscle will decrease and increase, respectively.
2.2 METHODS

2.2.1 Participants

Ten young adult male participants (25±3y, 178±7cm, 77±10kg) volunteered for the study. Participants were asked to refrain from unaccustomed and strenuous upper limb exercise for one day prior to testing and to not consume caffeine within four hours prior to testing. The participants were recruited from the university population and were considered to be recreationally active but not systematically trained. All participants were free from known neuromuscular or cardiovascular diseases. The study protocol was approved by the local university ethics board and conformed to the Declaration of Helsinki. Informed written consent was obtained prior to testing.

2.2.2 Experimental Protocol

Elbow angle was recorded and ultrasound imaging conducted with the participant seated on a HUMAC NORM dynamometer (CSMi Medical Solutions, Stoughton, MA, USA) (Figure 1A). The non-dominant arm (left arm for all participants) was secured tightly to a custom forearm dynamometer attachment at the wrist and midpoint of the forearm (~12cm proximal to the head of the ulna) using two 5cm wide inelastic Velcro restraints, which aligned the medial epicondyle of the humerus with the rotational axis of the dynamometer. Extraneous movements were minimized using inelastic shoulder and waist restraints. Participants sat in an upright position, such that the inertial weight of the left arm was supported in testing position, with the shoulder flexed at 90° and the forearm in a prone position. Ultrasound recordings were obtained at 135°, 120°, 90°, 45°, and 0° of elbow flexion (elbow joint angle of 0° was considered full extension) (Figure 1B).
Figure 1. Schematic diagrams of the experimental set up. A) Participant situated in testing position in a HUMAC NORM dynamometer with shoulder flexed at 90° and forearm in prone position (participant shown at 0° elbow flexion). B) Ultrasound imaging positions.

2.2.3 Ultrasonography

To investigate the effect of changing elbow joint angle on L\textsubscript{F} and PA, ultrasound imaging was performed using a linear array probe (GE model M12L, 4.9mm, 5-13MHz), attached to a Vivid 7 ultrasound unit (GE Healthcare, Mississauga, Ontario, Canada). Because of the size and location of the muscle in relation to bony contours and fascial sheaths, it was not possible to follow L\textsubscript{F} and PA in the anconeus during continuous low intensity contractile movements or at static angles during various contractile intensities. Therefore, images were collected at rest for the five angles of elbow flexion. Briefly, the probe was placed directly on the skin overlying the anconeus muscle approximately 3cm
distal to lateral epicondyle of the humerus, and olecranon process of the ulna. The probe was positioned parallel to the direction of the aponeurosis to allow the fascicles to be displayed as a banded pattern. Once a suitable recording position was obtained (minimum of one distinct muscle fascicles per image (Figure 2A)), the location was marked with indelible ink on the skin surface. Anconeus muscle thickness was determined at 135° and 0° of elbow flexion with the probe positioned perpendicularly to the aponeurosis. The probe was moved distally from the lateral epicondyle of the humerus toward the ulna identifying the deepest border of the anconeus muscle, from which the measurement was made (Figure 2B). Imaging was repeated for a given elbow angle if the operator deemed the previous image unsatisfactory, and was repeated until a useful image was obtained. The probe was held firmly in place by the same operator for all tests and standard ultrasound gel was used as the coupling agent.
Figure 2. Ultrasound images of the anconeus from a representative participant. A) Longitudinal section visualizing two distinct fascicles (F1 and F2) for 120° of elbow flexion at rest. SA, superficial aponeurosis; IPU, location of fascicle insertion on the posterior face of the ulna. B) Cross section showing muscle thickness measurement (d) for 0° of elbow flexion at rest.

2.2.4 Data Reduction and Analysis

All ultrasound images captured during testing were transferred to a desktop computer for offline analysis using EchoPAC software (v.7.0.1, GE Vingmed Ultrasound, Horton, Norway) which allowed for the calculation of $L_F$ and PA. Pennation angle was defined as the angle created by the fascicle at its insertion point on the posterior face of the ulna. Fascicle length was defined as the length of a line coincident with the fascicle, between the insertion point of the fascicle onto the ulna and the superficial aponeurosis. Images were selected so that fascicles were visible near the point
of insertion onto the ulna. However, the fascicle was often not visible in its entirety, in which case its intercept with the aponeurosis was extrapolated (Reeves and Narici, 2003), as is illustrated in Figure 3.
**Figure 3.** Ultrasound images of the anconeus from a representative participant showing fascicle length ($L_F$) and pennation angle (PA) measurement at rest. The solid lines represent the aponeurosis and posterior face of the ulna. Pennation angle (denoted as $\beta$)
is the angle at which the fascicle leaves the posterior face of the ulna and intersects with
the theoretical aponeurosis indicated with an extrapolated broken line. Fascicle length
was calculated as the sum of the measured fascicle length (L_{F1}) and the estimated (L_{F2})
fasicle length [h/Sine(α)].

2.2.5 Statistical analysis

Data were analyzed with SPSS statistical software (version 16, SPSS Inc.
Chicago, IL). Separate one factor (elbow joint angle) repeated measures univariate
analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were performed with an a priori repeated contrast, to
compare the dependent variables, average L_{F} and average PA, for each angle of elbow
flexion to the subsequent elbow joint angle (135° elbow flexion representing baseline).
A paired t-test was used to compare anconeus muscle thickness at 0° and 135° of elbow
flexion. The level of significance was set at P<0.05. Data are presented as mean ±
standard deviation (SD).
2.3 RESULTS

Despite the challenges of applying ultrasound to a small muscle that is enveloped by a relatively thick layer of fascia and surrounded by bony contours, useful images were obtained at all joint angles for each participant. On average 3.9±0.5 images were obtained per elbow joint angle, yielding 1.7±0.2 fascicles per participant per elbow joint angle.

In all ten participants, LF decreased and PA increased from 135-0° of elbow flexion. The overall or maximum change throughout the entire ROM in LF and PA was 18mm (32%) and 5° (45%), respectively. Average values of LF decreased by ~12% from 135-120° and 120-90°, and ~11% from 90-45° (P<0.05; Table 1, Figure 4A). Average values of PA were increased from 135-120°, 120-90°, and 45-0° (P<0.05; Table 1, Figure 4B). Percent increase for PA between each elbow joint angle (135-120°, 120-90°, and 45-0°) was determined to be ~12%. The thickness of the muscle ranged from 8-12mm at 135°, and increased by 9% between 135° and 0° of elbow flexion (P<0.05; Table 1).

