



HAL
open science

Kinematic modeling at the ant scale: propagation of model parameter uncertainties

Santiago Arroyave-Tobón, Jordan Drapin, Anton Kaniewski, Jean-Marc Linares, Pierre Moretto

► **To cite this version:**

Santiago Arroyave-Tobón, Jordan Drapin, Anton Kaniewski, Jean-Marc Linares, Pierre Moretto. Kinematic modeling at the ant scale: propagation of model parameter uncertainties. *Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology*, 2022, 10, 10.3389/fbioe.2022.767914 . hal-03592115

HAL Id: hal-03592115

<https://hal.science/hal-03592115>

Submitted on 1 Mar 2022

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.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

Kinematic modeling at the ant scale: propagation of model parameter uncertainties

Santiago Arroyave-Tobon^{1,†,*}, Jordan Drapin^{2,†}, Anton Kaniewski¹,

Jean-Marc Linares¹, Pierre Moretto²

¹*Aix Marseille Univ, CNRS, ISM, Marseille, France*

²*Centre de Recherches sur la Cognition Animale (CRCA), Centre de Biologie Intégrative (CBI), Université de Toulouse, CNRS, UPS, Toulouse, France*

Correspondence*:

Corresponding Author

santiago.arroyave-tobon@univ-amu.fr

†These authors have contributed equally to this work and share first authorship

2 ABSTRACT

3 Quadrupeds and hexapods are known by their ability to adapt their locomotive patterns
4 in function of the environment. Computational modeling of animal movement can help to
5 better understand the emergence of locomotive patterns and their body dynamics. Although
6 considerable progress has been made in this subject in recent years, the strengths and limitations
7 of kinematic simulations at the scale of small moving animals are not well understood. In response
8 to this, this work evaluated the effects of modeling uncertainties on kinematic simulations at
9 small scale. In order to do so, a multibody model of a *Messor barbarus* ant was developed. The
10 model was built from 3D scans coming from X-ray micro-computed tomography. Joint geometrical
11 parameters were estimated from the articular surfaces of the exoskeleton. Kinematic data of a
12 free walking ant was acquired using high-speed synchronized video cameras. Spatial coordinates
13 of 49 virtual markers were used to run inverse kinematics simulations using OpenSim software.
14 The sensitivity of the model's predictions to joint geometrical parameters and marker position
15 uncertainties was evaluated by means of two Monte Carlo simulations. The developed model was
16 four times more sensitive to perturbations on marker position than those of the joint geometrical
17 parameters. These results are of interest for locomotion studies of small quadrupeds, octopods
18 and other multi-legged animals.

19

20 **Keywords:** multibody, inverse kinematics, ant, motion capture, uncertainty

1 INTRODUCTION

21 Legged locomotion is the most common form of terrestrial animal movement (Christensen et al., 2021).
22 Even if quadrupedal and hexapodal locomotion have evolved independently (Blickhan and Full, 1987),
23 they present similarities. Both quadrupeds and hexapods can adapt their locomotive patterns according to
24 their objective (Hoyt and Taylor, 1981; Nirody, 2021). Like quadrupeds, hexapods exhibit a wide variety
25 of locomotor strategies (Nirody, 2021), e.g. walking, running, jumping (Musthak Ali et al., 1992) or even
26 swimming (Schultheiss and Guénard, 2021) and gliding (Yanoviak et al., 2005). As some quadrupeds
27 do, insects change smoothly the inter-leg coordination patterns based on their locomotion speed (Ambe
28 et al., 2018). In the metachronous gait (or direct wave gait), hexapods propagate swinging movements
29 from the hind legs to the forelegs, similarly as quadrupeds do in the walking gait (Ambe et al., 2018). In

30 tripod gait, hexapods move their diagonal legs in phase, as quadrupeds do in the trotting gait (Ambe et al.,
31 2018). These equivalences in the locomotion mechanics generate similar ground reaction force patterns in
32 quadrupeds and hexapods, as demonstrated experimentally by Full et al. (1991). In that study, the authors
33 demonstrated that at constant average speed, cockroaches function as a spring-mass system in which three
34 legs add up to function as one leg of a biped or two legs of a quadruped.

35 As opposed to bipedal and quadrupedal locomotion, hexapodal locomotion is characterized by its
36 plasticity. For instance, hexapods can adopt quadrupedal or bipedal gaits to increase speed, as has been
37 shown in cockroaches (Full et al., 1991). The bipodal posture adopted when the insect stands up, allows for
38 a longer stride length while maintaining the same stride frequency, thus raising the speed. In stick insects,
39 the coordination of the middle legs and hindlegs is similar to typical regular gaits of quadrupeds Grabowska
40 et al. (2012a). The emergence of quadrupedal gaits on hexapod robots has also been demonstrated when a
41 sudden fault event occurs to one leg (Yang and Kim, 1998). However, these adaptations deserve further
42 analysis to better understand the plasticity and dynamics of multi-legged gait.

43 The hexapodal gait has been first described as an alternative tripod gait that ensures high static stability
44 (Hughes, 1952) regardless of the support. Yet, studies estimating ground reaction forces demonstrate
45 different functions of the rear, median and front legs (sustain, propel, push or drag) (Cruse, 1976; Full et al.,
46 1991; Grabowska et al., 2012b; Reinhardt and Blickhan, 2014; Wöhrle et al., 2017). Other studies, dedicated
47 to the effects of the ground substrates or load carried, demonstrated the plasticity of the tripod gait in
48 response to mechanical constraints (Bernadou et al., 2011; Pfeffer et al., 2019; Merienne et al., 2020).
49 These studies suggest that hexapodal gait is more complex than a mere alternating tripod one. Furthermore,
50 the small scale and lack of a precise description of the architecture of the musculoskeletal system could
51 explain why the hexapodal gait is less documented than the quadrupedal or bipedal gaits.

52 Learning how insects adapt their locomotion strategies to their environment (motor and neural control),
53 how each body segment moves for a given locomotion strategy (kinematics), and how forces are generated
54 (muscle actuation) and transmitted (joint dynamics), could help answer biological questions, and develop
55 engineering applications. For instance, kinematic, dynamic and motor control data regarding animal
56 locomotion proves indispensable for bio-inspired robotics development. Particularly, some examples of
57 applications include: bio-inspired robot architecture (Lu et al., 2018), bio-inspired control strategies for
58 legged robots (Dupeyroux et al., 2019; Ouyang et al., 2021), and bio-inspired actuation systems (Ahn et al.,
59 2019), among others.

60 Computational modeling of animal movement can help to better understand the emergence locomotive
61 patterns and their mechanics by means of the musculoskeletal models. A musculoskeletal model is
62 comprised of a kinematic model coupled to a dynamic model. The kinematic model, which represents the
63 skeletal system, is a set of body segments connected by joints (i.e. a multibody system). A dynamic model,
64 which represents the muscular system, is a set of actuators attached to the skeletal system.

