

# **Preliminary study of angular velocity vs. angular position phase diagram of the thoraco-pelvis joint with ambulatory lumbar traction exoskeleton**

Mélissa Moulart, M Acien, Nicolas Olivier, Frédéric Marin

# **To cite this version:**

Mélissa Moulart, M Acien, Nicolas Olivier, Frédéric Marin. Preliminary study of angular velocity vs. angular position phase diagram of the thoraco-pelvis joint with ambulatory lumbar traction exoskeleton. 47th congress of the Society of Biomechanics, Oct 2022, Monastir, Tunisia. pp.S1 - S307,  $10.1080/10255842.2022.2116885$ . hal-03887165

# **HAL Id: hal-03887165 <https://hal.science/hal-03887165v1>**

Submitted on 6 Dec 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.

COMPUTER METHODS IN BIOMECHANICS AND BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING  $\textcircled{\scriptsize{\textbf{S}}}$  \$213 to cite this article: Moulart al. (2022) Preliminary study of angular velocity vs. angular position phase<br>diagram of the thoraco-pelvis joint with ambulatory lumbar traction exoskeleton s213-s214<br>in ABSTRACTS 47th congress

# Preliminary study of angular velocity vs. angular position phase diagram of the thoraco-pelvis joint with ambulatory lumbar traction exoskeleton

M. Moulart<sup>a,b</sup>, M. Acien<sup>b,c</sup>, N. Olivier<sup>d</sup> and F. Marin<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Université de technologie de Compiègne, UMR CNRS 7338 BioMécanique et BioIngénierie, Alliance Sorbonne Université, Compiègne, France; <sup>b</sup>Japet Medical Devices, Loos, France;<br><sup>C</sup>l Iniversité Paris-Saclay faculté des Sciences du Sport, Gif Universite Paris-Saclay faculte des Sciences du Sport, Gif-sur-Yvette, France; <sup>d</sup>Univ. Lille, Univ. Artois, Univ. Littoral Côte d'Opale, ULR 7369 – URePSSS – Unite de Recherche Pluridisciplinaire Sport Santé Société, Lille, France

### 1. Introduction

Musculoskeletal disorders (MSDs) are a scourge in businesses, with very high costs (Parker et al. 2014). The use of a dedicated exoskeleton possibly provides a solution to reduce mechanical joint stresses. However, the biomechanical impact of an exoskeleton is complex to quantify (Vignais et al. 2013). The purpose of this study is to assess the effect of an ambulatory lumbar traction exoskeleton on kinematics on the thoraco-pelvis joint.

### 2. Methods

Laboratory motion capture session was performed on 10 asymptomatic subjects (3 $\delta$  and 7 $\circ$ , mean ± std, age:  $20.2 \pm 1.2$  years, mass:  $69.1 \pm 10.9$  kg, height:  $1.76 \pm 0.09$ ) with a sequence of movements (Sghaier et al. 2019). The sequence of movements is as follows: trunk frontal bending, trunk lateral bending, trunk axial rotation, walking, walking carrying a 5 kg box,



Figure 1. Transfer of a 5 kg box from one table to another (transfer movement).



Figure 2. Phase diagram (angular velocity vs. angular position) for the simple trunk movements: flexion, lateral bending and axial rotation. The yellow curves are the result 'NO EXO' and the blue one the 'EXO ON'. However, we noticed the exoskeleton did not affect the axial rotation movement.

free lifting a 5 kg box (the subject can freely choose his lifting technique), squat lifting a 5 kg box (the subject must bend the knees with the trunk straight) and transferring a 5 kg box, according to 2 randomized conditions: (i) without an exoskeleton labelled 'NO EXO', and (ii) with the exoskeleton (Japet.W, Japet Medical Devices®) set on a lumbar traction of 8 kg labelled 'EXO ON' (Figure 1). All movements are repeated 3 to 5 times. Between the passage of the two conditions, each subject has a resting time of 5 min. 'NO EXO' data shall be considered as the reference data. On the basis of the data collected with the motion capture phase diagram, relative rotations between the trunk and the pelvis were computed (Burgess-Limerick et al. 1993).

## 3. Results and discussion

The preliminary results show a clear difference in amplitude and angular velocity according to the different conditions for the flexion and lateral bending (Figure 2).

#### 4. Conclusions

The analysis of joint kinematics using the angular velocity vs. angular position phase diagram explores not only a quantification of kinematic parameters, but also more information available from muscle receptors (Burgess-Limerick et al. 1993). As a result, this representation enables greater sensitivity to the environmental change effect in terms of neuromechanical muscle coordination (Burgess-Limerick et al. 1993). Here, in our case, it is, indeed the wearing of the exoskeleton that influences the movement's biomechanics of the lumbar complex.

In our study, because of the movement's amplitude decrease by  $-45^{\circ}$  in flexion and  $20^{\circ}$  in inclination,<br>the lumber traction exoskeleton limits the trunk the lumbar traction exoskeleton limits the trunk motion angular range in an area considered to be at moderate risk by ergonomics (Sghaier et al. 2019). Furthermore, for these movements, it also decreases the angular speeds, consequently reducing the operator's production rate with the counterpart of a longterm endurance increase (Vignais et al. 2013).

This preliminary study demonstrated the relevance of a phase diagram analysis for quantifying the biomechanical impact of a lumbar-drawn exoskeleton.

The perspective of this work is now to conduct a clinical study with a larger population to confirm the subject's benefit to the wear such an exoskeleton.

#### Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

#### Acknowledgements

We thank the volunteers, the company Japet Medical Devices for the loan of the exoskeletons, and the UTC for the availability of the motion capture platform.

#### References

- Burgess-Limerick R, Abernethy B, Neal RJ. 1993. Relative phase quantifies interjoint coordination. J Biomech. 26(1):91–94.
- Parker SL, Godil SS, Mendenhall SK, Zuckerman SL, Shau DN, McGirt MJ. 2014. Two-year comprehensive medical management of degenerative lumbar spine disease (lumbar spondylolisthesis, stenosis, or disc herniation): a value analysis of cost, pain, disability, and quality of life: Clinical article. J Neurosurg Spine. 21(2):143–149.
- Sghaier N, Bellhari-Trahin S, Marin F, Ben Mansour K. 2019. How to estimate the transparency assistance of a passive exoskeleton? a case study. Comput Method Biomech Biomed Eng. 22(sup1):S460–S462.
- Vignais N, Miezal M, Bleser G, Mura K, Gorecky D, Marin F. 2013. Innovative system for real-time ergonomic feedback in industrial manufacturing. Appl Ergon. 44(4):566–574.

KEYWORDS Musculoskeletal disorder (MSD); motion capture; exoskeleton; biomechanics

melissa.moulart@utc.fr