

# Investigation of Effect of Human Robot Interaction with Lower Limb Exoskeletons

Marukku Devage Sanka Dileepa Chandrasiri

(178035N)

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Master  
of Science in Biomedical Engineering

Department of Mechanical Engineering

University of Moratuwa

Sri Lanka

November 2021

## DECLARATION

---

I declare that this is my own work and this dissertation does not incorporate without acknowledgement any material previously submitted for a Degree or Diploma in any other University or institute of higher learning and to the best of my knowledge and belief it does not contain any material previously published or written by another person except where the acknowledgement is made in the text.

Also, I hereby grant to University of Moratuwa the non-exclusive right to reproduce and distribute my dissertation, in whole or in part in print, electronic or other medium. I retain the right to use this content in whole or part in future works (such as articles or books).

Signature:

Date:

The above candidate has carried out research for the MSc thesis under my supervision.

Signature of the Supervisor(s):

Date:

Prof. R.A.R.C Gopura

Professor,

Department of Mechanical Engineering,

University of Moratuwa, Sri Lanka.

## Abstract

Continuous development of exoskeletons (wearable robots) is essential to enhance the user experiences and performances of the wearable device. Therefore, it is necessary to determine human ergonomics and the comfort levels of wearable robots. These aspects can be analyzed by determining human-robot interaction (HRI). HRI is classified in cognitive- HRI (cHRI) and physical-HRI (pHRI) in the literature. cHRI involves the identification of complex human expression and physiological aspects. These pieces of information can be observed using a human-robot cognitive interface. Electroencephalogram (EEG) and electromyography (EMG) are mainly used sensing methods in cHRI. EEG is used to identify electrical activities of brain, while EMG is used to identify electrical activities of muscles. Furthermore, pHRI involves evaluating physical quantities such as position, force, and pressure between humans and robots. In order to identify pHRI with wearable robotic interfaces, a novel surface muscle pressure (SMP) sensory system was developed. The SMP sensor was calibrated and evaluated using surface electromyography (sEMG ) data for two separates experimental scenarios. Hence the system was proposed to determine the pHRI of wearable robotics.

In order to determine HRI, a dummy lower limb exoskeleton was designed and manufactured in compliance with human ergonomics and biomechanics. The exoskeleton consists of 8 degrees of freedom (DoF) motions with variable limbs and weight attachment locations. Furthermore, sEMG, motion analysis, and SMP sensory systems were used to carry out the experiments. Moreover, a human lower limb model simulation with ground force reaction prediction was developed to determine the inverse dynamics. The experiments were carried out without exoskeleton, with the exoskeleton, and with exoskeleton weight attachments with six healthy subjects for the walking motion. A qualitative, comfortable level analysis was carried out simultaneously for each experiment. Captured SMP, sEMG, inverse dynamics and qualitative results were processed and feature extracted to evaluate HRI for different weight distributions and attachment locations. The relationship between exoskeleton attachments and locations was observed. The experiment results have provided an improved understanding of HRI for developing practical and ergonomically comfortable lower limb exoskeleton devices.

***Keywords***-Lower-limb Exoskeletons, Human-Robot Interaction, Electromyography, Inverse Dynamics

## DEDICATION

---

*To my parents,  
Chandra Chandrasiri and Sudharma Chandrasiri  
Thanks for your great support and  
continuous care.  
Without you none of my success would be possible.*

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

---

After immense ups and downs, I am writing this thanking note in remembrance of the great assistance provided by everyone who were there with myself for the successful completion of this research work. It has been a great run for me and it is time for myself to pay my sincere gratitude towards all these great people.

The long list of the people who have my unending homage, should be started with my thesis supervisor Prof. R. A. R. C. Gopura. For me choosing the path of higher studies was challenging and life changing. I am eternally grateful to him for accepting myself as his research student and for the continuous support given to reach great milestones which I would not have even imagined. Over the entire period of my research, his humane qualities left an example for me to look up to and I am honoured to be a student of him.

I wish to extend my gratitude to Eng.Pubudu Ranaweera for providing his valuable insights for the successful completion of this research work. Doing a research alone can be tiresome and restless at most of the time. However, it is the people around you who make that feeling disappear. I am very grateful to all the members of Bionics Laboratory, Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Moratuwa, who had my back in each step of the way. Among them I would like to appreciate the support Dr. Kanishka Madusanka in shaping my Master's Degree work. Moreover, I would like to recall the motivational advices of Mr. Achitha Mihiran, Mr. Achintha Iroshan Mr. Dinesh Kumara and Mr. Dulanjana Perera.

I take this opportunity to express my gratitude towards the Senate Research Council of University of Moratuwa for the financial support granted to me under the grant no. SRC/ST/2019/56 to conduct my studies.