65 The proper development of the kinematic model is essential for predicting later muscle and joint
66 forces (Dunne et al., 2021). In kinematic modeling, constrained inverse kinematics, as opposed to with
67 unconstrained inverse kinematics, leads to a more realistic prediction of joint kinematics. Conversely,
68 unconstrained inverse kinematics, which permits a fast exploitation of experimental data using stick models,
69 can generate unrealistic behaviors, such as a model's body segments changing length (Dunne et al., 2021).
70 This kind of behavior is unsuitable for musculoskeletal simulations. In constrained kinematic modeling,
71 which is conducted using multibody models, the position and orientation of each segment of the kinematic
72 chain is derived from the trajectories of experimental markers. This is done by optimizing procedures

73 that minimize the weighted least-squares distance between experimental markers and the corresponding
74 markers placed on the kinematic model (Lu and O'Connor, 1999). The position and orientation of each
75 segment of the kinematic chain, together with their first order derivatives, can be used for further muscle
76 and joint force estimation.

77 In the case of vertebrates, the development and use of musculoskeletal models are mainly motivated by
78 medical applications (REFS). In the case of insects, motivations are mostly related to biology, ecology
79 and evolution. Ramdya et al. (2017) developed a multibody model of drosophila to study fast locomotor
80 gaits. Guo et al. (2018) proposed a neuro-musculo-skeletal model for insects to study control strategies
81 in gait patterns. David et al. (2016) and Blanke et al. (2017) developed musculoskeletal models of the
82 dragonfly's mandible to study bite forces. A kinematic model of stick insects was developed by Theunissen
83 and Dürr (2013). In the case of ants, locomotion studies mostly focus on experimental procedures. For
84 example: video-based kinematic analysis (Weihmann and Blickhan, 2009; Moll et al., 2010; Pfeffer et al.,
85 2019), stepping pattern analysis (Zollikofer, 1994), center of mass tracking (Reinhardt and Blickhan, 2014;
86 Merienne et al., 2020, 2021), quantification of ground reaction forces (Reinhardt et al., 2009; Wöhrl et al.,
87 2017), and mandible forces (Zhang et al., 2020), among others.

88 Despite the aforementioned examples, the use of musculoskeletal models at the insect-scale is not yet
89 widespread; probably due to the technological barriers to acquire experimental data (kinematic, dynamic
90 and morphometric data). When comparing the relative resolution of motion capture systems vs. the subject
91 size, it can be argued that motion capture at the human scale is far more accurate than at the insect-scale.
92 In human motion analysis using reflective markers, the measuring uncertainty can reach 0.33 mm in a
93 volume of $5.5 \times 1.2 \times 2.0 \text{ m}^3$ (Eichelberger et al., 2016) (0.0275% in the smallest dimension). Motion
94 analysis by means of physical markers is not easy in small insects. A pattern matching procedure based on
95 video films is a feasible solution for the moment. Using this technique at small scale, our setup reached, on
96 average, 3% resolution in each dimension of the calibrated volume (including tracking errors and pattern
97 recognition errors). The difficulty with small scales lies in keeping the depth of field of the camera at a
98 reasonable size when zooming in to get a clear whole-body image. This problem is not encountered in
99 larger subjects because the lenses are far from the objective. Similar difficulties are faced in morphometric
100 data acquisition in small insects, which is required for the definition of joint locations in musculoskeletal
101 modeling. This implies that the effect of uncertainties in musculoskeletal modeling at the insect-scale must
102 be considered and evaluated to understand the limits of this tool in locomotion analysis. Estimation of
103 uncertainties in kinematic modeling has been widely addressed at the human scale (see for example (Groen
104 et al., 2012; El Habachi et al., 2015; Martelli et al., 2015)). At the insect-scale, however, it is unclear how
105 modeling assumptions affect predicted results in kinematic modeling.

106 The present work therefore evaluated the effects of modeling assumptions in kinematic analysis at the
107 small insect-scale, particularly on a *Messor barbarus* ant. To achieve this objective, i) a whole-body
108 kinematic model of the *Messor barbarus* ant was developed (Section 2.1), ii) an inverse kinematics
109 simulation of the ant gait was reproduced using the developed model and experimental kinematic data
110 (Section 2.6), and iii) the sensitivity of the predicted results regarding model parameter uncertainties was
111 evaluated (Section 2.7).

2 METHODS

112 The global research methodology followed in this work is illustrated in Figure 1. Specimens 1 and 2 belong
113 to the medium sized caste of the *Messor barbarus* species (more details in Section 2.1). Specimen 1 was
114 used to build a 3D model from micro-computed tomography (Section 2.2). 3D models of body segments

115 were used to extract joint geometrical parameters and to create a multibody model (Sections 2.3 and 2.4).
 116 Specimen 2 was used to acquire experimental kinematic data and to extract marker trajectories (Section
 117 2.5). Experimental kinematic data was used to scale the multibody model and to run an inverse kinematics
 118 simulation (Section 2.6). To evaluate the impact of the propagation of model parameter uncertainties on
 119 joint angles, two Monte Carlo (MC) simulations were conducted (Section 2.7). Model parameters subjected
 120 to uncertainty are represented by a Gaussian distribution icon in Figure 1.




Figure 1. Followed research methodology. Gaussian distribution icon indicates model parameters subjected to uncertainty.

121 2.1 Experimental model

122 We used workers from a colony of *Messor barbarus* collected in April 2018 in Saint Hippolyte (42 ° 78
 123 North; 2 ° 97 East, Pyrénées Orientales, France). *Messor barbarus* is a seed-collecting ant whose mature
 124 colonies can harbor tens of thousands of individuals (Hölldobler and Wilson, 1990). The body mass of the
 125 scanned subject was 8.92 mg.

126 The main colony was kept in a box (L: 50 x W: 30 x H: 15 cm) with walls coated with Fluon® to prevent
 127 ants from escaping. The ants could shelter inside nests formed with test tubes (length: 20 cm; diameter: 2.5
 128 cm) covered with opaque paper. They had access to water and a mixture of bird seeds. The experimental
 129 room was maintained at a constant temperature of 26 ° C (thermometer: TFA Dostmann / Wertheim) and
 130 under an artificial photoperiod regime 12h: 12h (light: dark).

131 2.2 Micro-Computed Tomography

132 Following the procedure used by Peeters et al. (2020), specimen 1 was stored in 90% ethanol, then stained
 133 in a 2 M iodine solution for a minimum of 24 h and transferred into micro tubes filled with 99% ethanol. It
 134 was then transferred to Okinawa Institute of Science and Technology Graduate University (OIST, Japan) to
 135 be scanned using micro-Computed Tomography (μ-CT). This was performed using a Zeiss Xradia 510
 136 Versa 3D X-ray microscope operated by the Zeiss Scout-and-Scan Control System software (version 11.1).
 137 A vertical stitching enabled a 3 times scanning along a head-trunk-gaster axis each with a resolution of 933

138 $\times 1013 \times 988$ pixels (providing a voxel of $5.7 \mu\text{m}$). These scans were compiled to increase the resolution
 139 of the whole ant body to $3159 \times 1013 \times 988$ pixels. The DICOM images of the μ -CT scan were used to
 140 build the 3D models of the body segments. A segmentation was done using ITK-SNAP (version 3.6.0)
 141 (Yushkevich et al., 2006) to differentiate the body segments as follows: head, thorax, abdomen, coxa,
 142 trochanter, femur, tibia, metatarsus and tarsus. The four tarsal segments were lumped all into a unique rigid
 143 segment called tarsus in this work.