Table 1. Muscle architecture measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Angle of elbow flexion (°)</th>
<th>135</th>
<th>120</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>45</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fascicle length (mm)</td>
<td>56±7*</td>
<td>50±9*</td>
<td>44±9*</td>
<td>40±8</td>
<td>38±7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennation angle (°)</td>
<td>11±1*</td>
<td>12±2*</td>
<td>13±3</td>
<td>14±2*</td>
<td>16±3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thickness (mm)</td>
<td>10±2†</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>11±2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measurements were obtained from 10 healthy young males at rest. Values are mean±SD.

*denotes a difference compared to the subsequent degree of elbow flexion.

†denotes a difference between 0° and 135° of elbow flexion.
Figure 4. A) Mean fascicle length (mm) at five angles of elbow flexion (°). B) Mean pennation angle (°) at five angles of elbow flexion (°). Data are presented as means±SD. * denotes difference among angles of elbow flexion (P<0.05).
2.4 DISCUSSION

This study examined the architectural features, $L_F$ and PA, of the human anconeus muscle at rest *in vivo* for five elbow joint angles. A few studies have described anconeus muscle architecture from cadavers at a single often unspecified, fixed joint angle (Coriolano et al., 2009; Ng et al., 2012; Pereira, 2013), and one study estimated $L_F$ and PA over a 120° ROM using computer software (Pereira, 2013), but here we investigated these key architectural features using ultrasonography *in vivo* over the full range of elbow joint excursion. The results indicate that anconeus $L_F$ and PA substantially decrease and increase, respectively, as the elbow joint angle approaches full extension from a flexed position. These findings support and extend pilot data tested over a smaller ROM (0-120°) reported in an abstract as relative changes only in $L_F$ and PA (Harwood et al., 2010). Our results have important implications related to neuromuscular function of this muscle as a model for study in health and disease.

Cadaveric studies have described the anatomy of the human anconeus muscle, including muscle architectural measures $L_F$ and PA, yet most do not report a specific elbow joint angle. Average $L_F$ was reported as ~30mm (Coriolano et al., 2009; Pereira, 2013), whereas average PA was determined to be 71±12° (Ng et al., 2012). The moderate discrepancy between the cadaveric $L_F$ value and that reported in the current study ($L_F$, 46±10mm), is likely the result of comparing: 1) an average $L_F$ derived from multiple joint angles to a single $L_F$ recorded at one often unspecified angle; and 2) *in vivo* measurements obtained from a healthy, young population to *in situ* preparations from elderly cadavers. Skeletal muscle architecture of human cadaver muscle has been found to differ greatly from age-matched *in vivo* ultrasonographic measurements, wherein
pennation angles and fascicle lengths differed ~13-180% and ~4-21%, respectively, depending on the muscle under investigation (Martin et al., 2001). Martin et al. (2001) attributed these differences to shortened cadaveric fibre bundle length, suggesting that cadaveric muscle exists architecturally in a state of partial contraction. It is likely that this hypothesized state of partial contraction of the muscle partially accounted for the relatively large disparity between cadaveric and in vivo values reported here (PA: 13±3°), as PAs have been shown to increase relative to muscle length during shortening contractions (Narici et al., 1996; Fukunaga et al., 1997; Kawakami et al., 1993; Maganaris et al, 1999, Simoneau et al., 2012). However, the measurement procedure may have contributed also to the differences between one cadaveric study (Ng et al., 2012) and the present study. In cadavers, the average PA was determined as the angle at which the fascicle intersects 90 degree quarterly intervals along the long axis of the muscle (see Ng et al., 2012, Figure 3). Whereas in the present study, PA was measured as the angle at which the fascicle emerges from its insertion on the posterior face of the ulna. It has been shown that PAs are systematically smaller at the insertion of the muscle onto the tendon compared with those imaged from more central locations of the muscle (Blazevich et al., 2006). Furthermore, anconeus compartmentalization could also explain variations in PA findings (Bergin et al., 2013). Therefore, PA values from the current study may not compare to those extracted from the cadaver study as they represent two related, but distinct, measures.

More important to the purpose of the present study is that the anconeus studies cited above, only described the muscle architecture at a single elbow joint angle (position of fixation). One study (Pereira, 2013) attempted to measure changes in anconeus muscle
fiber length over multiple elbow joint angles (ranging from 0-120° of elbow flexion) using a 2-D kinematic model. That study reported that muscle fiber lengths differed over the ROM tested, with the greatest change recorded at 90° elbow flexion. However, the investigation was limited by a small sample of human cadavers (comprised of eight elderly men) and a simple 2-D kinematic model, which the authors admitted did not fully represent physiological \textit{in vivo} conditions. Thus, the use of ultrasonography was necessary to obtain a more accurate representation of changes in L$_F$ and PA \textit{in vivo} in relation to elbow joint angle. As noted in the introduction, rate coding and MU recruitment patterns are affected by the compliance of the muscle-tendon complex, which is dependent upon changes in muscle architectural properties (Pasquet et al., 2005). Therefore, the ability to investigate the degree of change in L$_F$ and PA \textit{in vivo} is necessary for description of both the anatomy and MU function of the anconeus.

