

ANALELE UNIVERSITĂȚII "EFTIMIE MURGU" REȘIȚA ANUL XXI, NR. 1, 2014, ISSN 1453 - 7397

Radu Panaitescu-Liess

# A Comparative study about the Influence of Vibration on Elbow Joint Mobility

The results shown in [1] have referred to a particular appreciation of the elbow joint mobility of a subject to the action vibrations produced by a fitness device. Experiments - performed on four subjects - were held at the Institute of Research - Development - Innovation of the University "Transilvania" of Brasov and focused on the effects of vibrations on the joint mobility. This article represents a complement to the paper [1].

Keywords: mobility, elbow joint, vibrations.

### 1. Introduction

In my dissertation I designed and developed a numerical analysis system, for assessing the influence of vibration on the osteoarticular system (fingers, hands, elbows, knees), using virtual instrumentation MediTouch.

As shown in the previous article, in the study of effects of vibrations on the elbow joint mobility, I used an analysis equipment manufactured by MediTouch, which consists of an ergonomic elbow brace (ArmTutor), assisted by a specialized software.

Vibrations were induced by a fitness machine, inSPORTline type, model Rose 132. Reference sets of measurements were made before and after exposure to vibration [1].

To study the elbow joint mobility, experiments were performed on four subjects:

Subject A - male, 16 years old, left-handed;

Subject B - male, 43 years old, right-handed;

Subject C - male, 12 years old, right-handed;

Subject D - female, 39 years old, right-handed. [1], [2]



Figure 1. The four subjects during testing

## 2. Analysis

Subjects A, B, C and D were exposed to vibration "standing" on the vibrating plate. Subjects wore shoes as follows: Subjects B and D - Vibram soled shoes mountain and subjects A and C - sports shoes. Programs used and exposure intervals are shown in Tables 1 to 4:

Table 1. Subject A [1], [2]										
Program	Stage	Frequency [Hz]	Time [min]	Total time [min]						
р	2	3,92	2	2						
P <sub>1</sub>	4	4,40	1	3						

# Table 2. Subject B [1], [2]

Program	Stage	Frequency [Hz]	Time [min]	Total time [min]	
	2	3,92	2		
	4	4,40	2		
P <sub>1</sub>	6	4,87	2	9	
	8	5,23	2		
	10	5,72	1		

Table 3. Subject C [1], [2]

Program	Program Stage		Time [min]	Total time [min]
D	2	3,92	2	2
$P_1$	4	4,40	1	3

# Table 4. Subject D [1], [2]

Program	Stage	Frequency [Hz]	Time [min]	Total time [min]
	2	3,92	2	
P <sub>1</sub>	4	4,40	2	6
	6	4,87	2	

For the forearms, the movement [deg], the movement frequency [cyc/sec], the maximum displacement - Max. ROM and maximum frequency of movement - Max. Freq. Energy were recorded.

### 3. Conclusion

For the elbow joints (Tables 5 to 8), subjects A and D have registered improvements of the joints mobility relative to subjects B and C, which have registered, in general, decreases of the movement frequency, caused by the exercise fatigue (with an insignificant increase for the movement frequency in the left forearm of the subject B). There are 2 values outside the pattern:  $104^{0}$  (right forearm, subject A) and  $101^{0}$  (right forearm, subject D). The values of Max. ROM reveal less control over the movement of those forearms. [3]

	Table 5. Subject A [1], [3]											
	Before vibrations					After vil	brations					
	Max. Freq. Energy		Max.	Max. ROM Max. Freq. Energ [deg] [Hz]		q. Energy	Max. ROM					
Elbow	[	[Hz]				[Hz]		[deg]				
	<mark>0,86</mark> 1,16		<mark>95</mark>	<mark>65</mark>	<mark>1,03</mark>	<mark>1,4</mark> 6	<mark>104</mark>	<mark>58</mark>				
	Right Left Right		Left	Right	Left	Right	Left					
	forearm	forearm	forearm	forearm	forearm	forearm	forearm	forearm				

#### Table 6. Subject B [3]

	Before vibrations				After vibrations				
	Max. Freq. Energy		Max. ROM		Max. Freq. Energy		Max. ROM		
Elbow	[H	lz]	[deg]		[Hz]		[deg]		
LIDOW	<mark>0,96</mark>	1,00	<mark>81</mark>	<mark>57</mark>	<mark>0,80</mark>	1,03	<mark>67</mark>	<mark>47</mark>	
	Right	Left	Right	Left	Right	Left	Right	Left	
	forearm	forearm	forearm	forearm	forearm	forearm	forearm	fore-	
								arm	

						Table 7	Subject	C [3]	
		Before v	ibrations		After vibrations				
	Max. Freq. Energy		Max. ROM		Max. Freq. Energy		Max. ROM		
Elbow	[H	[Hz] [de 0,90 0,93 92		[deg]		[Hz]		[deg]	
	<mark>0,90</mark>			<mark>80</mark>	<mark>0,86</mark>	<mark>0,9</mark>	<mark>57</mark>	<mark>76</mark>	
	Right	Left	Right	Left	Right	Left	Right	Left	
	forearm	forearm	forearm	forearm	forearm	forearm	forearm	forearm	

						Table 8.	Subject D	[3]
	Before vibrations				After vibrations			
	Max. Freq. Energy		Max. ROM		Max. Freq. Energy		Max. ROM	
Elbow	[Hz]		[deg]		[Hz]		[deg]	
	<mark>0,83</mark>	1,03	<mark>101</mark>	<mark>61</mark>	<mark>0,90</mark>	<mark>1,33</mark>	<mark>77</mark>	<mark>55</mark>
	Right	Left	Right	Left	Right	Left	Right	Left
	forearm	forearm	forearm	forearm	forearm	forearm	forearm	forearm

~ . .

. . . . . .

For the future, I proposed virtual simulations using Simulink software.

#### References

- [1] Panaitescu-Liess R., *Experimental research on the influence of vibration on elbow mobility*, Buletinul științific al Universității Tehnice de Construcții București, p.p. 54-59.
- [2] Panaitescu-Liess R., *Analiza răspunsului dinamic al organismului uman în interacțiune cu fenomenele vibratorii,* Raport de cercetare II, septembrie 2012.
- [3] Panaitescu-Liess R., *Efecte complexe produse asupra organismului uman de echipamentele cu acțiune vibrantă*, Raport de cercetare III, 2013.

Address:

 Assist.Eng. Radu Panaitescu-Liess, Technical University of Civil Engineering Bucharest, Faculty of Technological Equipment, Calea Plevnei, Nr. 59, Sect. 1, Bucuresti, <u>pa.radu@yahoo.com</u>