144 2.3 Extraction of joint geometrical parameters

145 Defining the types of joints was done from both literature and morphometric data (Liu et al., 2019).
 146 From the 3D models of the body segments, joint geometrical parameters were estimated from the articular
 147 surfaces of the exoskeleton using a CAD software (3D EXPERIENCE, Dassault Systèmes, France). For
 148 ball-and-socket joints, the center of a sphere fitted to the articular surface was considered as the center of
 149 rotation of the joint (see Figure 2 (b,f)). For hinge joints, the rotation axis was defined as the line passing
 150 through the center of two spheres fitted to the condyles of the joint (see Figure 2 (c,d,e)). The procedure to
 151 determine joint geometrical parameter was also used in insect biomechanical modeling by Blanke et al.
 152 (2017). Because of low perceived motion, and to facilitate the convergence of the inverse kinematics
 153 algorithm, the internal rotation of the metatarsus of each leg was not considered (it was assumed as a
 154 blocked degree of freedom (DOF)).

155 2.4 Creation of the multibody model

156 A multibody model was created representing the whole-body locomotor system of the *Messor barbarus*.

157 According to the recommendations of the ISB (Wu et al., 2002, 2005), a coordinate system was defined
 158 for each body segment and for the ground. All coordinate systems were defined as right-handed and
 159 orthogonal, as follows (see Figure 2):

- 160 • Definition of the sagittal plane: plane perpendicular to the line passing through the center of two
 161 spheres fitted to the propodeal spiracles and containing the point P_{SP} . Point P_{SP} was defined as the
 162 mid-point of the line segment defined by the two propodeal spiracles, see Figure 2b.
- 163 • Global coordinate system (x_g, y_g, z_g): The z_g -axis points upward, parallel to the field of gravity.
 164 The x_g -axis points in the direction opposite to the direction of travel. The y_g axis was defined as the
 165 common axis perpendicular to x_g - and z_g -axis.
- 166 • Thorax coordinate system (x_t, y_t, z_t): the origin of this coordinate system was defined as the mid-
 167 point of the line segment passing through the center of the spheres fitted to the thorax/neck joint
 168 and thorax/abdomen joints, points P_h and P_a in Figure 2b respectively. The y_t -axis was defined
 169 parallel to the line segment P_hP_a and pointing anteriorly. The x_t -axis was defined as the common
 170 axis perpendicular to the normal vector of the sagittal plane and to y_t . The z_t -axis was defined as the
 171 common axis perpendicular to x_t - and y_t -axis.
- 172 • For hinge joints, the origin of the coordinate system was chosen as the mid-point of the line segment
 173 representing the rotation axis (for example: points $P_{ml.to}$ and $P_{ml.fe}$ in Figure 2c, $P_{ml.ti}$ in Figure 2d
 174 and $P_{ml.mt}$ in Figure 2e). The z -axis was defined parallel to the rotation axis and pointing medially.
 175 The y -axis was defined perpendicular to the z -axis and pointing to the origin of the coordinate system
 176 of the previous segment. The x -axis was defined as the common axis perpendicular to y - and z -axis.
- 177 • For ball-and-socket joints, the origin of the coordinate system was chosen as the center of the sphere
 178 fitted to the articular surface (for example: points $P_{ml.co}$ and $P_{ml.ta}$ in Figure 2b and 2f, respectively).
 179 The y -axis was defined parallel to the line passing through the origin of the coordinate system and
 180 the origin of the coordinate system of the previous segment, and pointing proximally. The x -axis was




Figure 2. Definition of the joint geometrical parameters and coordinate systems. For all coordinate systems, the x -axis is represented in red, the y -axis in green, and the z -axis in black. For ball-and-socket joints, a sphere fitted to the articular surface was considered as the center of the rotation of the joint. For hinge joints, the rotation axis was defined as the line passing through the center of two spheres fitted to the condyles of the joint. Fitted spheres are represented in red and rotation axes are represented in yellow. (a) Representation of the sagittal plane. (b) Geometrical elements used to define the sagittal plane, the coordinate system of the thorax (x_t, y_t, z_t) and the coordinate system of the middle left coxa. The point P_{SP} was defined as the mid-point of the line segment passing through the center of the two propodeal spiracles. The points P_h and P_a correspond to the center of the spheres fitted to the thorax/head and thorax/abdomen joints, respectively. The point P_{ml_co} corresponds to the center of the sphere fitted to the articular surface of the middle left thorax/coxa joint. (c, d, e) Geometrical elements used to define the rotation axes and the coordinate systems of the coxa/trochanter, trochanter/femur, femur/tibia and tibia/metatarsus joints. In respective order, the points P_{ml_to} , P_{ml_fe} , P_{fe_ti} and P_{ti_mt} were defined as the mid-points of the line segments representing the rotation axis of the joints. (f) Geometrical elements used the rotation center and the coordinate systems of the metatarsus/tarsus joint. The point P_{ml_ta} corresponds to the center of the sphere fitted to the articular surface of the metatarsus/tarsus joint.

181 defined as the common axis perpendicular to the normal vector of the sagittal plane and to y . The
 182 z -axis was defined as the common axis perpendicular to x - and y -axis.

183 According to the previous definitions of the coordinate systems, the following convention for rotations
 184 was adopted. Abduction: positive rotation about the x -axis. Adduction: negative rotation about the x -axis.
 185 Internal rotation: positive rotation about the y -axis. External rotation: negative rotation about the y -axis.
 186 Flexion: negative rotation about the z -axis. Extension: positive rotation about the z -axis.

187 The model was composed of 39 segments and 65 DOF. Segments were considered as rigid bodies and
 188 joints were considered without clearance. Half of the kinematic chain of this model is represented in Figure
 189 3. 47 virtual markers were placed on the model according to the tracked anatomical landmarks (see Figure
 190 4). The model was created using the software tool NSM Builder (version 2.1) (Valente et al., 2017) and
 191 finally exported in an OpenSim format. Range of motion of the joints were constrained to feasible values
 192 to aid the convergence of the inverse kinematics algorithm. These values were determined in OpenSim by
 193 articulating each DOF of the model until some structures of the joint segments touch each other. Obtained
 194 values are presented in Tables 1 and 2.