The relative change in L$_F$ and PA reported for the anconeus in the current study closely resembles that derived using ultrasonography for other muscles \textit{in vivo}, under passive conditions, relative to the ROM tested at their respective joints. For example, L$_F$ and PA measured in the biceps femoris at three knee angles, covering a 90° ROM (0°, 45°, 90° flexion), were reported to decrease 27% and increase 27%, respectively (Chleboun et al., 2001). Similarly, in the vastus lateralis, L$_F$ decreased 27% and PA increased 29%, when knee angle changed from 110-0° of flexion (Fukunaga et al., 1997). Moreover, Kawakami et al. (1998) measured percent change in L$_F$ and PA in the relaxed medial gastrocnemius (MG), lateral gastrocnemius (LG), and soleus (SOL) across an ankle joint ROM of 45° (-15-30° extension) and observed a 21%, 23%, and 30% decrease in L$_F$ were reported for the MG, LG, and SOL, respectively, while PA increased 32%,
42%, and 47% in these same muscles. In another study on the MG, Narici et al. (1996) measured \( L_F \) and PA changes over a slightly larger ROM (60°), and observed a 40% decrease in \( L_F \) and 75% increase in PA. With the exception of the change in PA reported for this MG study (Narici et al., 1996), the percent changes in these muscle groups across a full or nearly full ROM and those reported here for the anconeus (\( L_F \), decreased 32%; PA, increased 45%) are uniform. Thus, although the anconeus is a short stabilizing muscle it does undergo architectural changes during extension as the elbow joint moves throughout a large ROM. Absolute values of PA reported previously for the three heads of the triceps brachii (TB) are also similar to those determined for the anconeus in the present study. Although resting \( L_F \) and PA values for the three heads of the TB across the full ROM have not been assessed, different studies have examined their muscle architecture (PA) at different elbow joint angles. Using ultrasound, Blazevich et al. (2001) found PA for the relaxed lateral head of the TB, in men of similar age as those in the present study, to be 12±1.8° when the elbow was flexed 90°. At 0° of elbow flexion, PAs of 15±6° (Kawakami et al., 1993) and 19.7±2.9° (Kubo et al., 2003) were reported for the TB long head, while 11±5° was observed for the medial head (Kawakami et al., 1993). As mentioned, these values are consistent with those reported in the present study (13±3° and 16±3° at 90° and 0° of elbow flexion, respectively), indicating anconeus participates in elbow extension movements (Basmajian et al., 1972) and shares similar relative muscle architecture and relative changes in architecture as the TB with elbow excursion, at least with respect to PA.

In summary, \( L_F \) and PA of the relaxed anconeus were observed to change as a function of elbow joint angle. The values obtained here, using ultrasonography, differed
slightly to those reported previously in cadaveric studies (Coriolano et al., 2009; Pereira, 2013; Molinier et al., 2011; Ng et al., 2012) with respect to $L_F$, but were significantly different for PA, which was attributed partially to a difference in measurement procedure and the limitation of comparing *in vivo* measures to cadaveric. Relative change in $L_F$ and PA for the anconeus was consistent with that of other muscles measured using the same technique (Chleboun et al., 2001; Kawakami et al., 1998; Fukunaga et al., 1997).

Moreover, absolute values of PA observed for the anconeus were very similar to those reported in the TB (Kubo et al., 2003; Blazevich et al., 2001; Kawakami et al., 1993), which share innervation and function with the anconeus. These similarities in muscle architecture changes indicate that the anconeus behaves like other skeletal limb muscles. Therefore, the high intramuscular EMG signal clarity reported for this muscle during functional contractions does not appear to be related to any unusual architectural feature, supporting the muscle as a valuable model of study in neuromuscular physiology and functional anatomy.
2.5 REFERENCES


3.0 STUDY 2: Motor Unit Number Estimation of the Anconeus

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The ability to objectively assess the number of functioning motor units (MUs) in human muscle has important implications for the study of health (Sorenson et al., 2006; Daube et al., 2009), adult aging (Power et al., 2012; McNeil et al., 2005; Dalton et al., 2008), and diseases of lower motoneurons (Bromberg et al., 2008; Olney et al., 2000). Many methods have been used to derive a MU number estimate (MUNE) (Bromberg, 2007), one of which includes decomposition-enhanced spike-triggered averaging (DE-STA) (Stashuk et al., 2003). Decomposition-enhanced spike-triggered averaging has proven to be a reliable and valid technique for estimating the number of MUs in a muscle group (Doherty et al., 2009; Boe et al., 2004; 2006). However, DE-STA can be affected by muscle activation level and contractile force (McNeil et al., 2005; Dalton et al., 2008; Stashuk et al., 2003; Boe et al., 2004). In even a simple task, the resultant net force produced is a combination of multiple forces contributed by usually more than one muscle acting synergistically. Therefore, the many individual force-electromyography (EMG) relationships of the various contributing muscles form the resultant force-EMG relationship for the whole muscle complex. An example of this disproportionate

---

1A version of this chapter has been published. Used with permission from John Wiley and Sons.

contribution to resultant force is the human elbow extensors, which are comprised of the
three heads of the triceps brachii (medial, long, and lateral) and the anconeus. The three
heads of the triceps brachii contribute ~85% of the resultant elbow extension torque,
whereas the small (cross-sectional area = 2,002mm$^2$), primarily type I (60-67%) anconeus
muscle, which acts both to extend the elbow and abduct the ulna during resisted
pronation (Travill, 1962; Basmajian and Griffin, 1972; Le Bozec and Maton, 1982;
Hwang et al., 2004), contributes less than ~15% to maximal elbow extension torque
(Zhang and Nuber, 2000). Furthermore, the relative contribution to force of any single
component of the elbow extensors is affected by shoulder joint angles (Davidson and
Rice, 2010).

Despite the relative small size of the anconeus it is considered a very useful
clinical model in investigation of radial nerve function (Gassel and Diamantopoulos,
1964), neuromuscular transmission \textit{in vitro} (Maselli et al., 1991), myasthenia gravis,
Lambert-Eaton myasthenic syndrome, and congenital myasthenic syndromes (Kennett
and Fawcett, 1993). In non-clinical models, the anconeus has been shown to be valuable
in the study of MU properties during static and dynamic elbow extension contractions,
and during fatiguing tasks (Harwood et al., 2011; 2012a; 2012b). The anconeus is easily
accessible for needle EMG recordings and compared with other limb muscles (Pasquet et
al., 2006; Abellaneda et al., 2009), MU recordings exhibit high signal-to-noise ratios
across a broad range of elbow extension torque and contractile velocities (Harwood et
al., 2011; 2012a; 2012b), and are active throughout all contraction intensities (Harwood et
al., 2012b). These properties indicate the anconeus is an attractive model for
decomposition-based quantitative EMG (DQEMG) techniques used in MUNE studies,
because a greater signal-to-noise ratio allows for a better quality and yield of surface-detected individual motor unit potentials (S-MUPs), especially at higher levels of muscle activation. Despite the clinical and practical utility of this muscle for studying MU properties, and the many muscle architectural investigations (Hwang et al., 2004; Pereira, 2013; Coriolano et al., 2007, Naito et al., 1991), the functional anatomy of the anconeus is not understood completely. Furthermore, whether the relatively less complex interference pattern of anconeus intramuscular EMG recordings may be due to a low number of MUs in the muscle has not yet been explored.

