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ABSTRACT

In bipedal locomotion, swing-leg protraction and retraction refer to the forward and backward motion, respectively, of the swing-leg before touchdown. Past studies have shown that swing-leg retraction strategy can lead to stable walking. We show that swing-leg protraction can also lead to stable walking. We use a simple 2D model of passive dynamic walking but with the addition of an actuator between the legs. We use the actuator to do full correction of the disturbance in a single step (a one-step dead-beat control). Specifically, for a given limit cycle we perturb the velocity at mid-stance. Then, we determine the foot placement strategy that allows the walker to return to the limit cycle in a single step. For a given limit cycle, we find that there is swing-leg protraction at shallow slopes and swing-leg retraction at steep slopes. As the limit cycle speed increases, the swing-leg protraction region increases. On close examination, we observe that the choice of swing-leg strategy is based on two opposing effects that determine the time from mid-stance to touchdown: the walker speed at mid-stance and the adjustment in the step length for one-step dead-beat control. When the walker speed dominates, the swing-leg retract but when the step length dominates, the swing-leg protracts. This result suggests that swing-leg strategy for stable walking depends on the model parameters, the terrain, and the stability measure used for control. This novel finding has a clear implication in the development of controllers for robots, exoskeletons, and prosthetics and to understand stability in human gaits.

© 2016 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

It has been observed that during humans walking and running, the swing leg moves backward (the angle between the legs is decreasing) prior to touchdown. This is referred to as ‘swing-leg retraction’ and is hypothesized to stabilize human gait (Daley and Usherwood, 2010; Seyfarth et al., 2003; Wisse et al., 2005).

Model studies of un-actuated machines walking downhill, also known as passive dynamic walking robots (Garcia et al., 1998; McGeer, 1990), have two families of solutions for certain ramp slopes. One solution is stable while the other is unstable. Quite interestingly, the stable solution has a swing-leg retraction while the unstable solution has a swing-leg protraction. This observation led (Wisse et al., 2005) to hypothesize that swing-leg retraction helps improve walking stability. Model studies with controlled swing-leg retraction motions have strengthened this hypothesis. In particular, swing-leg retraction has been demonstrated to increase the stability as measured by the eigenvalue of the Poincaré map (Wisse et al., 2005; Hobbenel and Wisse, 2008), and to increase the ability to reject disturbance (e.g., terrain variation) (Hobbenel and Wisse, 2008). Swing-leg retraction has also been shown to increase the stability and the robustness to disturbances for models of running (Blum et al., 2010; Karssen et al., 2011).

In addition, there have been a number of model-based studies that have tried to understand the benefits of swing-leg retraction beyond stabilization. Specifically, swing-leg retraction has been shown to (1) increase the energy-efficiency by reducing the foot velocity just before touchdown and by reducing the push-off impulse (Hasaneini et al., 2013b, 2013a; Karssen et al., 2011); (2) minimize foot slippage (Karssen et al., 2011; Hasaneini et al., 2013b); (3) improve the accuracy of predicting touchdown timing (Bhounsule et al., 2014); (4) decrease peak forces at collisions (Karssen et al., 2011); and (5) increase viability and controllability regimes (Hasaneini et al., 2013b). However, the focus of this paper is on the effect of swing-leg strategy on locomotion stability.

How does swing-leg retraction improve walking stability? We provide an explanation based on the paper by Wisse et al. (2005). Consider a 2D biped model moving with a certain speed, the nominal speed, which corresponds to a certain energy, the nominal energy (see Fig. 1A). The nominal values above are evaluated at a particular instance in the walking motion (e.g., at mid-stance). Let us assume that the biped speed/energy has changed (e.g., due to a disturbance). In the explanation given below, we are interested in the change in speed, energy, step length, and time with respect to their nominal values.
(1) When the biped is going fast, it has excess energy. This energy can be dissipated by taking a longer step to get back to the nominal speed. This is indicated by the negative gradient on the $\phi$ vs $t$ plot. The literature has ample examples of this scenario.

(2) When the biped is going fast, the step time will decrease. Similarly, when the biped is going slow, the step time will increase. Thus changes in the biped speed and step time have a negative correlation.

From (1) and (2) we see that the step length has a negative correlation with the step time which implies a swing-leg retraction strategy (see Fig. 1D). Thus it seems that only swing-leg retraction can lead to stable walking.

However, we argue that (2) is not always true. This is because the step time depends on (a) the biped speed and (b) the step length found in (1). When the biped is going fast, the step length needs to increase to get back to the nominal speed as stated in (1). A faster speed will lead to a decrease in the step time but the corresponding increase in step length will increase the step time. When the effect of biped speed dominates the computation of step time, there is swing-leg retraction (see Fig. 1D). But when the effect of step length dominates the computation of step time, there is swing-leg protraction (see Fig. 1E).