Moreover, enormous thanks to CSSM laboratory members for providing materials and support for development of sensory interfaces: Dr. Damith Chathuranga, Mr. Asitha Kulasekara , Mr. Rancimal Arumathanthri and Mr. Chanaka Prasad. guided me throughout the study.

support, love and motivation provided by my loving family. I would pay my sincere homage to them, with heavy heart for being the reason to keep moving forward when the things get hard.

Sanka Dileepa Chandrasiri  
msankachandrasiri@gmail.com

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

<b>Declaration</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>Abstract</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>Dedication</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>Acknowledgments</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>appendix</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>List of Figures</b>	<b>xiii</b>
<b>List of Tables</b>	<b>xiv</b>
<b>List of Abbreviations</b>	<b>xv</b>
<b>A Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
A.1 Motivation . . . . .	2
A.2 Contribution of the Thesis . . . . .	3

A.3	Thesis Overview . . . . .	3
<b>B</b>	<b>Literature Review</b>	<b>6</b>
B.1	Biomechanics and Kinematics of Lower Limb . . . . .	6
B.2	Lower limb Exoskeletons . . . . .	12
B.2.1	Trunk-Hip-Knee-Ankle-Foot (THKAF) exoskeletons . . . . .	13
B.2.2	Hip-Knee-Ankle-Foot (HKAF) exoskeletons . . . . .	17
B.2.3	Trunk-Hip-Knee (THK) exoskeletons . . . . .	19
B.2.4	Hip-Knee (HK) exoskeletons . . . . .	19
B.2.5	Knee-Ankle-Foot (KAF) exoskeletons . . . . .	21
B.2.6	Single joint exoskeletons . . . . .	23
B.3	Human-Robot Interaction . . . . .	26
B.3.1	Cognitive Human-Robot Interaction . . . . .	26
B.3.2	Physical Human-Robot Interaction . . . . .	27
<b>C</b>	<b>Development of Surface Muscle Pressure Monitoring System</b>	<b>28</b>
C.1	Force Sensitive Resistors Based Sensory System . . . . .	28
C.1.1	Design Concept . . . . .	29
C.1.2	Experiment Setup and Protocols . . . . .	30
C.1.3	Experimental Results and Discussion . . . . .	33
C.2	Pneumatic Surface Muscle Pressure Sensory System . . . . .	37



C.2.1	Design Concept . . . . .	37
C.2.2	Fabrication Process . . . . .	40
C.2.3	Data Acquisition Tools and Protocols . . . . .	41
C.2.4	Experimental Results and Evaluation . . . . .	43
<b>D</b>	<b>Experiments and Results</b>	<b>48</b>
D.1	Development of Dummy Exoskeleton . . . . .	48
D.1.1	Mechanical Design . . . . .	49
D.1.2	Fabrication Process . . . . .	50
D.2	Simulation Model . . . . .	51
D.2.1	Lower Limb Motion Analysis Model . . . . .	52
D.2.2	Ground Reaction Force Prediction . . . . .	52
D.3	Experiment Setup . . . . .	54
D.4	Experimental Protocol . . . . .	55
D.5	Results . . . . .	60
D.5.1	Guideline for design of lower limb exoskeletons . . . . .	70
<b>E</b>	<b>Conclusion and Future Directions</b>	<b>72</b>
	<b>List of Publications</b>	<b>74</b>
	<b>References</b>	<b>82</b>

<b>Appendix</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>A Anybody Musculoskeletal Model</b>	<b>83</b>
A.1 Body Mass Scaling Factors . . . . .	83
A.2 Fat Percentage . . . . .	84
A.3 Ground Reaction Force Prediction Foot Plate Conditions . . . . .	84
<b>B sEMG signal feature extraction</b>	<b>86</b>
B.1 Main Program . . . . .	86
B.2 Signal Noise Reduction . . . . .	87
B.3 FFT Transformation . . . . .	88
B.4 Butterworth Bandpass Filter . . . . .	89
B.5 Notch Filter . . . . .	89
B.6 Noise Peak Filteration . . . . .	90
<b>C Engineering drawings of dummy lower-limb exoskeleton</b>	<b>92</b>

## LIST OF FIGURES

---

A.1	Summary of research work. . . . .	4
B.1	The anterior view of the human lower limb. . . . .	7
B.2	Motions of the hip . . . . .	8
B.3	Motions of the knee and ankle . . . . .	8
B.4	Simplified human lower limb kinematic model of the lower limb . . . . .	10
B.5	Definition of D-H parameters. [1] . . . . .	11
B.6	Classification of lower limb exoskeletons based on the area of application. . . . .	12
B.7	Classification of lower limb exoskeletons based on wearer's attachment locations . . . . .	14
B.8	Trunk-Hip-Knee-Ankle-Foot (THKAF) exoskeletons . . . . .	18
B.9	Hip-Knee-Ankle-Foot (HKAF) and Trunk-Hip-Knee (THK) exoskeletons . . . . .	20
B.10	Hip-Knee (HK) and Knee-Ankle-Foot (KAF) exoskeletons . . . . .	22
B.11	Hip, knee and ankle-foot exoskeletons . . . . .	24
C.1	SMP sensory system . . . . .	29