In order to provide a comprehensive assessment of the number of functional MUs with DE-STA, the contraction intensity should equal or exceed the upper limit of MU recruitment, such that all MUs, or at least a large proportion of the MU pool (low and high threshold MUs), are active and contributing to the mean S-MUP amplitude. A limitation of most muscles studied to date using the DE-STA MUNE technique is the inability to discriminate S-MUPs of active MUs at forces higher than ~30% of maximum voluntary contraction (MVC) (Doherty and Stashuk, 2003). It is known that the anconeus nears MU recruitment completion at ~25-35%MVC during an isometric contraction (Harwood et al., 2012b). Accordingly, this study estimated the number of functional MUs in the anconeus, using DE-STA, at low (10%), moderate (30%), and higher (50%) relative muscle activation levels (root-mean-square of MVC (RMS_{MVC})), to determine the effect of varying levels of muscle activation on MUNEs in healthy, young men. We hypothesized that at higher levels of muscle activation (i.e., 50\%RMS_{MVC}), a representative portion of the entire anconeus MU pool would be sampled, resulting in lower MUNEs compared with those estimated at lower activation levels.
3.2 METHODS

3.2.1 Participants

Ten young men (25±3y, 178±7cm, 77±10kg) participated in this study. The participants were recruited from the university population and were considered to be recreationally active and not systematically trained. All participants were free from known neuromuscular or cardiovascular diseases. The study protocol was approved by the local University ethics board and conformed to the Declaration of Helsinki. Informed written consent was obtained prior to testing.

3.2.2 Experimental Protocol

Participants were asked to refrain from strenuous exercise one day prior to testing and to not consume caffeine on the day of testing. Elbow extension force was recorded using a custom isometric dynamometer constructed so that the weight of the left upper limb (non-dominant in all subjects) was supported in the testing position with the shoulder and elbow flexed 90°, and the forearm in the prone position. A Velcro strap secured the wrist to a padded, convex, plastic cup (5x10cm) attached to the strain gauge (Model SST-700-100A; ASTechnology, Halliburton, Ontario, Canada) (Figure 5A). Participants’ backs were stabilized firmly to eliminate extraneous body movements and posterior displacement of the shoulder during elbow extension.

Data collection began with determination of the maximal compound muscle action potential (CMAP) of the anconeus (Figure 5B). A stimulating bar electrode was held firmly over the radial nerve ~10cm proximal to the olecranon process on the lateral aspect of the arm, and current was increased until the CMAP was achieved. The active electrode was repositioned to minimize the visible rise time of the CMAP negative-peak
amplitude, ensuring the recording electrode was over the motor point. Surface-detected and intramuscular EMG of the anconeus were acquired using DE-STA software on a Neuroscan Comperio system (Neurosoft, El Paso, Texas). One pair of self-adhering Ag-AgCl electrodes (1x1.5cm; Marquette Medical Systems, Jupiter, Florida) was placed over the midpoint of the anconeus muscle belly in a monopolar configuration with an active electrode ~2-4cm distal to the space between the olecranon process of the ulna and the lateral epicondyle of the humerus, and the reference electrode ~10cm distal to the olecranon process of the ulna (Coriolano et al., 2007). To record neuromuscular properties of the lateral and long heads of the triceps brachii and short head of the biceps brachii, pairs of self-adhering pediatric cloth electrodes (2.25x3.5cm; Tyco Healthcare Group Ltd, Mansfield, Massachusetts) were positioned over the posteromedial surface of the left arm in a bipolar configuration: (1) over the long head of the triceps brachii ~10-15cm distal to the axilla; (2) over the posterolateral surface of the left arm ~20cm proximal to the lateral epicondyle of the humerus; and (3) over the anteromedial surface of the arm ~20cm proximal to the medial epicondyle of the humerus for the short head of the biceps brachii. All electrode pairs were positioned at an inter-electrode distance of 2cm. To reduce impedance at the skin-electrode interface, electrode placement was preceded by cleaning the skin with an alcohol-based tissue pad. Intramuscular EMG was recorded via a disposable concentric needle electrode with a recording surface of 0.03mm² (Model N53153; Teca, Hawthorne, New York) inserted into the anconeus 6-8mm distal to the active surface electrode (Figure 5A).

Following determination of the anconeus CMAP, single pulse percutaneous muscle stimulation of elbow extensors was delivered using a constant voltage (pulse
width 100µs) stimulator (DS7AH; Digitimer, Ltd., Welwyn Garden City, Hertfordshire, UK) to elicit a mechanical twitch. Two custom-made aluminum foil stimulation pads (ranging from 5x6cm to 5x12cm depending on arm size) were coated in electrode gel and firmly secured transversely over the muscle belly of the triceps brachii with the anode positioned ~10cm proximal to the olecranon process of the ulna and the cathode ~10cm distal to the axilla. Visual inspection and palpation was used to ensure that only the elbow extensors, including the anconeus, were activated during electrical stimulation. Finally, current intensity of the stimulator (45-95mA) was increased until no additional twitch force was generated and then increased by 15% to ensure supramaximal stimulation.