Figure 3. Kinematic chain representing half of the ant locomotor system. Anatomy: th (thorax), pet (petiole), abd (abdomen), cox (coxa), tro (trochanter), fe (femur), ti (tibia), mt (metatarsus), ta (tarsus). Type of joint: hinge (example: mt/ta) or ball-and-socket (example: head/thorax).

195 2.5 Kinematic data acquisition and treatment

196 Kinematic data of a free walking ant (mean speed over the length of the calibrated walkway: 3.4 mm s^{-1})
 197 was acquired using high-speed synchronized video cameras (AI GO-5000M-PMCL). The experimental
 198 setup was composed of a wide walkway where the ant walked through, 5 cameras (1 of the top and 2
 199 for each side of the walkway) and 3 infra-red spots (see Figure 5). The shutter time was $1/3333 \text{ s}$, the
 200 acquisition time was set to 10 s with a sampling frequency of 300 Hz. The infrared spots were added to
 201 compensate this short shutter time. The resolution of the camera sensor was 2560×2048 pixels. Using
 202 Hiris software of R&D Vision (version 5.2.0), the active sensor window was adjusted to the ant size in a
 203 2000×418 pixels rectangular area. The average field of vision of the cameras was $15.8 \times 4.9 \times 7.8 \text{ mm}$
 204 that gives a spatial resolution of 0.0096 mm/pixel . Obtained raw videos are available from the project
 205 repository.




Figure 4. Position and denomination of the markers on the model. The following abbreviations are used for the denomination of the markers. Prefix: f (front), m (middle) or r (rear); Position: l (left), r (right). Anatomy and articulation: th (thorax), pet (petiole), abd (abdomen), cox (coxa), tro (trochanter), fe (femur), ti (tibia), mt (metatarsus), ta (tarsus).

Table 1. Maximum range of motion allowable for each degree of freedom of trunk joints. Values are presented per leg: front, middle, rear. The same values were used for left and right legs. These values were determined in OpenSim by articulating each degree of freedom of the model until some structures of the joint segments touch each other.

degree of freedom	maximum allowable range of motion (deg)
thorax/head adduction	75
thorax/head internal rotation	40
thorax/head flexion	120
thorax/abdomen adduction	25
thorax/abdomen internal rotation	60
thorax/abdomen flexion	100

206 Following a similar protocol than Merienne et al. (2020), the filming procedure was: (1) the ant was
 207 randomly collected from the colony and left in a box for 15 minutes in order to reduce the stress of the
 208 capture. (2) The ant was located at the beginning of the walkway and the recording started when it entered
 209 in the calibrated volume. The temperature of the room was $26 \pm 0.2^\circ$ during the filming procedure. Only
 210 one gait cycle was studied to avoid the variability of the motor control during different gait cycles (change
 211 of the walking speed, balance management and change of movement direction).

212 Video recordings were processed afterwards with the Vicon Peakmotus (version 10) software tool.
 213 Segment extremities were tracked semi-automatically during a gait cycle using a pattern matching technique.

Table 2. Maximum range of motion allowable for each degree of freedom of the leg joints. Values are presented per leg: front, middle, rear. The same values were used for left and right legs. These values were determined in OpenSim by articulating each degree of freedom of the model until some structures of the joint segment touch. Nonallocated values (NA) correspond to blocked degrees of freedom

degree of freedom	front legs (deg)	middle legs (deg)	rear legs (deg)
thorax/cox abduction	70	80	110
thorax/cox internal	40	55	105
thorax/cox flexion	80	100	105
cox/tro abduction	120	NA	NA
cox/tro internal	165	NA	NA
cox/tro flexion	180	120	130
tro/fe flexion	130	180	120
fe/ti flexion	160	165	190
ti/mt flexion	190	200	175
mt/ta flexion	200	200	240

214 The gait cycle was defined when the left middle leg leaves the ground and lifts, and it ends when that same
 215 leg leaves the ground again. Kinematic data was filtered with 4th order Butterworth low-pass filters with a
 216 cut-off frequency of 5 Hz. It was then resampled from 300 to 100 Hz to decrease computation time. Spatial
 217 coordinates of the anatomical landmarks (those represented in Figure 4) were exported on a c3d format file.
 218 This file is available from the project repository.




Figure 5. Video acquisition system. The experimental setup was composed of a wide walkway where the ant walked through, and was captured by 5 cameras. C: cameras, IR: infrared spots, P: 250x20 mm wide walkway.

219 **2.6 Model scaling and inverse kinematics analysis**

220 Spatial coordinates of the anatomical landmarks were used to scale the multibody model and to run
221 inverse kinematics simulations. A scaling procedure was carried out to fit the model (originally created
222 from the morphology of specimen 1) to the morphology of specimen 2. This was performed using the open
223 source software tool OpenSim (version 4.0) (Seth et al., 2018). Using the scaled model, inverse kinematics
224 simulations were also performed in OpenSim. Joint angles as well as root mean square errors (RMSE)
225 were obtained from these simulations.

226 **2.7 Propagation of model parameter uncertainties**

227 In order to evaluate the sensitivity of the calculated kinematic data to model parameter uncertainties, two
228 MC simulations were conducted. A similar procedure was used by Martelli et al. (2015) and Myers et al.
229 (2015).

230 In the first MC simulation, position of model markers was randomly perturbed according to their
231 uncertainty. Random values were assumed to have a uniform distribution (i.e. all outcomes were
232 considered as equally likely). Variations were assumed to be the same in all directions of the measurement
233 volume. Therefore, the uncertainty zone for the model markers was assumed to be spherical. The radius
234 of these spherical uncertainty zones was chosen as a common residual value for the camera calibration
235 process for the used experimental setup: 0.4 mm.

236 In the second MC simulation, joint geometrical parameters (location and orientation) were randomly
237 disturbed. The uncertainty in location and orientation of joints is mainly related with operator-dependent
238 variability of the treatment and identification of the articular surfaces. In order to define perturbation
239 magnitude (translation and rotation) introduced to the joint geometrical parameters, several procedures
240 of identification of articular surfaces were carried out. Cylindrical uncertainty zones were assumed for
241 hinge joints while spherical uncertainty zones for ball-and-socket joints. The radius of the cylindrical and
242 spherical uncertainty zones was considered to be the same for all the joints and equal to: 0.2 mm.

243 These MC simulations were implemented and run by means of the OpenSim API. 1000 iterations were
244 carried out for each MC simulation, which were enough to guarantee a stabilization of average values.
245 Average values of joint angles at each time step were calculated from the obtained results. Coverage
246 intervals were defined as twice the standard deviation. The sensitivity of the kinematic results regarding
247 model parameter uncertainties was defined as the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) of the joint angles during the
248 gait. The SNR was calculated as the maximum amplitude of the signal (also called power of the signal, P_s)
249 divided by the maximum coverage interval (also called power of the noise, P_n) of the joint angle during
250 the gait. Therefore, a SNR value was obtained per degree of freedom for the analyzed gait cycle.

