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Abstract

This paper concerns the synthesis of Functional Electrical Stimulation (FES) patterns for efficient functional movement. We propose an approach based on a nonlinear optimization formulation. The study considers a biomechanical knee model and the associated agonist/antagonist muscles. The goal of this method is to synthesize optimal patterns which minimize the muscular activities in order to reduce the fatigue. The approach is illustrated with a sinusoidal desired knee joint trajectory. Moreover, The applied optimal FES patterns allow the muscles co-contraction during the movement.

1. Introduction

In healthy subjects, the Central Nervous System (CNS) sends electrical signals to muscular fibres that produce a force, and then a movement. When there is a spinal cord lesion, Functional Electrical Stimulation (FES) may be used to activate the skeletal muscles like in the SUAW’s project [2]. However, its application poses some problems in practice. In fact, the applied stimulation patterns are often empirically chosen, increasing the muscular fatigue. For motion synthesis, we use the muscular activities minimization approach. Therefore, our work goal, presented in this paper, is to obtain optimal stimulation patterns based on a nonlinear optimization problem formulation.

2. Method

2.1. Biomechanical model

In this first on going study, we consider a 2D biomechanical model with one degree of freedom characterizing the knee joint. It is controlled by two-antagonist muscles, which are the quadriceps and the hamstring. Figure 1 is a simplistic representation of this joint. where, \( \theta \) is knee joint angle, \( L_f \) and \( L_s \) are the femur and shank+foot lengths, \( L_{iq} \) and \( L_{ih} \) are the distances between the insertion point of each muscle (quadriceps and hamstring) and the rotation point \( O \), \( r \) is the pulley radius. \( F_q \) and \( F_h \) are the quadriceps and the hamstring forces applied on the tibia. \( m \) is the shank+foot mass and \( \beta \) is the mass distribution coefficient. The geometrical formulation of each muscle length \((L_q, L_h)\) is given in [5]. The dynamics is described by the following second order nonlinear equation:

\[
I \ddot{\theta} = \Gamma_q - \Gamma_h + mg(\beta L_q)\cos(\theta) - F_i \dot{\theta} - K_v(\theta - \theta_f) \tag{1}
\]

where, \( \dot{\theta} \) and \( \ddot{\theta} \) are the knee joint velocity and acceleration, \( \Gamma_q \) and \( \Gamma_h \) are the quadriceps and hamstring torques, \( F_i \) and \( K_v \) are the viscous friction and elasticity coefficients, \( I \) is the inertia of shank+foot group and \( \theta_f \) is the resting angle of elasticity torque that should be identified.

2.2. Muscle model under FES

The muscle model used in the following is the one proposed in [4]. One of the main aspect of this model is that its input is the FES signal. This model is composed of two parts (figure 2):
• The activation model, that describes the behaviour of muscle fibres under FES and includes the fibre recruitment percentage and the dynamic activation representing mainly the calcium dynamics.

• The mechanical muscle model, that represents the mechanical muscular contraction. It is controlled by the recruitment rate $\alpha$ and the chemical control $u_{ch}$.

The model input is a square signal (figure 2) described by the pulse width $PW$, the intensity $I$ and the frequency $f$.

$$F(L) = F_{max} \cdot \exp \left[ \frac{L/L_0 - 1}{b_1} \right]$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

where, $L$ is the current muscle length and $L_0$ the muscle length at maximal force $F_{max}$. Methods for the estimation phase are proposed in [5] [6].

2.4. Optimal stimulation patterns

For synthesizing the optimal FES patterns, we optimize the pulse width ($PW$) and the intensity ($I$) of the stimulation patterns minimizing the joint trajectory tracking errors and the activation of the two antagonistic muscles (Eq. 3). The optimization problem is stated as:

$$\min_u J(x, u)$$

subject to, $u_{min} < u < u_{max}$

where, $x = [K_q, K_h, F_q, F_h, \theta, \dot{\theta}]^T$ is the state vector and $u = [u_q, u_h]^T$ the inputs, with $u_q = [PW_q, I_q]$ the quadriceps inputs and $u_h = [PW_h, I_h]$ the hamstring inputs. $K_i$ is the muscular stiffness and $F_i$ is the muscular force ($i = q, h$). $u_{max}$, $u_{min}$ are the maximal and minimal constraints of inputs. $q$ and $h$ represent respectively the quadriceps and the hamstring muscles.

The optimization criterium is:

$$J = \frac{1}{2} \int_{t=0}^{t_{end}} \left( \dot{\theta}(u_q, u_h) - \dot{\theta}_d \right)^2$$

$$+ \mu_2 \alpha_q (u_q)^2 + \mu_3 \alpha_h (u_h)^2 \left( \int dt \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

where, $\dot{\theta}_d$ is the desired joint trajectory, $t_{end}$ is total duration of the movement and $\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3$ are the cost function weights. The recruitment rate $\alpha_q$, $\alpha_h$ of quadriceps and hamstring represent their muscular activities depending on $PW$ and $I$. In the following, we will assume that the frequency $f$ is fixed.

3. Results

Simulations have been performed using MatLab 7.0.0 on a PC platform (Pentium-IV 3-GHz, 1-Gb RAM). In the first part of the simulation, we test the minimal number of inputs for obtaining an efficient synthesis. Intensities $I_q$ and $I_h$ of muscle input signals are first fixed. We only optimize the pulse widths $PW_q$, $PW_h$ for synthesizing a knee sinusoidal motion. We choose 10 degrees of freedom for the motion control in order to decrease the computation duration.
4. Discussion and Conclusions

In the current paper, a nonlinear optimization method was used to determine optimal electrical stimulation patterns. This optimization is based on nonlinear knee and muscle models. The results show the optimization method effectiveness for an optimal electrical stimulation. In the first part of results, we observe good motion synthesis except at the start due to the system delay. The results are less accurate in the second part, although the number of optimized parameters is the same. The increase of degrees of freedom improves the tracking accuracy. However, it increases the optimization duration. The results show the co-contraction occurrence of antagonistic muscles. The co-contraction rate is not explicitly controlled but it appears for the motion stabilization. It depends on the cost function weight \( \mu_1, \mu_2 \) and \( \mu_3 \). In the future works, the optimal stimulation patterns will be applied to paraplegics for experimental validations. An important part of work will then be the specific parameters identification of each subject.
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