



HAL
open science

Experimental vs. model-based comparison of stepping threshold in response to external force-controlled perturbation

Marie-Laure Mille, Pascal Vallee, Romain Tisserand, Jean-Louis Vercher, Richard C. Fitzpatrick, Thomas Robert

► To cite this version:

Marie-Laure Mille, Pascal Vallee, Romain Tisserand, Jean-Louis Vercher, Richard C. Fitzpatrick, et al.. Experimental vs. model-based comparison of stepping threshold in response to external force-controlled perturbation. 2017 ISPGR World Congress, Jun 2017, FORT LAUDERDALE, United States. 2 p. hal-01791265

HAL Id: hal-01791265

<https://hal.science/hal-01791265v1>

Submitted on 14 May 2018

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Experimental vs. model based determination of stepping threshold in response to external force-controlled perturbation.




Marie-Laure Mille, Pascal Vallée, Romain Tisserand, Richard C Fitzpatrick, Jean-Louis Vercher and Thomas Robert.

Background and aim. Stepping is a common protective strategy for dynamic balance recovery following external perturbations of stance. The present study investigated the threshold for triggering a step during force-controlled forward perturbations of different durations delivered at waist level, and confronted the experimental results with a simple biomechanical model that could predict when a subject had to step.

Methods. Twenty-two healthy young adults (5 women; 19-37 years old) were asked to try not to step in response to 86 different force/time combinations of forward waist-pulls (Fig A). Each trial perturbation was characterized by its force (F_n - normalized according to the subject body weight), its duration (T), and its consequence (step or no-step). The probability to step as a function of perturbation characteristics was then calculated for the entire group and the force at which 50% of the subjects stepped (F_{50}) were identified for each tested perturbation duration (Fig B). Experimental results were compared to a numerical criterion used to estimate if a recovery step was necessary for a given square force perturbation. It was obtained from the dynamics of a linear inverted pendulum + foot model, considering that the maximal balance recovery reactions. These were an instantaneous shift of the center of pressure at the edge of the functional base of support ($CoP_{max}=15,3\text{ cm}$) that arises after the perturbation (delay representing the reaction time $RT = 116\text{ ms}$). Values of CoP_{max} and RT were obtained from the experimental measures.

Results. The experimental stepping boundary was well described by a simple hyperbolic function with a positive horizontal asymptote: $F_{50} = a/T + C$, with a the constant defining the radius of curvature of the function and C the horizontal asymptote describing the smallest force necessary to trigger a step - any force smaller than C could be sustained indefinitely without a step. The results of this fitting (Gauss-Newton, nonlinear, least-mean-squares) is represented on Fig C (red line) and the mean squared error was very small (MSE 0.12). The values of F_{max} computed using the biomechanical model (Fig C solid blue line) correctly predicted the pulling force threshold.

Conclusions. The stepping boundary describes the maximal force that has to be applied for a specific time to trigger a step. Experimentally, this boundary corresponded to a constant impulse (i.e. constant perturbation force and duration product), which could be easily applied in a clinical environment. When compared to the biomechanical model, the stepping boundary was mainly explained by the RT and the CoP displacement within the functional BoS (CoP_{max}). Future work could investigate clinical population to further test validity of both stepping boundary methods and their predictive capabilities.

A**B****C**