3 RESULTS

251 In order to determine how modeling assumptions affect inverse kinematics results at the ant scale, a
252 multibody model of the *Messor barbarus* was developed together with a simulation framework to evaluate
253 its sensitivity. Both the model and the simulation framework are freely available on the SimTK repository:
254 <https://simtk.org/projects/barbarus>. From the experimental kinematic data, an inverse
255 kinematics simulation was conducted. The results of this simulation, representing a gait cycle of free
256 locomotion of the *Messor barbarus*, are summarized in Tables 3 and 4. A video of the simulated kinematics
257 is available from the project repository.

258 These results correspond to the range of motion of the joint angles. The whole set of results is available
259 from the project repository and can also be reproduced from the model and the experimental kinematic




Figure 6. Representation of the uncertainty of the computed kinematics of the ant gait. The uncertainty $\Delta\theta$ is represented for the femur/tibia angle ($\theta_{fe/ti}$) of the middle left leg for: joint axis perturbation $\Delta\theta_a$ (black shaded confidence intervals) and marker position perturbation $\Delta\theta_m$ (green shaded confidence intervals).

260 data. It can be noticed that the trochanter/femur (tr/fe) joint is the one with the wider range of motion, while
 261 the thorax/coxa joints exhibit the smallest one. The average RMSE of the inverse kinematics simulation
 262 was 0.21 mm, which corresponds to 3.2% of specimen size.

263 The sensitivity of the kinematic results regarding model parameter uncertainties was evaluated by means
 264 of the SNR. These results are summarized per set of joints, from marker perturbation, as well as from axis
 265 perturbation, in Table 5. High SNR values indicate that the power of the signal (computed joint angle) is
 266 representative with respect to the power of the noise (confidence intervals). SNR values near or lower than
 267 1 indicate that the dynamics of the signal of interest might be hidden by noise. It can be noticed that the
 268 computed kinematics is more sensitive to marker perturbation compared to joint axis perturbation (Table
 269 5). The perturbation applied to the markers generated a SNR of 2.2 in average for all the joints. This means
 270 that the dynamics of the studied signal (computed joint angles) can be observed despite possible variations

Table 3. Results of the inverse kinematics simulation for the trunk joints. Reported values represent the range of motion in degrees of the joint angles.

degree of freedom	range of motion (deg)
thorax/head abduction	19.5
thorax/head internal rotation	9.0
thorax/head flexion	13.3
thorax/abdomen abduction	11.9
thorax/abdomen internal rotation	14.2
thorax/abdomen flexion	13.8

Table 4. Results of the inverse kinematics simulation for the leg joints. Reported values represent the range of motion in degrees of the joint angles. Nonallocated values (NA) correspond to blocked degrees of freedom.

degree of freedom	front right leg (deg)	middle right leg (deg)	rear right leg (deg)	front left leg (deg)	middle left leg (deg)	rear left leg (deg)
thorax/cox abduction	40.7	32.0	16.5	19.1	23.4	27.2
thorax/cox internal rotation	29.3	54.0	35.7	28.1	26.0	16.3
thorax/cox flexion	26.5	25.9	90.6	22.1	39.4	14.9
cox/tro abduction	78.2	NA	NA	74.6	NA	NA
cox/tro internal rotation	76.3	NA	NA	47.3	NA	NA
cox/tro flexion	90.0	30.6	30.2	43.9	48.3	42.4
tro/fe flexion	120.7	53.1	103.9	78.6	27.2	15.6
fe/ti flexion	61.6	73.6	66.7	39.3	38.2	60.2
ti/mt flexion	53.8	41.0	29.0	63.4	17.7	17.2
mt/ta flexion	56.9	36.2	43.5	57.7	NA	23.4

271 during the motion analysis process. The SNR from axis perturbation was almost four times higher than that
 272 from markers perturbation. No significant differences in sensitivity were found between the joints of the
 273 legs on the right side of the body with respect to those on the left side. No tendency can be inferred from
 274 the sensitivity of the joints with respect to their anterior-posterior position: front, middle and rear. The joint
 275 that showed the highest SNR values (consequently a lower sensitivity) was the fe/ti joint, and this was the
 276 case for both marker and axis perturbation.

277 Figure 7 illustrates kinematic results obtained from the simulation of the ant model and the experimental
 278 kinematic data for joints of the middle right leg ((a) thorax/cox, (b) cox/tro, (c) tro/fe, (d) fe/ti, (e) ti/mt
 279 and (f) mt/ta flexion angles). Mean values (in solid lines) from both MC simulations (marker and axis
 280 perturbation) are shown with their corresponding confidence intervals (shaded regions). The green line
 281 and shaded region represent the results from the marker perturbation, and the black line and shaded region
 282 represent the results from the axis perturbation. The SNR of the thorax/cox flexion angle obtained from
 283 the axis perturbation simulation is illustrated in Figure 7 (a). From these results, it can be noticed that the
 284 confidence intervals of the joint angles when disturbing the axis location and orientation were smaller than
 285 the confidence intervals obtained from the marker position perturbation.

4 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

286 In this paper, the propagation of parameter uncertainties in kinematic modelling has been evaluated at the
 287 small-scale. This work demonstrates the feasibility of using biomechanical models to study locomotion in
 288 relatively small animals. Because of their scale, motion analysis techniques for hexapods are less developed

Table 5. Results of the sensitivity analysis. These results represent the average of signal-to-noise ratio per joint obtained from: marker perturbation (first column) and axis perturbation (second column). In the case of cox/tro, tro/fe, fe/ti, ti/mt, and mt/ta joints, averages were calculated from the signal-to-noise ratio of the six legs.

joint	signal-to-noise ratio from marker perturbation	signal-to-noise ratio from axis perturbation
all joints	2.20	8.10
right-hand side joints	2.29	7.96
left-hand side joints	2.27	8.92
front legs joints	1.54	9.13
middle legs joints	2.82	8.05
rear legs joints	2.69	7.97
thorax/head	1.71	5.08
thorax/abdomen	1.38	4.97
thorax/cox	1.58	4.65
cox/tro	2.73	7.25
tro/fe	1.57	5.52
fe/ti	6.87	27.63
ti/mt	1.70	8.62
mt/ta	1.19	7.14

289 compared to those for quadrupeds and bipeds. In relatively big animals, the use of several reflective markers
 290 per segment allows a good precision of the kinematic data. However, the use of physical markers is not
 291 easy in motion analysis in small insects. This implies that the capabilities of the small-scale biomechanical
 292 modeling techniques must be well evaluated.

293 To do so, a multibody model of a *Messor barbarus* ant was developed. It is available in open source
 294 from the project repository and can be used and enhanced by the scientific community. Besides, the model
 295 could allow biologists to study function/structure relationships of *Messor barbarus*. The whole set of
 296 experimental and simulated kinematic data is also available from the project repository.