C.2	Experimental setup . . . . .	30
C.3	SMP sensory system sEMG acquisition system attachments . . . . .	31
C.4	Angular deflection of knee using cartesian coordinates of hip, knee and ankle joints . . . . .	33
C.5	sEMG, SMP and Knee Angle for seven squatting cycles . . . . .	34
C.6	sEMG analysis data for 10 subjects . . . . .	35
C.7	Units of SMP monitoring system . . . . .	38
C.8	Silicone pressurized air pouch (PAP) . . . . .	39
C.9	Fabrication process of PAP . . . . .	40
C.10	Developed SMP monitoring system (PAP, PC, pneumatic pressure sensor and micro-controller . . . . .	41
C.11	Experimental setup . . . . .	42
C.12	Assembly of SMP monitoring system . . . . .	43
C.13	Deformation of PAP for different internal pressures . . . . .	44
C.14	Deformation of PAP for different internal pressures . . . . .	44
C.15	SMP and sEMG variation graphs . . . . .	46
D.1	Dummy exoskeleton . . . . .	49
D.2	The dummy exoskeleton segments . . . . .	50
D.3	The test subject wearing the dummy exoskeleton . . . . .	51
D.4	AnyBody human model . . . . .	53

D.5	AnyBody human model simulation architecture . . . . .	53
D.6	The experimental setup . . . . .	54
D.7	Sample size analysis data . . . . .	55
D.8	sEMG and SMP sensory acquisition systems attachments . . . . .	56
D.9	The test subject wearing dummy exoskeleton with sEMG and SMP acquisition systems . . . . .	56
D.10	Motion capture reflective markers locations . . . . .	57
D.11	The weight attachment locations of the dummy exoskeleton . . . . .	58
D.12	Summary of the experiment process . . . . .	59
D.13	sEMG results for 0.5 m/s speed . . . . .	61
D.14	sEMG results for 1 m/s speed . . . . .	62
D.15	sEMG peaks values increments of Rectus Femoris with respect to with Exoskeleton value (a) sEMG peaks values increments for 1.25 kg attachment, (b) sEMG peaks values increments for 0.5 m/s speed . . . . .	64
D.16	sEMG peaks values increments of Biceps Femoris with respect to with Exoskeleton value (a) sEMG peaks values increments for 1.25 kg attachment, (b) sEMG peaks values increments for 0.5 m/s speed . . . . .	65
D.17	sEMG peaks values increments of Gastrocnemius with respect to with Exoskeleton value (a) sEMG peaks values increments for 1.25 kg attachment, (b) sEMG peaks values increments for 0.5 m/s speed . . . . .	66

D.18 Kinematic data (a) Ankle angle, (b) Knee angle . . . . .	67
D.19 Force and SMP data for 0.5 m/s speed (a) Ground force prediction (b) Surface muscle pressure . . . . .	68
D.20 Qualitative analysis for lower limb attachment locations and weights (a) Borg's scale result for 1.25kg attachment, (b) Reference Borg's scale for discomfort levels . . . . .	69
D.21 Lower limb weight attachment locations . . . . .	71
C.1 Dummy exoskeleton, (a) lateral view of the exoskeleton, (b) hip mechanism, and (c) knee mechanism. . . . .	92

## LIST OF TABLES

---

B.1	ROM of the human hip complex . . . . .	9
B.2	ROM of the human knee complex and ankle . . . . .	9
B.3	DH Parameters of human Lower Limb . . . . .	12
B.4	Classification of multi-joint exoskeletons . . . . .	23
C.1	Physical properties of air pouch . . . . .	40
C.2	Statistical Data of Deformation Curve Fits . . . . .	45
D.1	Sample size analysis data . . . . .	55
D.2	Weight attachments . . . . .	58
D.3	Comfort level matrix . . . . .	71
C.1	Description of the components of the dummy exoskeleton . . . . .	92

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

---

<b>cHRI</b>	Cognitive Human Robot Interaction
<b>DAQ</b>	Data Acquisition
<b>DC</b>	Direct Current
<b>DH</b>	Denavit Hartenberg
<b>DLS</b>	Damped Least Squares
<b>DoF</b>	Degrees of Freedom
<b>EEG</b>	Electroencephalography
<b>EMG</b>	Electromyography
<b>FSR</b>	Force Sensitive Resisters
<b>HRI</b>	Human Robot Interaction
<b>HK</b>	Hip Knee
<b>HKAF</b>	Hip Knee Ankle Foot
<b>KAF</b>	Knee Ankle Foot
<b>pHRI</b>	Physical Human Robot Interaction
<b>SMP</b>	Surface Muscle Pressure
<b>THKF</b>	Trunk Hip Knee Foot
<b>THK</b>	Trunk Hip Knee