Swing-leg protraction can be advantageous because it decreases the energetic cost of swinging the leg. Note that in swing-leg retraction, the hip actuator needs to do more work to move the leg beyond its normal step length so that the swing leg has enough time to be able to move backward before touchdown. However, in swing-leg protraction the leg is moving forward before touchdown and the actuator does not need to do extra work to move the leg beyond its normal step length. Thus, the finding that swing-leg protraction helps bipedal stability has implication for the energy-efficient control of artificial legs in robots, exoskeletons, and prosthetics and in understanding mechanics of human gait.

In this paper, we demonstrate that swing-leg protraction can also lead to stable walking and provide an intuitive explanation. Stable walking with swing-leg protraction has also been independently observed by Safa and Naraghi (2015) in a similar walking model but without a hip actuator, but it was mostly ignored as a viable strategy for bipedal stabilization. Although past results suggest that swing-leg retraction leads to stable walking, our results do not contradict them. Specifically, we have examined swing-leg strategies on a broader range of walking motions and terrains not covered in the past studies. Our analysis with a simple bipedal model suggests that the choice of swing-leg strategy depends on the model parameters, the terrain, and the stability measure used for control. Thus, further investigation is needed to understand the role of swing-leg motion in gait stabilization.

2. Methods

We give brief details of the model and methods used to determine the swing leg control strategy. We use a 2-dimensional model of walking shown in Fig. 2 similar to the one used by Wisse et al. (2005). The model has massless legs of length $\ell$ and a point-mass $M$ at the hip. Gravity $g$ points downward and the ramp slope is $\gamma$. The stance leg makes an angle of $\theta$ with the vertically downward direction and the swing leg makes an angle of $\phi$ with the stance leg. The model has a rotary hip actuator that can control the swing leg relative to the stance leg.

We use a Poincaré map to relate the state of the walker between successive mid-stance positions (see Fig. 3). We define the mid-stance to be the position when
the gravity vector is along the stance leg. Given the variables at step $i$, namely, the mid-stance velocity ($\dot{\theta}_{\text{m}}^i$), the swing leg angle at touchdown ($\phi_i^-$), and the ramp slope ($\gamma$), we can find the mid-stance velocity at step $i + 1$ ($\dot{\theta}_{\text{m}}^{i+1}$) using the mapping function $F$ as follows: $\dot{\theta}_{\text{m}}^{i+1} = F(\dot{\theta}_{\text{m}}^i, \phi_i^-, \gamma)$. A limit cycle is the steady state motion of the model. To compute the limit cycle, we put $\dot{\theta}_{\text{m}}^{i+1} = \dot{\theta}_{\text{m}}^i, \phi_i^-= \phi_0$, and $\gamma = \gamma^*$ to get $\dot{\theta}_{\text{m}}^0 = F(\dot{\theta}_{\text{m}}^0, \phi_0, \gamma^*)$.  

See supplementary material for elaborate details on evaluation of $F$.

Stability is defined as the ability of the biped to stick to the same limit cycle in the presence of a disturbance (e.g., terrain variation, a push). We use the following definition of stability in this analysis: a limit cycle is stable if the biped can fully correct a perturbation in the state in a single step and unstable otherwise. Such a controller that allows for full correction of disturbances in a single step is known as one-step deadbeat control (Antsaklis and Michel, 2006). We call this the superstability-based measure. However, the more widely used stability measure is based on the maximum eigenvalues of $F$, which we call the eigenvalue-based measure. According to the eigenvalue-based measure, the biped is considered to be stable if the magnitude of the maximum eigenvalue is less than 1, and unstable otherwise (Garcia et al., 1998; Sirogatz, 1994). The main advantage of our measure, the superstability-based measure over the eigenvalue-based measure, is that it is not based on linearization but is more stringent. Note that both these stability measures assess the local stability based on small perturbations as opposed to global stability, which is the ability not to fall down under small as well as large perturbations.

We state the control problem as follows. Given a mid-stance velocity at step $i$, $\dot{\theta}_{\text{m}}^i = \dot{\theta}_{\text{m}}^0$, for the given ramp slope, $\gamma^*$, we need to find the step length, $\phi_0$ required to get back to the nominal mid-stance velocity, $\dot{\theta}_{\text{m}}^0$, at the next step. Thus $\dot{\theta}_{\text{m}}^0 = F(\dot{\theta}_{\text{m}}^0, \phi_0, \gamma^*)$.  

We also need to evaluate the time from mid-stance to touchdown, $t_i$, which is given as follows: $t_i = \int_0^{\dot{\theta}_{\text{m}}^0} \frac{dt}{\dot{\theta}_{\text{m}}^0} = \frac{\dot{\theta}_{\text{m}}^0}{\dot{\theta}_{\text{m}}^0} \left( \frac{2\sinh \gamma + \gamma^*}{\sqrt{\dot{\theta}_{\text{m}}^0}^2 + 2(1 - \cos \theta)} \right)$.  