297 In spite of the differences in morphology of the studied species, the obtained joint angles were in the same
 298 order of magnitude as those reported in the literature about ant kinematics (see Table 6). The difference
 299 between angle range of left and right legs comes from the fact that the ant did not walk perfectly straight.
 300 Obtained kinematic data are valuable for roboticists to implement bio-inspired gaits in robots (see Ouyang
 301 et al. (2021) for example).

302 A possible error source in the conducted kinematic simulation could be linked to the use of two
 303 different specimens for acquiring experimental data (one for the geometrical 3D model and one for
 304 the experimental kinematic data). When using two subjects to perform a constrained kinematics simulation,
 305 a scaling procedure is required, which is naturally an additional source of errors. This might be one of
 306 the main reasons for the obtained RMSE values. In comparison to human locomotion simulations, the
 307 obtained normalized RMSE values for ant locomotion simulation were greater. In human simulations, it is
 308 recommended not to exceed 0.6% relative RMSE regarding body size (in contrast to a normalized RMSE
 309 of 3.2% obtained in this work). This difference can also be related to the fact that the ant body is composed
 310 of more segments than the human one.

311 Thanks to the developed model, the impact of the propagation of model parameter uncertainties in inverse
 312 kinematics simulations at insect-scale was evaluated. Obtained SNR values indicate that the geometric
 313 and kinematic measurement techniques used are feasible for the development of multibody models at




Figure 7. Kinematic results obtained from the simulation of the ant model and the experimental kinematic data for flexion angle of the middle right leg of (a) thorax/cox; (b) cox/tro; (c) tro/fe; (d) fe/ti; (e) ti/mt and (f) mt/ta. The recorded and simulated gait cycle lasted 1.39 s. These results are a sample of the whole set of results available from the project repository. Solid lines indicate the mean values from the Monte Carlo simulations from the marker perturbation (green) and from the axis perturbation (black). For marker and axis perturbation respectively, the green and black shaded region represent the confidence interval (calculated as twice the standard deviation). The dashed vertical lines (37% and 87%) indicate when legs of both tripods were on the ground. The SNR of the thorax/cox flexion angle obtained from the axis perturbation simulation is illustrated in 7 (a). P_s (standing for power of the signal) corresponds to the peak-to-peak amplitude of the signal. P_n (standing for power of the noise) corresponds to the maximal coverage interval of the joint angle during the gait.

314 the ant-scale. The fact that the model is more sensitive to marker perturbations, indicates that efforts in
 315 kinematic modeling at the ant-scale must be centered around the kinematic acquisition (marker definition,
 316 placement, tracking, etc.) rather than geometric acquisition (μ -CT, segmentation, joint parameter definition,
 317 etc.). The fact of experiencing lower sensitivity at the fe/ti joint can be explained by the large range of
 318 motion of this joint and, also, because it is composed of the two longest segments of the limb. Long

Table 6. Summary of studies investigating ant kinematics.

Study	Analyzed angle	Specie	Methods	Range of motion (deg)	Corresponding range of motion from this study (deg)
Weihmann and Blickhan (2009)	thorax/head flexion	Cataglyphis fortis	video-based analysis (250 Hz, 480x480 pixels of camera resolution)	5	13
Weihmann and Blickhan (2009)	thorax/head flexion	Formica pratensis	video-based analysis (250 Hz, 480x480 pixels of camera resolution)	5	13
Reinhardt and Blickhan (2014)	thorax/head flexion	Formica polyctena	video-based analysis (500 Hz, 768x512 pixels of camera resolution)	10	13
Weihmann and Blickhan (2009)	thorax/abdomen flexion	Cataglyphis fortis	video-based analysis (250 Hz, 480x480 pixels of camera resolution)	10	14
Weihmann and Blickhan (2009)	thorax/abdomen flexion	Formica pratensis	video-based analysis (250 Hz, 480x480 pixels of camera resolution)	14	14
Reinhardt and Blickhan (2014)	thorax/abdomen flexion	Formica polyctena	video-based analysis (500 Hz, 768x512 pixels of camera resolution)	10	14
Guo et al. (2018)	thorax/cx flexion angle on middle left leg	Cataglyphis fortis	video-based analysis (500 Hz, 480x480 pixels of camera resolution)	63	39
Guo et al. (2018)	cx/fe flexion angle on middle left leg	Cataglyphis fortis	video-based analysis (500 Hz, 480x480 pixels of camera resolution)	37	27
Guo et al. (2018)	fe/tb flexion angle on middle left leg	Cataglyphis fortis	video-based analysis (500 Hz, 480x480 pixels of camera resolution)	83	38

319 segments are easier to track, plus the perturbation of the measurement process has lower impact than in the
 320 case of short segments. The fact of having no significant differences in sensitivity between the joints of the
 321 legs on the right side of the body compared to those on the left side can be associated to the symmetry of
 322 the video acquisition system regarding the walkway.

323 This study presents several limitations, however. From an experimental point of view, the following
 324 aspects can be improved. Each body segment was tracked by only two markers. The number of tracked
 325 markers per segments could be increased to improve the quality of the simulation. Additionally, emerging
 326 automatic tracking techniques (i.e. deep learning powered motion-tracking) must be explored as an
 327 alternative to reduce tracking time and to increase the number of tracked points per segment. Finally, the

328 four tarsal segments were all lumped into a unique rigid segment. This was due to the configuration and the
329 capacity of the experimental setup (camera resolution, number of cameras, camera position, etc.) which
330 did not provide enough resolution to track the tarsals segments individually. On the other hand, from a
331 modeling point of view, the segments of the ant were considered as rigid bodies because of the complexity
332 of taking body deformation into consideration. This assumption merits a profound analysis in order to
333 determine the effects of segment compliance in insect locomotion, which seems to play an important role
334 (Blickhan et al., 2021).

335 Finally, future work is required to develop a dynamic model of the ant gait. This requires determining
336 muscle parameters (geometrical and force-generating parameters), segment mass and inertia properties, as
337 well as ground reaction forces. This study contributes to the construction of a musculoskeletal model of
338 ants which can be useful in the study of evolution, neural control, and bio-mimetic applications.