Participants then performed a series of MVCs, of which the RMS amplitude of EMG at the greatest force (RMS_{MVC}) was used to establish the 10%, 30%, and 50% target RMS_{MVC}. Another MVC was then performed with electrical stimulation to assess voluntary activation, using the interpolated twitch technique (Belanger and McComas, 1981), and measure neuromuscular properties of the elbow extensors. All MVCs lasted 3-5s, were separated by at least 3min rest, and did not exceed 3-4 contractions in total. Participants were encouraged verbally, and visual feedback of force was provided on a 22” LED computer monitor positioned directly in front of them at a distance of ~1.8m. A subsequent MVC was performed during which EMG of the anconeus, long and lateral heads of the triceps brachii, and short head of the biceps brachii were recorded without electrical stimulation to establish a baseline of surface EMG activity for each muscle. Prior to beginning submaximal targeting contractions, a maximal (3s) voluntary effort (MVE) of the elbow flexors against experimenter resistance was performed to establish
the maximal EMG of the short head of the biceps brachii. The concentric needle electrode was then inserted into the anconeus distal to the active recording electrode, and participants were asked to match a target line of 10%, 30%, or 50%RMVC of the muscle in a randomized order. The investigator manipulated the concentric needle to minimize rise times of the negative-peak amplitudes of the first 2-3 detected MU potentials (MUPs). Needle repositioning was completed by either adjusting the depth of insertion or sampling from a new area. Participants were then asked to gradually increase elbow extension force to the %RMS target line within 1-2s and hold the contraction steady for 30s, during which time both the intramuscular EMG of the anconeus and surface-detected EMG of all four muscle groups were obtained simultaneously and stored for further analysis. Participants were given at least 1min of rest between submaximal contractions. Targeting contractions were performed in a random order until at least 20 suitable MUP trains and their respective S-MUPs were sampled for each %RMS target amplitude (Boe et al., 2009) (Figure 5B). Following the protocol, a single elbow extensor MVC was performed to ensure there was no fatigue as a result of the contractions.

Intramuscular EMG signals were band-pass filtered from 10Hz-10kHz and digitized and stored using the Neuroscan Comperio system (Neuroscan Medical Systems, El Paso, TX). Surface EMG signals of the lateral and long heads of the triceps brachii, and the short head of the biceps brachii were pre-amplified (x100), amplified (x2), band-pass filtered (10-1,000Hz) (Neurolog, Welwyn City, UK) and sampled at 2500Hz using a Power 1401 (Cambridge Electronic Design, Cambridge, UK) for offline analysis. Lastly, force data were analog-to-digital converted at a rate of 1000Hz (Power 1401, Cambridge Electronic Design, Cambridge, UK) for offline analysis.
Figure 5. A) Depiction of a participant situated in testing position in a custom dynamometer with shoulder and elbow flexed 90° and forearm in prone position. Pediatric cloth electrodes for the biceps brachii (partially shown in image) and the lateral and long heads of the triceps brachii are shown. Reference (Ref) and active (Act) Ag-AgCl electrodes are shown over the anconeus. A concentric needle electrode is shown inserted into the anconeus (~5-10mm distal to Act electrode), and the stimulating electrode is depicted over the radial nerve (~10cm proximal to olecranon process). (B) Raw EMG tracings from a representative participant. (I) Electrically evoked CMAP and
voluntarily generated mean S-MUP at: (II) 10%RMSTMVC, (III) 30%RMSTMVC, and (IV) 50%RMSTMVC.

3.2.3 Data Reduction and Analysis

Spike2 (version 7.10) software (CED, Cambridge, UK) was used for all off-line analyses. A custom-designed script was used to determine the force of each MVC and target contraction, coefficient of variation (CV) of target contractions, and evoked twitch forces and twitch contraction durations (time-to-peak twitch force + half-relaxation time). The peak RMS value of the surface-detected EMG signal of the elbow extensors was calculated for the MVC during a 1s period at the peak plateau in force amplitude of the MVC. Similarly, MVE of the biceps brachii was expressed by determining the RMS of the MVE (RMSMVE), however, RMSMVE was calculated over a 1s period at the midpoint of the contraction in the absence of an elbow flexion force recording. Average RMSMVC of the lateral and long heads of the triceps brachii, and RMSMVE of the short head of the biceps brachii were determined for the 30s period of each target contraction in which the percent RMSMVC of the anconeus was relatively constant. All RMS values were expressed relative to either the RMSMVC (elbow extensors) of their respective muscle, or the RMSMVE (short head of the biceps brachii).

All off-line analyses of DE-STA MUNEs were completed by the same experienced operator using previously defined criteria (Boe et al., 2009). Decomposed EMG signals were reviewed off-line to ensure the accuracy of the automated decomposition procedure. Motor unit potential trains with at least 50 detected discharges were required and acted as triggers for spike-triggered averaging of the surface EMG signal. The MU discharge pattern was then inspected visually for a stable and
physiological rate of \( \sim 12 \text{Hz} \) (i.e., CV \( \leq 30\% \)) (Harwood et al., 2011). The interspike interval histogram was examined to confirm a Gaussian distribution. Motor unit potential trains that did not meet these criteria were excluded from further analysis. Next, S-MUPs were inspected to identify a distinct waveform which was temporally linked to the needle potential (within 10ms). The computer generated negative-peak onset and negative-peak amplitude markers of the acceptable S-MUPs were inspected and repositioned manually if necessary to ensure they were accurate with respect to the waveform characteristics they represented (Boe et al., 2006; 2009). A computer algorithm automatically aligned the negative onset markers for all accepted S-MUPs and generated a mean S-MUP template based upon their data-point by data-point average (Doherty and Stashuk, 2003). Finally, a MUNE was derived by dividing the negative-peak amplitude of the CMAP by the negative-peak amplitude of the mean S-MUP.

### 3.2.4 Statistical Analysis

Data were analyzed with SPSS (version 16, Chicago, Illinois). For S-MUPs, frequency distribution histograms were generated at each relative muscle activation level (\( \%\text{RMS}_{\text{MVC}} \)). A repeated measures univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed to identify differences between contractile levels for all EMG and force measures. When a main effect was observed, a Tukey’s HSD *post hoc* analysis was performed with a modified Bonferroni correction factor to determine where significant differences existed among contraction intensities. Linear regression analyses (\( R^2 \)) were performed to evaluate the shared variance between elbow extension force (\( \%\text{MVC} \)) and EMG amplitude (\( \%\text{RMS}_{\text{MVC}} \)) for all four muscles investigated. The alpha level was set
at $P \leq 0.05$. Graphical and tabular data are presented as means ± SE and means ± SD, respectively.
3.3 RESULTS

The average elbow extension MVC, twitch amplitude, and twitch contraction duration of the participants in this study were 228.8±79.1N, 22.1±8.8N, and 145.4±19.9ms, respectively. Voluntary activation was near maximal in all participants (98.9±0.9%). The distributions of S-MUP negative-peak amplitudes were different for the three levels of activation, with 50%RMS<sub>MVC</sub> yielding the most inclusive range (Figure 6). Compared with average S-MUP negative-peak amplitudes at 10%RMS<sub>MVC</sub>, average anconeus S-MUP negative-peak amplitude were ~30% and ~57% greater at 30% and 50%RMS<sub>MVC</sub>, respectively, and 50%RMS<sub>MVC</sub> was 38% greater compared with 30%RMS<sub>MVC</sub> (<i>P</i>&lt;0.05, Figure 7A). Accordingly, anconeus MUNE<sub>s</sub> were less with each increase in target EMG amplitude (<i>P</i>&lt;0.05, Figure 7B).