Our numerical calculations are done as follows. To evaluate the limit cycle, we fix the mid-stance speed, $\dot{\theta}_{\text{m}}^0$, and ramp slope, $\gamma$, and compute the step length using Eq. (1). Next, we set $\dot{\theta}_{\text{m}}^0 = \dot{\theta}_{\text{m}}^0$ in Eq. (3) to compute the time from mid-stance to touchdown. Then we vary the mid-stance velocity, $\dot{\theta}_{\text{m}}^0$, and evaluate the swing leg angle, $\phi_0$, that will lead to a one-step deadbeat control using Eq. (2) and the time from mid-stance to touchdown using Eq. (3).

3. Results and discussion

We show results for two limit cycles in Fig. 4: $\dot{\theta}_{\text{m}}^0 = 0.1$ and $\dot{\theta}_{\text{m}}^0 = 0.4$. Fig. 4A and C shows plots of hip angle at touchdown, $\phi_i^-$, vs mid-stance velocity, $\dot{\theta}_{\text{m}}^0$, for various ramp slopes. These plots demonstrate that for faster mid-stance velocity than the nominal, the walker needs to take a longer step than the nominal to get back to the limit cycle, and vice versa for slower mid-stance velocity. The reason is that a longer step length increases while shorter step length decreases the relative energy loss at touchdown (Ruina et al., 2005). Fig. 4B and D shows plots of the hip angle at touchdown, $\phi_i^-$, vs time to touchdown, $t_i$, as a function of ramp slope. These plots give the trajectory that the swing leg should follow to enable a one-step deadbeat control. That is, if the swing leg follows the specific curve for the given ramp slope, then the biped is guaranteed to return to the limit cycle on the following step.

The gradient at the limit cycle for the plot of swing leg angle versus time (limit cycle shown by the black dot in Fig. 4) determines the swing-leg strategy; a negative gradient indicates swing-leg retraction while a positive gradient indicates swing-leg protraction. The region of swing-leg protraction is indicated in gray in Fig. 4. Table 1 gives the swing-leg speed for each limit cycle considered in Fig. 4. From the table and the figure we note the following: (1) swing-leg protraction at shallow ramp slopes and swing-leg retraction at steep ramp slopes, and (2) swing-leg protraction region increases as the limit cycle speed increases, that is, the gray region increases with $\dot{\theta}_{\text{m}}^0$. We explain this observation next. The equation for the stance leg is classical inverted pendulum equation and is given by $\theta = \sin \theta$. We do the small angle approximation to rewrite this equation $\theta = \theta_0$. Next, we solve this equation and use the initial conditions at mid-stance, $\theta(0) = 0$ and $\theta(0) = -\dot{\theta}_{\text{m}}^0$, to get $\theta(t) = \dot{\theta}_{\text{m}}^0 \sinh(t)$. At touchdown we have $t = t_i$ and $\theta(t_i) = 0.5\phi_i$, thus, $\phi_i = 2\dot{\theta}_{\text{m}}^0 \sinh t_i$.

We take the differential of the above equation to get $\partial \phi_i = 2\sinh(t_i) (\partial \dot{\theta}_{\text{m}}^0) + 2\dot{\theta}_{\text{m}}^0 \cosh(t_i)$. Rearranging the equation, we get the following expression for the swing-leg speed:

$$\phi_i = \frac{\partial \phi_i}{\partial t_i} = \frac{2\dot{\theta}_{\text{m}}^0 \cosh t_i}{2\dot{\theta}_{\text{m}}^0} - 2\sinh t_i$$

The sign of the swing-leg speed depends on the term $\frac{\partial \phi_i}{\partial t_i} - 2\sinh$, because all the other terms in the expression are positive. From Fig. 4A and C, we note that $\frac{\partial \phi_i}{\partial t_i} = 0$ at the limit cycle (black dot) is positive but the value decreases as the ramp slope increases. That is, at shallow ramp slopes, the gradient, $\frac{\partial \phi_i}{\partial t_i}$, is large, which makes the denominator in the above equation positive, leading to swing-leg protraction. However, as the ramp slope increases, the gradient, $\frac{\partial \phi_i}{\partial t_i}$, is small, which makes the denominator negative, leading to swing-leg retraction. Further, we note that as the limit cycle speed $\dot{\theta}_{\text{m}}^0$ increases, we get a larger range of ramp slopes where the gradient, $\frac{\partial \phi_i}{\partial t_i}$, is large, thus increasing the swing-leg protraction region (compare the gray region in D with that in B).