FUNDING

339 This work was partially subsidized by the CNRS AO MITI Biomim founding. Work by JD was supported
340 by a scholarship from the *Collectivité Territoriale de Martinique*.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

341 The authors would like to thank Pr. Evan Okonomo and Dr. Francisco Hita Garcia (Biodiversity and
342 Biocomplexity Unit, Okinawa Institute of Science and Technology, Japan) who performed the scans that
343 enabled to determine segment and joint geometries. They would also like to acknowledge Moran Le
344 Gleau's contribution to the treatment of the μ -CT under the supervision of Adam Khalife, as well as Tanguy
345 Puluhen for his help during the development of the multibody model. Thanks also to the CNRS GDR 2088
346 Biomim who encouraged this work.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

347 The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial
348 relationship that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

SUPPLEMENTAL DATA

349 The ant model and the simulation framework are freely available at the SimTK repository: <https://simtk.org/projects/barbarus>
350

REFERENCES

- 351 Ahn, C., Liang, X., and Cai, S. (2019). Bioinspired Design of Light-Powered Crawling, Squeezing, and
352 Jumping Untethered Soft Robot. *Advanced Materials Technologies* 4, 1900185. doi:10.1002/admt.
353 201900185
- 354 Ambe, Y., Aoi, S., Nachstedt, T., Manoonpong, P., Wörgötter, F., and Matsuno, F. (2018). Simple analytical
355 model reveals the functional role of embodied sensorimotor interaction in hexapod gaits. *PLOS ONE*
356 13, e0192469. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0192469
- 357 Bernadou, A., Espadaler, X., Dos-Reis, V., and Fourcassié, V. (2011). Effect of substrate roughness on load
358 selection in the seed-harvester ant *Messor barbarus* L. (Hymenoptera, Formicidae). *Behavioral Ecology*
359 and *Sociobiology* 65, 1763. doi:10.1007/s00265-011-1184-4
- 360 Blanke, A., Watson, P. J., Holbrey, R., and Fagan, M. J. (2017). Computational biomechanics changes our
361 view on insect head evolution. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 284, 20162412.
362 doi:10.1098/rspb.2016.2412

- 363 Blickhan, R. and Full, R. J. (1987). Locomotion Energetics of the Ghost Crab: II. Mechanics of the Centre
364 of Mass During Walking and Running. Journal of Experimental Biology 130, 155–174. doi:10.1242/
365 jeb.130.1.155
- 366 Blickhan, R., Weihmann, T., and Barth, F. G. (2021). Measuring strain in the exoskeleton of
367 spiders—virtues and caveats. Journal of Comparative Physiology A 207, 191–204. doi:10.1007/
368 s00359-020-01458-y
- 369 Christensen, K. B., Günther, M., Schmitt, S., and Siebert, T. (2021). Cross-bridge mechanics estimated
370 from skeletal muscles' work-loop responses to impacts in legged locomotion. Scientific Reports 11,
371 23638. doi:10.1038/s41598-021-02819-6
- 372 Cruse, H. (1976). The function of the legs in the free walking stick insect, *Carausius morosus*. Journal of
373 comparative physiology 112, 235–262. doi:10.1007/BF00606541
- 374 David, S., Funken, J., Potthast, W., and Blanke, A. (2016). Musculoskeletal modelling under an evolutionary
375 perspective: deciphering the role of single muscle regions in closely related insects. Journal of The
376 Royal Society Interface 13, 20160675. doi:10.1098/rsif.2016.0675
- 377 Dunne, J. J., Uchida, T. K., Besier, T. F., Delp, S. L., and Seth, A. (2021). A marker registration
378 method to improve joint angles computed by constrained inverse kinematics. PLOS ONE 16, 1–11.
379 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0252425
- 380 Dupeyroux, J., Serres, J. R., and Viollet, S. (2019). Antbot: A six-legged walking robot able to home like
381 desert ants in outdoor environments. Science Robotics 4
- 382 Eichelberger, P., Ferraro, M., Minder, U., Denton, T., Blasimann, A., Krause, F., et al. (2016). Analysis of
383 accuracy in optical motion capture – A protocol for laboratory setup evaluation. Journal of Biomechanics
384 49, 2085–2088. doi:10.1016/j.jbiomech.2016.05.007
- 385 El Habachi, A., Moissenet, F., Duprey, S., Cheze, L., and Dumas, R. (2015). Global sensitivity analysis
386 of the joint kinematics during gait to the parameters of a lower limb multi-body model. Medical &
387 Biological Engineering & Computing 53, 655–667. doi:10.1007/s11517-015-1269-8
- 388 Full, R. J., Blickhan, R., and Ting, L. H. (1991). Leg design in hexapedal runners. The Journal of
389 Experimental Biology 158
- 390 Grabowska, M., Godlewska, E., Schmidt, J., and Daun-Gruhn, S. (2012a). Quadrupedal gaits in hexapod
391 animals – inter-leg coordination in free-walking adult stick insects. Journal of Experimental Biology
392 215, 4255–4266. doi:10.1242/jeb.073643
- 393 Grabowska, M., Godlewska, E., Schmidt, J., and Daun-Gruhn, S. (2012b). Quadrupedal gaits in hexapod
394 animals – inter-leg coordination in free-walking adult stick insects. Journal of Experimental Biology
395 215, 4255–4266. doi:10.1242/JEB.073643
- 396 Groen, B., Geurts, M., Nienhuis, B., and Duysens, J. (2012). Sensitivity of the olga and vcm models to
397 erroneous marker placement: Effects on 3d-gait kinematics. Gait & Posture 35, 517–521. doi:https:
398 //doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2011.11.019
- 399 Guo, S., Lin, J., Wöhrle, T., and Liao, M. (2018). A Neuro-Musculo-Skeletal Model for Insects With
400 Data-driven Optimization. Scientific Reports 8, 2129. doi:10.1038/s41598-018-20093-x
- 401 Hölldobler, B. and Wilson, E. O. (1990). The Ants (Cambridge: Harvard University Press). doi:10.2307/
402 1419398
- 403 Hoyt, D. F. and Taylor, C. R. (1981). Gait and the energetics of locomotion in horses. Nature 292, 239–240.
404 doi:10.1038/292239a0
- 405 Hughes, G. M. (1952). The co-ordination of insect movements: I the walking movements of insects.
406 Journal of Experimental Biology 29, 267–285