Average relative elbow extension forces (%MVC) were consistently below the relative target EMG amplitude (%RMS<sub>MVC</sub>) of the anconeus, but the difference was less with each increase in target EMG amplitude (Figure 8A). Relative EMG amplitudes (%RMS<sub>MVC</sub>) of the lateral and long heads of the triceps brachii and the short head of the biceps brachii increased with the relative target EMG amplitudes of the anconeus (Figure 8B) and elbow extension force (%MVC) (Figure 8A). Antagonist coactivation of the biceps brachii was ~12% across all target EMG amplitudes of the anconeus (<i>P</i>&lt;0.05, Figure 8A). However, the difference between the EMG amplitude of the anconeus compared with the lateral head and the long head of the triceps brachii decreased with increasing target EMG amplitudes of the anconeus (~45% at 30-50%RMS<sub>MVC</sub> vs. ~80% at 10%RMS<sub>MVC</sub>, <i>P</i>&lt;0.05, Figure 8B).
Table 2. Compound muscle action potential of the anconeus and contractile properties of the elbow extensors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>CMAP (mV)</th>
<th>MVC (N)</th>
<th>Pt (N)</th>
<th>PPt (N)</th>
<th>VA (%)</th>
<th>Post MVC (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=10</td>
<td>5.5±1.8</td>
<td>230.4±74.2</td>
<td>28.9±12.2</td>
<td>41.9±14.8</td>
<td>98.9±0.9</td>
<td>236.2±72.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values are mean ± SD. CMAP, compound muscle action potential; MVC, maximal voluntary contraction; Pt, resting twitch; PPt, potentiated twitch; VA, voluntary activation.

Figure 6. Frequency distribution histograms of S-MUP negative-peak amplitudes (Negative Pk Amp) at three relative muscle activation levels (10%, 30%, 50%RMS<sub>MVC</sub>). #, number; RMS<sub>MVC</sub>, root-mean-square of anconeus EMG during maximal voluntary contraction (MVC) of the elbow extensors.
Figure 7. A) Average surface detected motor unit potentials (S-MUPs) and B) derived motor unit number estimates (MUNEs) at three target activation levels (10%, 30%, and 50% RMS_{MVC}). Data are presented as mean ± SE. * denotes difference among muscle activations (P < 0.05). Negative Pk Amp, negative-peak amplitude, RMS_{MVC}, root-mean-square of anconeus EMG during maximal voluntary contraction (MVC) of the elbow extensors.
Figure 8. A) Scatterplot of force (%MVC) plotted against normalized EMG amplitude (%RMS_{MVC}) for anconeus (closed circles), long head of triceps brachii (dark grey circles), lateral head of triceps brachii (light grey circles), and biceps brachii (open diamonds) at three anconeus muscle activation levels (10%, 30%, and 50%RMS_{MVC}). Coefficients of determination for the least squares regression lines of the: anconeus, $R^2 = 0.71$; lateral head, $R^2 = 0.68$; long head of triceps brachii, $R^2 = 0.56$; and biceps brachii, $R^2 = 0.25$. B) Bar graph of target EMG amplitude of anconeus (%RMS_{MVC}) plotted against normalized EMG amplitude (%RMS_{MVC}) for anconeus (black bars), long head of
triceps brachii (dark grey bars), lateral head of triceps brachii (light grey bars), and biceps brachii (white bars). Data are presented as mean ± SE. * denotes difference between anconeus and long and lateral heads of the triceps brachii within a target EMG amplitude (P < 0.05). † denotes biceps brachii EMG coactivation is significantly greater between 10% and 50%RMS_{MVC}. RMS_{MVC}, root-mean-square of anconeus EMG during maximal voluntary contraction (MVC) of the elbow extensors.
3.4 DISCUSSION

These results, in keeping with the size principle of orderly recruitment (Henneman et al., 1965), indicate that larger MUs are recruited at higher levels of muscle activation as evidenced by higher average S-MUP negative-peak amplitudes at increased activation levels. Relative to the CMAP, the larger S-MUPs at higher activation levels resulted in correspondingly lower MUNEs. This negative relationship between S-MUP amplitude and MUNE has been reported previously in the tibialis anterior (McNeil et al., 2005; Power et al., 2010), first dorsal interosseus (FDI) (Boe et al., 2005), soleus (Dalton et al., 2008), and biceps brachii (Power et al., 2012). However, in all these models, successful MUNE was limited to contraction intensities ≤40%MVC, falling below the upper limits of MU recruitment in these muscles (Seki and Narusawa, 1996; Van Cutsem et al., 1997; Oya et al., 2009). The inability to explore contraction intensities >40%MVC was the result of limitations in DE-STA software; specifically the inability to decompose MU potentials from a complex and stochastic EMG signal, when an increased number of MUs contributes to the interference pattern. Here, because of the unique aspects of the anconeus outlined in the introduction, we were able to test this relationship at higher activations (50%RMS<sub>MVC</sub>) and, most importantly, perform MUNE with DE-STA at a muscle activation level which presumably recruited a sample-representative of the whole MU pool for this muscle (Harwood et al., 2012b).