The transition from swing-leg retraction to swing-leg protraction occurs through infinity. From Figs. 4B and D, we note that at shallow ramp slopes, there is swing leg protraction indicated by positive gradient. As the ramp slope increases, the gradient increases, reaching positive infinity. Further increase in the ramp slope causes the gradient to flip from positive to negative infinity and then increases to a finite negative value. Thus, for each limit cycle speed, $\dot{\theta}_{\text{m}}^0$, there is ramp slope, $\gamma$, at which $\frac{\partial \phi_i}{\partial t_i} = 2\sinh t_i = 0$. When this happens, the swing leg speed is infinite (see Eq. (5)). The physical explanation for this is that the change in leg angle
and the change in speed produce an equal and opposite effect on the time from mid-stance to touchdown. Thus, the time from mid-stance to touchdown is unchanged leading to an infinite swing leg speed. As infinite speeds are impossible, the biped loses its ability to be super-stable at this point.

The plot of $\phi_i^m$ shown in Fig. 4B and D can be used to control the hip actuator in exoskeletons and legged robots. When the swing leg is made to follow the $\phi_i^m$ trajectory, there will be a complete cancellation of perturbation in speed in a single step, assuming that there are no further disturbances from mid-stance to touchdown. Note that to be able to choose a particular trajectory one requires measurements of mid-stance position, mid-stance speed, and the ramp slope.

One interesting question is that: Do humans do one-step dead-beat control under perturbations? By the eigenvalue-based stability metric, this would correspond to a maximum eigenvalue of 0. Past studies on humans show that eigenvalues of walking are between 0.4 and 1 (Dingwell and Kang, 2007), which suggest an exponential decay rather than dead-beat control. But because human walking data is noisy and has considerable variability, even if humans did a dead-beat control (in some dimensions), it would not be distinguishable from an exponential decay.

Fig. 3. A typical step of our point mass model. The walker starts in the upright or mid-stance position in (I). In this position, the gravity (not shown in the figure) is along the stance leg and in the downward direction. The swing leg is not shown in I. Next, the stance leg (shown in dark color throughout) moves passively under gravity and the swing leg (shown in light gray color throughout) is controlled to follow a time-based trajectory $\phi_i^m$. Just before touchdown in (II), the swing leg is at an angle $\phi_i$. Next, after touchdown in (III), the swing leg becomes the new stance leg. Finally, the stance leg and the swing leg move passively. The walker ends in the upright position or mid-stance position on the next step in (IV).

Fig. 4. Swing-leg strategy for two limit cycles for a range of ramp slopes. Plots for the limit cycle characterized with mid-stance velocity $\dot{\theta}_i^m = 0.1$ (A and B) and $\dot{\theta}_i^m = 0.4$ (C and D). The plots on the left column, A and C, show the hip angle at touchdown ($\phi_i^m$) vs mid-stance velocity $\dot{\theta}_i^m$ while the plots on the right column, B and D, show the hip angle at touchdown ($\phi_i^m$) vs the time from mid-stance to touchdown ($t_i$). The model chooses a swing-leg protraction strategy in the grey region and a swing-leg retraction strategy elsewhere.
We assumed that the swing leg is massless in our model. But real robots and humans have legs with finite mass. So the question is whether the results hold true when the legs are massy. The effect of a massy leg is that the swing leg will add/remove energy during the swing phase, in addition to that at touchdown. However, since robots and humans have relatively light legs (legs account for 15% of human weight (Srinivasan, 2006), we speculate that adding legs to the model would not alter the results significantly.

### 4. Conclusions

For a simple 2D point mass model of walking descending a ramp slope there are stable gaits with both swing-leg retraction as well as swing-leg protraction. The reason for different strategies is because the change in time (compared to nominal step time) from mid-stance to touchdown depends on two opposing effects: the perturbed mid-stance speed and the adjustment in step length. When the speed of walking dominates the computation of the time, we obtain swing leg retraction strategy, but when the step length dominates, we obtain swing-leg protraction strategy. For a given limit cycle characterized by a mid-stance speed, swing-leg protraction stabilizes walking at shallow ramp slopes and swing-leg retraction stabilizes walking at steep ramp slopes. The swing-leg protraction region increases as the limit cycle speed increases.

Our analysis suggests that the swing-leg strategy depends on the ramp slope, the nominal walking speed, and the definition of stability, which in our case is full cancellation of perturbations in a single step. Thus it is clear that the swing-leg strategy to stabilize bipedal walking is quite complex as it depends on a variety of factors. Further research is needed to elucidate the nature of swing-leg strategy for different models, actuation schemes, and stability specification (e.g., eigenvalue-based stability).

### Conflict of interest statement

None declared.

### Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data associated with this article can be found in the online version at http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2016.11.063.

### References