- 407 Liu, S.-P., Richter, A., Stoessel, A., and Beutel, R. G. (2019). The mesosomal anatomy of myrmecia
408 nigrocincta workers and evolutionary transformations in formicidae (hymenoptera). *Arthropod*
409 *Systematics & Phylogeny* 77, 1–19. doi:10.26049/ASP77-1-2019-01
- 410 Lu, H., Zhang, M., Yang, Y., Huang, Q., Fukuda, T., Wang, Z., et al. (2018). A bioinspired multilegged
411 soft millirobot that functions in both dry and wet conditions. *Nature Communications* 9, 3944. doi:10.
412 1038/s41467-018-06491-9
- 413 Lu, T. W. and O'Connor, J. J. (1999). Bone position estimation from skin marker co-ordinates using global
414 optimisation with joint constraints. *Journal of Biomechanics* 32, 129–134. doi:10.1016/S0021-9290(98)
415 00158-4
- 416 Martelli, S., Valente, G., Viceconti, M., and Taddei, F. (2015). Sensitivity of a subject-specific
417 musculoskeletal model to the uncertainties on the joint axes location. *Computer Methods in*
418 *Biomechanics and Biomedical Engineering* 18, 1555–1563. doi:10.1080/10255842.2014.930134.
419 PMID: 24963785
- 420 Merienne, H., Latil, G., Moretto, P., and Fourcassié, V. (2020). Walking kinematics in the polymorphic
421 seed harvester ant *Messor barbarus*: Influence of body size and load carriage. *Journal of Experimental*
422 *Biology* 223. doi:10.1242/JEB.205690
- 423 Merienne, H., Latil, G., Moretto, P., and Fourcassié, V. (2021). Dynamics of locomotion in the seed
424 harvesting ant *Messor barbarus*: effect of individual body mass and transported load mass. *PeerJ* 9, 20.
425 doi:10.7717/PEERJ.10664
- 426 Moll, K., Roces, F., and Federle, W. (2010). Foraging grass-cutting ants (*Atta vollenweideri*) maintain
427 stability by balancing their loads with controlled head movements. *Journal of Comparative Physiology*
428 *A* 196, 471–480. doi:10.1007/s00359-010-0535-3
- 429 Musthak Ali, T. M., Baroni Urbani, C., and Billen, J. (1992). Multiple jumping behaviors in the
430 ant *Harpegnathos saltator*. *Naturwissenschaften* 79, 374–376. doi:10.1007/BF01140185
- 431 Myers, C. A., Laz, P. J., Shelburne, K. B., and Davidson, B. S. (2015). A Probabilistic Approach to
432 Quantify the Impact of Uncertainty Propagation in Musculoskeletal Simulations. *Annals of Biomedical*
433 *Engineering* 43, 1098–1111. doi:10.1007/s10439-014-1181-7
- 434 Nirody, J. A. (2021). Universal Features in Panarthropod Inter-Limb Coordination during Forward Walking.
435 *Integrative and Comparative Biology*, 1–13doi:10.1093/ICB/ICAB097
- 436 Ouyang, W., Chi, H., Pang, J., Liang, W., and Ren, Q. (2021). Adaptive locomotion control of a hexapod
437 robot via bio-inspired learning. *Frontiers in Neurorobotics* 15, 1. doi:10.3389/fnbot.2021.627157
- 438 Peeters, C., Keller, R. A., Khalife, A., Fischer, G., Katzke, J., Blanke, A., et al. (2020). The loss of flight in
439 ant workers enabled an evolutionary redesign of the thorax for ground labour. *Frontiers in Zoology* 17,
440 33. doi:10.1186/s12983-020-00375-9
- 441 Pfeffer, S. E., Wahl, V. L., Wittlinger, M., and Wolf, H. (2019). High-speed locomotion in the Saharan
442 silver ant, *Cataglyphis bombycina*. *Journal of Experimental Biology* 222. doi:10.1242/jeb.198705
- 443 Ramdya, P., Thandiackal, R., Cherney, R., Asselborn, T., Benton, R., Ijspeert, A. J., et al. (2017).
444 Climbing favours the tripod gait over alternative faster insect gaits. *Nature Communications* 8, 14494.
445 doi:10.1038/ncomms14494
- 446 Reinhardt, L. and Blickhan, R. (2014). Level locomotion in wood ants: evidence for grounded running.
447 *Journal of Experimental Biology* 217, 2358–2370. doi:10.1242/jeb.098426
- 448 Reinhardt, L., Weihmann, T., and Blickhan, R. (2009). Dynamics and kinematics of ant locomotion: do
449 wood ants climb on level surfaces? *Journal of Experimental Biology* 212, 2426–2435. doi:10.1242/jeb.
450 026880

- 451 Schultheiss, P. and Guénard, B. (2021). Kinematic study of six mangrove ant species (Hymenoptera:
452 Formicidae) reveals different swimming styles and abilities. *Myrmecological News* 31, 217–224.
453 doi:10.25849/MYRMECOL.NEWS_031:217
- 454 Seth, A., Hicks, J. L., Uchida, T. K., Habib, A., Dembia, C. L., Dunne, J. J., et al. (2018). OpenSim:
455 Simulating musculoskeletal dynamics and neuromuscular control to study human and animal movement.
456 *PLOS Computational Biology* 14, e1006223. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1006223
- 457 Theunissen, L. M. and Dürr, V. (2013). Insects use two distinct classes of steps during unrestrained
458 locomotion. *PLoS ONE* 8, e85321. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0085321
- 459 Valente, G., Crimi, G., Vanella, N., Schileo, E., and Taddei, F. (2017). nmsbuilder: Freeware to create
460 subject-specific musculoskeletal models for opensim. *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine*
461 152, 85–92. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmpb.2017.09.012
- 462 Weihmann, T. and Blickhan, R. (2009). Comparing inclined locomotion in a ground-living and a climbing
463 ant species: sagittal plane kinematics. *Journal of Comparative Physiology A* 195, 1011. doi:10.1007/
464 s00359-009-0475-y
- 465 Wu, G., Siegler, S., Allard, P., Kirtley, C., Leardini, A., Rosenbaum, D., et al. (2002). ISB recommendation
466 on definitions of joint coordinate system of various joints for the reporting of human joint motion—part
467 I: ankle, hip, and spine. *Journal of Biomechanics* 35, 543–548. doi:10.1016/S0021-9290(01)00222-6
- 468 Wu, G., van der Helm, F. C. T., (DirkJan) Veeger, H. E. J., Makhsous, M., Van Roy, P., Anglin, C., et al.
469 (2005). ISB recommendation on definitions of joint coordinate systems of various joints for the reporting
470 of human joint motion—Part II: shoulder, elbow, wrist and hand. *Journal of Biomechanics* 38, 981–992.
471 doi:10.1016/j.jbiomech.2004.05.042
- 472 Wöhrle, T., Reinhardt, L., and Blickhan, R. (2017). Propulsion in hexapod locomotion: How do desert ants
473 traverse slopes? *Journal of Experimental Biology*, jeb.137505doi:10.1242/jeb.137505
- 474 Yang, J.-M. and Kim, J.-H. (1998). Fault-tolerant locomotion of the hexapod robot. *IEEE Transactions on*
475 *Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Part B (Cybernetics)* 28, 109–116. doi:10.1109/3477.658585
- 476 Yanoviak, S. P., Dudley, R., and Kaspari, M. (2005). Directed aerial descent in canopy ants. *Nature* 433,
477 624–626. doi:10.1038/nature03254
- 478 Yushkevich, P. A., Piven, J., Hazlett, H. C., Smith, R. G., Ho, S., Gee, J. C., et al. (2006). User-guided 3d
479 active contour segmentation of anatomical structures: Significantly improved efficiency and reliability.
480 *NeuroImage* 31, 1116–1128. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2006.01.015
- 481 Zhang, W., Li, M., Zheng, G., Guan, Z., Wu, J., and Wu, Z. (2020). Multifunctional mandibles of ants:
482 Variation in gripping behavior facilitated by specific microstructures and kinematics. *Journal of Insect*
483 *Physiology* 120, 103993. doi:10.1016/j.jinsphys.2019.103993
- 484 Zollikofer, C. (1994). Stepping patterns in ants - influence of body morphology. *Journal of Experimental*
485 *Biology* 192, 107–118. doi:10.1242/jeb.192.1.107