The frequency histograms indicated that 50%RMS<sub>MVC</sub> yielded the most physiological distribution of negative-peak S-MUP amplitudes across the broadest range (31-1205µV) of available MUs relative to 10%RMS<sub>MVC</sub> (18-341µV) and 30%RMS<sub>MVC</sub> (18-902µV); it therefore better represents the activation of the whole MU pool in this
muscle. Moreover, repositioning of the indwelling needle electrode allowed sampling of a variety of MUs with correspondingly different sized S-MUPs from the whole MU pool, further increasing the likelihood of a MUNE which is more representative of the entire muscle. We found relatively few MUs for the anconeus (38 at 30%RMS\textsubscript{MVC}, equivalent to an average elbow extension force of 25%MVC) compared with other small limb muscles such as the FDI (91 at 30%MVC) (Boe et al., 2005), likely contributing to less signal interference, thus allowing the DE-STA technique to estimate MU numbers at higher muscle activations. The relatively few MUs estimated for the anconeus likely reflect the function of the muscle rather than simply the small size. Functionally, the anconeus is considered to be an accessory elbow extensor and stabilizer involved in gross movement control. The FDI, which is significantly smaller (~180mm\textsuperscript{2} vs ~250mm\textsuperscript{2} for the anconeus) (An et al., 1981; Infantolino and Challis, 2011), is critically involved in fine skilled hand movements and has 6-8 times more estimated numbers of MUs than the anconeus (Boe et al., 2005). Moreover, the abductor hallucis, which performs simple large toe abduction, is similar in size to the anconeus (~270mm\textsuperscript{2}) (Cameron et al., 2008), and also has relatively few MUs (ranging from 10-70) (Johns and Fuglevand, 2011). Thus, given the function in relation to the size of the anconeus, it is perhaps not surprising to estimate low numbers of MUs.

Muscle activations (%RMS\textsubscript{MVC}) for the elbow extensors and overall elbow extensor force (%MVC) during isometric elbow extension contractions were recorded to examine the neuromuscular function of the anconeus and its role in contributing to elbow extension. In general, the force-EMG relationship appears to depend highly upon the histophysiology of the muscle or muscle portion under investigation. Specifically, the
degree to which MU recruitment and rate coding contribute to force production, as a result of the diversity of MU sizes in the muscle (Fuglevand et al., 1993; Lawrence and DeLuca et al., 1983) and the interaction of synergistic muscles to accomplish a coordinated task. Linear force-EMG relationships are observed generally in muscles comprised of a variety of MU sizes, because force production is dependent upon a combination of recruitment and rate coding, whereas non-linear relationships are common in muscles with predominately similar sized MUs (Fuglevand et al., 1993; Lawrence and DeLuca et al., 1983). We observed a strong linear relationship between force (%MVC) and EMG amplitude (%RMS\textsubscript{MVC}) for the anconeus and for the lateral and long heads of the triceps brachii (Figure 8A), suggesting both MU recruitment and rate coding contribute overall to elbow extensor force gradation. However, the slope and y-axis offset of the least squares regression lines differed among muscles, whereby the lateral and long heads of the triceps brachii exhibited almost no muscle activation at 10%RMS\textsubscript{MVC} compared to the anconeus and failed to exceed anconeus EMG amplitudes across all elbow extension forces (Figure 8A). A commonly reported limitation for the DQEMG technique is the challenge of deriving MUNEs at high target forces or high muscle activation levels (McNeil et al., 2005; Boe et al., 2005). As a consequence, MUNEs cannot be assumed to always represent the entire MU pool or “true anatomical number”, especially in muscles that grade force predominantly through MU recruitment. The high level of anconeus muscle activation recorded by surface EMG at low elbow extension forces and more gradual increases in EMG amplitude compared with the heads of the triceps brachii at higher forces indicates the anconeus relies more on MU recruitment at low forces (Le Bozec and Maton, 1982; Le Bozec et al., 1980), whereas,
rate coding predominates at forces above ~25-35%MVC (Harwood et al., 2012b). Conversely, as outlined in the introduction, modulation of force has been reported over a larger range of elbow extension intensities primarily through increases in MU recruitment in the triceps brachii (Dalton et al., 2010; Harwood and Rice, 2012). Additionally, relatively high anconeus muscle activation at low force production supports the role of the anconeus as an elbow stabilizer (Dideriksen et al., 2012). Nevertheless, during the task of increasing levels of elbow extension, the anconeus continues to contribute to force production accordingly (Figure 8A & B) and therefore participates in attainment of maximum elbow extension force. Thus, from a clinical perspective the anconeus is a suitable muscle for investigation of MUNE, as MU action potentials can be recorded at high muscle activation levels in which it seems likely the majority of MUs are active. As a result, the random sample of MUs used to derive the MUNE is more representative of the entire pool of MUs and not biased towards lower threshold MUs as it might be in rate coding oriented muscles.

In summary, a progressive increase in mean S-MUP negative-peak amplitude and subsequent decrease in MUNE was observed with increasing muscle activation levels in the anconeus. The anconeus as a model allowed for MUNE at higher levels of muscle activations (50%RMS\textsubscript{MVC}), which has not been feasible in other muscles tested using DE-STA. The force-EMG relationships of the anconeus, compared with the lateral and long heads of the triceps brachii, indicate that most, if not all, MUs in the muscle are recruited at 50%RMS\textsubscript{MVC}, such that a sample of the overall MU pool was taken, yielding a MUNE which seems most representative of the number and sizes of MUs in this muscle. Furthermore, the results indicate the anconeus has a low number of MUs when compared
to other small limb muscles (e.g., hand muscles), which may be one reason for the success in discriminating individual MUs at novel intensities of effort (50%RMS\textsubscript{MVC}) and very fast elbow extensions (Harwood et al., 2011). The effect of muscle activation on MUNEs demonstrated here and those reported previously (McNeil et al., 2005; Boe et al., 2004; 2009; 2005), suggest that muscle activation levels should be recognized when conducting MUNE studies. The unique properties of the anconeus highlighted here indicate that it may be a useful model to explore changes in MUNEs and MU properties in health and disease.
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4.0 GENERAL DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

The studies presented in Chapters 2 and 3 of this thesis investigate the functional anatomy of the anconeus in healthy young men. The specific aim was to examine anconeus anatomy as it pertains to its role as a valuable model in the study of motor unit (MU) properties (Harwood et al., 2011; 2012a; 2013). To achieve this, ultrasonography and decomposition-enhanced spike-triggered averaging (DE-STA) were used to explore muscle architecture and functional MU numbers in the anconeus, respectively.

The main findings of this thesis are that anconeus muscle architecture, specifically fascicle length ($L_f$) and pennation angle (PA), is dynamic, undergoing substantial changes with elbow joint excursion that are similar to other limb muscles reported elsewhere (Blazevich et al., 2001; Kubo et al., 2003; Kawakami et al., 1993; Kawakami et al., 1998; Chleboun et al., 2001; Fukunaga et al., 1997). The values obtained here are more representative of architectural changes at various elbow joint positions than those reported in cadaveric studies (Coriolano et al., 2009; Pereira, 2013; Ng et al., 2012). Furthermore, understanding these anatomical features relates to aspects of motor control related to MU recruitment and rate coding (Pasquet et al., 2005), but do not directly explain the clarity of intramuscular electromyography (EMG) previously reported. In Chapter 3, MU number estimates (MUNE) were successfully derived using DE-STA at higher muscle activation levels (root-mean-square of maximum voluntary contraction ($RMS_{MVC}$)) than previously reported in other limb muscles (Boe et al., 2005; McNeil et al., 2005; Dalton et al., 2008; Power et al., 2010). Surface-detected MU potential distribution and elbow extensor force-EMG data indicate near or full MU recruitment at 50%$RMS_{MVC}$, yielding a MUNE which is representative of the entire MU pool.
Furthermore, the anconeus has a relatively low number of MUs compared to other small limb muscles (e.g., hand muscles) (Boe et al., 2005), which may explain the ability to discriminate individual MUs at higher intensities of effort (50%RMS$_{MVC}$) than previously reported. In conclusion, the high signal-to-noise ratio that has made the anconeus a choice model in the study of MU properties, is more likely attributed to a relatively low number of MUs than minimal absolute change in its muscle architecture with elbow joint excursion.

4.1 LIMITATIONS

A general limitation of the anconeus is that elbow extension is the main movement that activates it, and although active at all levels, the anconeus only contributes ~15% to maximum elbow extension torque. Thus, other than relative EMG measures (%RMS$_{MVC}$), it is difficult to appreciate its contribution to extension torque which may limit this muscle for studies related to aging, training, and fatigue.

The results from Chapter 2 concluded that L$_F$ and PA decreased and increased, respectively, with elbow joint extension. These measures were made at five angles under static, passive conditions, as ultrasound imaging of the anconeus is not without limitation. Efforts were made to follow a change in muscle architecture during continuous slow, low intensity contractile movement, and at static angles during various contractile intensities. However, measurement of L$_F$ and PA change during dynamic movement proved very difficult, a result of the relatively small size and challenging location of the anconeus (just spanning the elbow joint). Similarly, isometric contractions with force enough to cause visible internal shortening of the muscle resulted in probe displacement, precluding the continuous image capture of the target fascicles. Thus, as a model, the anconeus
poses a challenge when measuring contractile or dynamic contraction-induced changes in muscle architectural features.

In general, DE-STA derived MUNEs have been limited to low or moderate contraction intensities (McNeil et al., 2005; Dalton et al., 2008; Boe et al., 2005; Power et al., 2010), as higher intensities result in complex and stochastic EMG signals that are not readily decomposed by the computer software (Boe et al., 2005; Conwit et al., 1997). However, in Chapter 3, unique properties of the anconeus allowed for successful MUNEs at a novel, higher muscle activation level (50%\text{RMS}_{MVC}). The 50%\text{RMS}_{MVC} target level was equivalent to ~40%\text{MVC} of the elbow extensors, which according to previous research exceeds MU recruitment for this muscle (~25-35%\text{MVC}) (Harwood et al., 2012b), providing a MUNE that is representative of its entire MU pool. Therefore, contraction intensity was not a limiting factor with the anconeus, as target levels beyond 50%\text{RMS}_{MVC} would likely only contribute to greater EMG signal interference and a less reliable MUNE.

4.2 FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Although these studies have advanced our knowledge of anconeus functional anatomy, some questions still remain. In Chapter 2, ultrasound images were only successfully obtained at rest, under passive conditions due to limitations associated with the ultrasonography technique used. Flat ultrasound probes that can be secured over the muscle of interest, may have enabled image collection during dynamic movements or at low contractile intensities for this muscle, as they have proven beneficial in the observation of fascicle lengths during activities such as walking and running (Aggelousis et al., 2010). Furthermore, extended field-of-view imaging and tracking software might
allow for greater ease when attempting to follow muscle fascicles under active and dynamic conditions. If these improvements in the imaging technique were successful, than it would be of significant interest to examine the effect of $L_F$ and PA change on MU recruitment and discharge rate during isometric and dynamic contractions at various intensities or levels of muscle activation. This would aid in understanding the mechanisms behind force production at different muscle lengths.

Lastly, Chapter 3 investigated the number of functional MUs in the anconeus. The ability to ascertain a MUNE at a muscle activation which recruits the entire MU pool, as was done here, could have beneficial application in the study of aging and disease. Numerous studies have explored MU loss with disease (i.e., ALS, diabetes) (Boe et al., 2009; Allen et al., 2013) and aging (Dalton et al., 2008; Power et al., 2010; 2012). However, EMG signal interference limited these studies to contractile intensities $\leq 40\%$MVC, which likely did not equal or exceed the upper limit of MU recruitment for the muscle under investigation. Therefore, anconeus MUNE$\text{s}$ obtained at $50\%$RMS$_{\text{MVC}}$ could provide further insight into the effect of aging and disease on higher threshold MUs, although as noted above the model has some limitations. Furthermore, previous clinical applications (Kennett and Fawcett, 1993), as well as the current study, found radial nerve stimulation and needle EMG to be very tolerable in the anconeus, suggesting it is an attractive model for study in aged and diseased populations.

With virtually all limb muscles, in vivo study is a compromise between selecting the most appropriate muscle model for the research question and that which has minimal functional and technical limitations. We cannot change the anatomy or become more
invasive but likely future technical improvements in imaging and EMG will allow further understanding of neuromuscular structure and function \textit{in vivo}.
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